



SPC
Secretariat
of the Pacific
Community



**GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE:
PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND STATES PROJECT**

**REPORT ON NAURU CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN PROPOSAL PREPARATION
USING THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH WORKSHOP
20-23 January 2014**



Introduction

The Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) project is funded by the European Union (EU) and implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Organisation (SPREP). The project budget is €11.4 million. The implementation period for the GCCA: PSIS project is from the date of signature of the agreement, 19 July 2011, to 19 November 2014.

The overall objective of the GCCA: PSIS project is to support the governments of nine Pacific smaller island states, namely Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga and Tuvalu in their efforts to tackle the adverse effects of climate change. The purpose of the project is to promote long term strategies and approaches to adaptation planning and pave the way for more effective and coordinated aid delivery on climate change at the national and regional level.

The project approach is to assist the nine countries design and implement practical on-the-ground climate change adaptation projects in conjunction with mainstreaming climate change into line ministries and national development plans; thereby helping countries move from an *ad hoc* project-by-project approach towards a programmatic approach underpinning an entire sector. This has the added advantage of helping countries better position themselves to access and benefit from new sources and modalities of climate change funding, e.g. national and sector budget support.

GCCA: Capacity development in proposal preparation using the logical framework approach Project ('LFA training') in Nauru

Following a regional workshop on Climate Finance and Proposal Preparation held in Apia, Samoa, 26 – 27 October 2012, and supported by the Asia-Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP) and SPC, six of the countries (Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue and Tuvalu) involved in the GCCA: PSIS project expressed their interest in having a national training workshop on project proposal preparation using the logical framework approach. This LFA training project responds to that expressed need. The project provides a valuable opportunity to strengthen national government staff to develop successful and integrated climate change adaptation project proposals. This will allow PSIS and donors to work together to ensure a more effective and coordinated aid delivery to address climate change at the national and regional level.

The Nauru training workshop was delivered over 4 days (20-23 January 2014). Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates (PREA) were contracted to deliver the LFA training, based on the resources that they had previously developed and piloted in the Cook Islands. The workshop was held in the main Nauru Government building and was attended by twenty one participants.

The training made use of a donor directory (Donors for Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific) developed for SPC and SPREP. PREA also researched additional donors active in the Pacific region who support PSIS and LDCs. All relevant training resources were provided to participants in hardcopy with an electronic copy provided on a USB stick for all participants.

The official process for submitting all requests for funding in Nauru requires Government Departments to complete a Government funding proposal template and submit this to the Development Aid unit in the Ministry of Finance (for all projects >\$5,000). The Aid unit reviews the completed funding template to ensure it the project is aligned to the Nauru Strategic Development Strategy (NSDS). The Aid unit has worked closely with Nauru's main donors to ensure that the template covers off on the main information requirements required by donors. This allows the aid unit to assess whether a proposal idea meets Nauru's NSDS, and whether the project idea is sufficiently developed and has the supporting information to meet donor requirements. When projects are approved for submission by the Aid unit, the funding template is passed back to the relevant line

ministry who are responsible for completing the donor specific project proposal template and submitting the proposal.

The training needs analysis was sent electronically to participants prior to the workshop. A review of the results revealed that only few participants had any real experience with proposal writing or any components of the LFA. The medium term outcomes resulting from the training will be assessed through issuing a longitudinal post-training survey (3 – 6 months after the training) combined with telephone interviews.

The key topics covered during the LFA training include a background on the project management cycle, a detailed look of the logical framework approach, proposal writing (informed by the LFA) and a brief summary of climate change donors active in the Pacific region. A detailed delivery plan is included in Annex 1.

The LFA training workshop was organised by SPC with support from in-country staff Mrs Claudette Wharton from the Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment (CIE).

Workshop Participants

Twenty participants attended the training over the four day workshop program representing various departments of the Nauru Government and some community leaders (see Annex 2). Eighteen participants attended all four days and were presented certificates. Learner guides, slide packs and USB flash drives were distributed to all participants.

