



SPC
Secretariat
of the Pacific
Community



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

**IMPACT EVALUATION OF
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH & PROJECT MONITORING WORKSHOP IN
KIRIBATI**



PREA
PACIFIC RESEARCH & EVALUATION ASSOCIATES

Contents

Introduction	1
Impact evaluation	1
About the training workshops	1
Methodology	2
Results	2
Workshop resources.....	2
Use of LFA steps.....	3
Proposals prepared since the training	4
Future proposals	4
Additional capacity building.....	5
About the workshop.....	6
Conclusion	7
Recommendations.....	7
Annex 1 – Participant Feedback	8
Benefits of the training.....	8
Follow up support	8
Other comments.....	9

Disclaimer:

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union. Whilst care has been taken in the preparation of the material in this document to ensure its accuracy, Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates and other contributors do not warrant that the information contained in this document is error-free and, to the extent permissible under law, it will not be liable for any claim by any party acting on such information.

Introduction

Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates (PREA) delivered training on the Logical Framework Approach and Project Monitoring to government staff in Kiribati on 5-10 June 2015. This training was a follow-up to previous training on proposal preparation using the logical framework approach.

The training formed part of the Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) project funded by the European Union (EU) and implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). The initial round of training was delivered to nine countries in 2013 - 2014. The second round of training in 2015 was delivered to five countries (Tuvalu, Kiribati, Palau, Tonga, Niue) that requested further capacity building¹.

The aim of the training was to strengthen the capacity of national government staff to use the logical framework approach to develop successful and integrated climate change adaptation project proposals.

The content of the training was based on the results of the impact evaluation from the first round of training, which identified areas which participants' sought further capacity building in. The intent was for participants from the first round of training to attend the second round so that they may build on their knowledge and skills from the initial training. However, many participants in the second round of training had not participated in the first round.

This report evaluates the impact of the training at least three months following the workshop.

Impact evaluation

The impact evaluation framework was informed by the anticipated short and medium-term outcomes from the training workshop.

The anticipated short and medium-term outcomes are summarised below:

- Participants apply the logical framework approach steps to develop proposals or in their general work duties
- Participants submit quality funding proposals informed by the logical framework approach
- Participants have confidence in applying the logical framework approach steps and project monitoring.

About the training workshops

The training workshop was delivered over four consecutive days.

The objective of the training was to build participant capacity in proposal preparation using the logical framework approach and project monitoring.

At the end of the workshop participants were expected to be able to:

- Apply the logical framework approach to develop a robust logframe matrix
- Develop an accurate timeline and budget for projects, based on identifying the tasks and costs to implement activities in the logframe matrix.
- Develop a monitoring plan and understand how to monitor projects as they are implemented.

The key topics covered during the workshop included:

¹ Cook Islands was later added as a sixth country but was not included in the impact evaluation.

- the logical framework approach steps
- developing a logframe matrix
- project monitoring (developing a monitoring plan & data collection methods)
- creating a timeline and budget.

The effectiveness of the training workshop was evaluated through a post-workshop survey that was completed by participants on the last day.

The Kiribati workshop was conducted on 5-10 June 2015 and attended by 18 participants.

Methodology

The impact evaluation took place in November 2015, five months following the training. The evaluation consisted of:

- An online survey issued to all participants.
- Personally addressed follow-up emails to remind participants to complete the survey online or as an attachment
- Phone calls to remind participants to complete the survey, or to complete the survey over the phone.

Some participants were not reached if they did not have a valid email address or other contact details.


Results

There were a total of 12 respondents for the Kiribati impact evaluation. This is a 67% response rate for participants (12 of 18) that provided valid email addresses.

Workshop resources

Over half of respondent (58%) indicated that they had used the learner guide or training resources at least two times since the training (Figure 1). This indicates that the training content was considered useful, and that participants sought to review the content of the training following the workshop. Only one respondent indicated that they had never used the learner guide or other resources provided.

Figure 1. Participant use of learning resources



Use of LFA steps

Most of the respondent (92%) indicated that they had found the LFA steps and tools useful in informing future project proposals (75% very useful, 17% useful). One respondent was undecided. Similarly, most respondents (83%) indicated that they considered the LFA steps useful for their general work duties (67% very useful, 17% useful). Two respondents were undecided. This demonstrates that the workshop's benefits extend beyond proposal writing but provide the knowledge and skills to apply critical thinking and analysis, as well as detailed planning including timelines and budgets, to the workplace.

"I CAN ONLY SAY THAT THE BIGGEST BENEFIT I GAINED FROM THE TRAINING IS ABOUT MY OWN CAPACITY BUILDING. WHAT WE HAVE COVERED DURING THE COURSE ARE 100% RELATED TO MY WORK AS A SENIOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER AT THE RURAL PLANNING DIVISION WITHIN THE MINISTRY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS. SINCE WE ARE DEALING WITH OUTER ISLAND COUNCILS' PROJECTS, OUR MAIN WORKS START FROM THE IDENTIFICATION STAGE UNTIL THE ACQUITTAL STAGE IN THE PROJECT CYCLE. THE TRAINING ALSO HIGHLIGHT THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MONITORING DURING THE PROCESS. HENCE, IT WAS VERY BENEFICIAL TO TAKE PART IN SUCH A COURSE AS IT TOTALLY BUILD UP OUR CAPACITY IN OUR MAIN AREA OF WORK."

Ten of the twelve respondents (83%) indicated having used at least one of the LFA steps, or project monitoring, for proposal preparation, or in general work duties. The two respondents who had not used any of the steps still indicated that they found the LFA useful.

The number of respondents using the LFA steps and project monitoring is outlined in Table 1.