Workshop Results

Mrs Claudette Wharton, Nauru GCCA: PSIS Project Officer welcomed participants to the workshop. Mr Sanivalati Tubuna, Project Officer SPC-GCCA: PSIS provided a background of the LFA training project and the role that SPC and SPREP play as implementing agency for the broader EU GCCA: PSIS project. After introductions, the two training facilitators from PREA began workshop proceedings for day 1.

Training delivery included a mix of informative presentations, large group activities to demonstrate new knowledge and skills followed by small group activities where participants were challenged to use the knowledge and skills for real-life project ideas they wanted to develop (see Annex 3 for photo of group work). There were three small project groups that worked through the LFA, representing the following project ideas:

1. Waste water management, focussing on improving water quality of the freshwater lens
2. Coastal erosion protection in Nauru
3. Conservation of remnant patches of native vegetation for biodiversity protection

The whole-of-class activity focussed on reducing the level of dust-related health and environmental impacts in Aiwo and surrounding areas. This topic was used instead of the case study in the learner guide.

The facilitators moved between groups to offer support and advice where required. The presence of two facilitators was valued by participants for both the presentations and the detailed group work. Start of day and post-lunch warm-up activities were conducted to refresh participants and prepare them for learning. Each day began with a recap of the preceding day and each day ended with a recap of the days' content.

PREA organised a guest presentation by Mr John Limen, A/ Secretary from the Nauru Government's Planning & Aid unit to reinforce the importance of good project design to inform proposals.

The workshop concluded on day group performances which reflected what participants had learnt, group photo and certificate of attendance presentation conducted by Mr Sanivaliti Tubuna of SPC and Mr Bryan Star, Director CIE.

Workshop Evaluation

The results of the workshop evaluation are presented as Annex 4. Only 12 participants who attended the four days completed the evaluation form due to the need to leave early.

The Nauru training was successful with participants indicating that they valued the learning opportunity the course presented. The participants all had experience working in teams, and on projects and were fluent in English. This facilitated the delivery. Participants decided they did not need to have the logframe matrix translated into Nauruan.

The training generally commenced an hour late on each of the four days due to the late arrival of most of the participants. This meant that some parts of the presentation and activities were reduced in duration leading to a sense of rushing. The facilitators asked participants of the need to arrive on time but this did not lead to changed behaviour. One option for future training is to provide breakfast as the first catered meal, in lieu of morning tea as this may lead to participants arriving on time.

Most participants indicated a strong to fair degree of confidence in being able to complete the stakeholder analysis, problem tree and solution tree steps of the logical framework approach upon their return to work. There was relatively strong confidence in developing a logframe matrix. The confidence in developing a proposal was more moderate, and this may be explained to the shorter period of time allowed for the proposal writing exercise due to the late arrival of participants and the reduction in length of the training. This is backed up by participants' comments, who indicated that the most useful aspect of the course was learning about the structured process of the LFA and the desire to have more training on the logframe matrix and proposal writing.

What participants found most useful

"Being NGO (CBO)- all learnt on this course was most useful. I have never been involved in writing up a project proposal not having the basic knowledge of how to go about it. However doing this course has certainly equipped me and empowered me to achieve more for my community. The learner guide - a great tool!"

"Problem solving with other participants which kind of fun and workable to meet target task that is very hard to solve."

"The relationship of the different contents such as outputs, activities, purpose and goal. How they can be connected in the logframe matrix"

When asked about follow up training, participants' comments included a range of responses:

1. Logframe matrix
2. Monitoring and Evaluation
3. More on proposal writing

All of the participants indicated that they would recommend the course to their colleagues. Most participants indicated that the length of the course was the right length, although several wanted a longer program. A number of participants commented that the course would have benefited from a longer period of time. It should be noted that due to the late arrival of participants, around four hours were stripped from the training. One participant noted that participants should have arrived on time, and another noted that more participants should have attended.

The participants all indicated satisfaction with the delivery, and the resources provided. The following comments reflect the success of the Nauru training delivery.

"An excellent 4 days!! Working together with members of the govt sector gave me an insight as to how and why project proposals come about, how they work and how communities can benefit."

“Even though it's a four day training I've learned a lot”

“Awesome!! New knowledge- extra power!! Had my brain working again....after Christmas. We will make use of this!! Great tips, thanks”.

Conclusion

The training was very successful in building capacity and motivation of Nauru government staff and community based groups to use the logical framework approach to design projects and inform the preparation of proposals. The participants noted the benefits of thinking through projects at the design stage, rather than jumping straight to solutions or actions. The impact evaluation in several months' time will determine whether any of the projects worked on during the training will be developed up into real proposals. The training has also provided some participants with the skills to approach problems with more confidence, and use this to find solutions in in collaboration with all stakeholders.

**Annex 1 Workshop Agenda
Secretariat of the Pacific Community**

Nauru

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE: PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND STATES

**PROPOSAL PREPARATION USING THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH
WORKSHOP**

Delivery plan summary

	Task / Topic
Day 1	Welcome Gathering group knowledge Introduction to the LFA Project Management Cycle Step 1. Stakeholder Analysis Step 2. Problem analysis
Day 2	Step 2. Problem analysis continued Step 3. Solution Analysis Step 4. Strategy Analysis – Selecting solutions Step 5. Logframe Matrix
Day 3	Step 5: Logframe Matrix continued Step 6: Activity Scheduling
Day 4	Step 7: Resource Scheduling Proposal Writing Donor agencies Celebration and group performances Final feedback and evaluation

Annex 2 Participants List

First Name	Surname	Job title	Organisation	Sex	Nationality	Email	Phone
Madeleine	Dube	Community Leader (Aiwo)	Nauru Cummunity Based Organization (N.C.B.O)	F	Nauru	madeleinedube1957@yahoo.com	5574230/5581154
Joseph	Kun	Project Officer	CIE (Agriculture)	M	Nauru	coconut tree joseph@hotmail	5565077
Calistus	Cain	Yaren District	Business Development Officer	M	Nauru	calistuscain@gmail.com	
Reagan	Moses	Climate Change Officer	CIE (Env)	M	Nauru	reaganmoses@gmail.com	
Albert	Teimitsi	Ozone Depleting Officer	CIE	M	Nauru	albert.teimitsi@gmail.com	
Sharona	Ephraim	Women in Development - CIE (Agriculture)	CIE	F	Nauru	leilaniniac@gmail.com	5569165
Jimna	Amram	Project Officer	CIE	F	Nauru	jimna.amram@naurugov.nr	5863317
Erana	Aliklik	NBSAP Project Officer	CIE	F	Nauru	eranalik12@gmail.com	5569376
John	Limen	Acg. Dep. Secretary Planning and AID	Finance	M	Nauru	john.limen@naurugov.nr	5579211
Jaden	Agir	Water Unit	CIE	M	Nauru	jadenagir7@gmail.com	5580984
Haseldon	Buraman	IWRM Project Manager	CIE	M	Nauru	haselden.buraman@naurugov.nr	
Claudette	Wharton	GCCA:PSIS Project Officer	CIE	F	Nauru	claudette.s.wharton@gmail.com	

Kay	Brechtefeld	Asst. Sector Planner	Finance	F	Nauru	Kay.brechtefeld@naurugov.nr	84917
Bryan	Star	Director (Environment)	CIE	M	Nauru	bryanstar007@gmail.com	5573117
Christine	Reiyetsi	PACC Project Officer	CIE	F	Nauru	creiyetsi@gmail.com	
Yatimi	Uepa	Desk Officer for Bilateral Affairs	Foreign Affairs & Trade	F	Nauru	yuepa25@gmail.com	5566225
Josie	Jacob	Director for Internal Affairs	Foreign Affairs & Trade	F	Nauru	josieannjacob@gmail.com	5573039
Vincent	Scotty	Env. Health	Health	M	Nauru	vscootty2004@yahoo.com	5573147
Creiden	Fritz	Director	CIE	M	Nauru	creiden.fritz@gmail.com	
Nerida-Ann	Hubert	President/NCD	Comm/Health	F	Nauru	ann.hubert@nauru.gov.nr ; annsteshia22@gmail.com	81392

Annex 3

Photos of workshop activities







Annex 4

POST TRAINING EVALUATION FORM - NAURU

Completed by 10 participants

The training was well structured	10	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The training was poorly structured
----------------------------------	----	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------------

The activities gave me the confidence that I can apply the knowledge in my work	6	2	2	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The activities did not give me confidence that I can apply the knowledge in my work
---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

I found the learner guide useful	10	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I did not find the learner guide useful
----------------------------------	----	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

I learnt things that will be useful to my work	10	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I did not learn things that will be useful to my work
--	----	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The course was well presented	10	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The course was poorly presented
-------------------------------	----	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------

The facilitators made the material enjoyable	11	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The facilitators did not make the material enjoyable
--	----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

For each of the following, please rate your level of confidence in being able to undertake the following steps of the logical framework approach when you get back to your job.

	<i>Very confident</i>							<i>Not at all confident</i>
Stakeholder analysis	6	1	3	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Problem analysis	6	2	2	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Solution analysis	6	2	2	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Logframe matrix	4	2	3	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

I am confident that I can put together a good project proposal	3	2	6	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I am not confident that I can put together a good project proposal
--	---	---	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

I would recommend this course to my colleagues	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I would not recommend this course to my colleagues
--	----	--------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Four days for the course was:	About right	7
	Too short	5
	Too long	<input type="checkbox"/>

What was the most useful thing you learnt on this course?

The structure or format Being NGO (CBO)- all learnt on this course was most useful. I have never been involved in writing up a project proposal not having the basic knowledge of how to go about it. However doing this course has certainly equipped me and empowered me to achieve more for my community. The learner guide - a great tool! Problem solving with other participants which kind of fun and workable to meet target task that is very hard to solve. LFA concepts and streamlining	
--	--

Introduction to LFA

The relationship of the different contents such as outputs, activities, purpose and goal. How they can be connected in the logframe matrix.

Putting together the following: problem tree and solution tree

Stakeholder analysis and the problem tree analysis

The whole purpose of the training

Activity scheduling, resource scheduling, LF matrix

Problem tree/solution tree

The course would have been more effective if:

Much longer time. Is a bit too short and things a bit rushed. Clearly presented

My only wish is that we could have just had a couple more days as I was eager to learn just that little bit more. However given 4 days was fine.

More participants attend for group work activities.

Maybe more examples of country region matrices

The venue was a bit difficult for proper training delivery.

If we had more time

People did not talk over each other and too much while facilitators were talking!! More participants maybe; Less breaks

More time was allocated

Which topic(s), if any, do you want follow-up training on?

All that we have heard with coordinators presenting very well

Anything and everything- to do with project proposal writing.

Logframe matrix for an LFA project

Logframe matrix definitely

Advanced proposal writing

I would look up the toolbox

Project proposal writing that can sell itself

Monitoring and evaluation

Do you have any further comments or feedback about any aspects of the training?

Still wanting to learn more despite all the new things that I have just learnt

An excellent 4 days!! Working together with members of the govt sector gave me an insight as to how and why project proposals come about, how they work and how communities can benefit.

Well presented

Pity that we did not have more time at the fault of participants' lateness

More public servant should have been present when the number of attendants was found to be low

It was excellent driven but it would have been more fruitful to have more different groups/organisations participated

Even though it's a four day training I've learned a lot

Awesome!! New knowledge- extra power!! Had my brain working again....after Christmas. We will make use of this!! Great tips, thanks. Safe trip

Possibly longer duration to have more exercises

It was done well enough given the four days time limit