The most used steps were the situation analysis, M&E plans, creating budgets, followed by problem/solution trees.

The steps had been used more often in performing general work duties than in preparing proposals. This demonstrates that the LFA training has built capacity of staff not only in proposal preparation but also in the performance of their role in government, and emphasises the benefits of the LFA process in planning for both work and proposals.

Table 1. Use of the LFA steps and project monitoring in proposal writing and other work duties

LFA Step	Used or performed since training for a project proposal	Used or performed since training for general work duties
Situation analysis	3	7
Stakeholder analysis	3	1
Problem tree or solution tree	3	5
Logframe matrix	3	4
Monitoring and evaluation plan	3	6
Data collection tools	2	2
Timeline	2	3
Budget	3	6

Proposals prepared since the training

Four respondents indicated they had completed or worked on a total of six funding proposals since the training workshop was held (Table 2). Four of the proposals are noted to have been successful, one was pending and one was not submitted. Two of the proposals had not used the LFA; of these one proposal was pending and one was not successful. The four proposals that had used the LFA were noted to be successful in receiving funding.

"I GET TO KNOW SOME IMPORTANT STEPS FOR ESTABLISHING NEW PROJECT PROPOSALS."

Table 2. Funding proposals prepared following the training

Donor / Grant Name	Were you successful	Did you use LFA	Short Proposal Summary
WHO	Yes	Yes	Coordinating meeting for Developing an National Essential Equipment List for Hospital (\$6,000.00+ AUD)
Taiwan (ROC) Annual Grant	Yes, The proposal approved and have been implemented	Yes	The proposal was for Old men transport to help them carry out their roles and responsibilities for the community efficiently as the transport is ready whenever they need it.
NZAid	Still waiting	No	To conduct refresher training to nurseryman from outer islands. Objective/purpose: To increase rural agricultural production
German fund	No	No	Support to marketing of organic farmers association. Objective: To increase production and selling of organic agricultural produce
International Fund for Agricultural Development	Yes	Yes	Outer islands water and food security. Objective: To improve outer islands food and water security.
PacWaste - SPREP	Yes	Yes	\$50,000 AUD

Future proposals

Nine survey respondents indicated they had plans to submit additional funding proposals in the next six months, whilst three respondents were unsure.


Eleven of the twelve respondents noted that they would use the LFA, or parts of it, in preparing future project proposals, whilst one was unsure.

The high number of respondents indicating that they would use the LFA in future proposals demonstrates the positive impact of the LFA training in motivating participants to use a clear, logical process to design better projects, leading to better-prepared proposals.

Most of the respondents indicated confidence, or limited confidence, in using the LFA steps and developing an M&E plan (Figure 2). The greatest area where respondents indicated a limited confidence was developing timelines.

Overall, the results are positive in that there was a good balance between respondents indicating confidence, and those with limited confidence, with only minimal numbers indicating no confidence. This is encouraging, considering most participants had not taken part in the first round of training. There is the potential for the development of an informal network or community of practice to support the use of the LFA in Kiribati. This should be encouraged so that the skills can be practiced, reinforced and maintained over time.

Figure 2. Confidence in using the LFA steps



Additional capacity building

Participants were asked to nominate any additional training they needed to support them in their work. Their responses were categorised in Table 3.

Table 3. Additional training requirements

Capacity building area	Number of nominations by participants
More LFA training	2
Support from PREA (mentoring)	1
Gantt chart	1
Donor analysis	1
Logframe	1
Situation analysis	1
Collecting baseline information	1

There was a spread of responses, with further training in the LFA and components of it being the most nominated.

"I STRONGLY SUGGEST THAT THE SAME TRAINING / WORKSHOPS WILL BE CONDUCTED EVERY YEAR TO LET NEW PARTICIPANTS GAIN NEW THINGS TO LEARN ABOUT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH STEPS. MAKING A LOT OF EXAMPLES FROM THE REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE AND INTERNATIONALLY WILL HELP TRAINEES TO UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPT OF LFA IN GENERAL."

About the workshop

Respondents were asked to provide feedback about their reflections of the training (see Annex 1 for all comments). Respondents were in general very positive about the training. Respondents noted that the training provided them the skills to develop proposals. The systematic process of the LFA was noted to be beneficial as a guiding process. Being able to analyse a problem was noted as a highlight by several respondents. Two respondents indicated that the workshop required more time to cover the large amount of content.

"DIGGING AND ANALYSING THE PROBLEM IS THE MAIN SKILL I LEARNED FROM THE LFA TRAINING WHICH NOW CONTRIBUTES TO A LOT OF SOLVING PROBLEMS STRATEGIES I CAN PRIORITISE FOR TIMING INTERVENTIONS."

One respondent noted that there was a need to integrate the training with proposal process within the National Economic Planning Office (NEPO) to ensure that all proposals going through NEPO require use of the LFA. It was also important to ensure that participants at the training were those responsible for developing proposals.

Conclusion

The Kiribati workshop was successful based on the respondents' use of the LFA for proposals and in general work duties, and comments on the benefits of the training. Though the success of the proposals cannot be directly attributed to the LFA training, the open feedback from Kiribati respondents indicates the positive impact of the training.

The Kiribati respondents demonstrated the benefits that flow from the training in both proposal writing and in general work duties. As such, the GCCA-funded training is having wider benefits that its core objective of the development of better proposals. Overall, the impact of the Kiribati training was positive.

Recommendations

Government to consider integrating LFA into NEPO grant application forms and process
Develop a contact list of past LFA participants and keep them updated on resources and grant opportunities that may be of interest.

Provide LFA refresher training to past participants to increase their confidence in specific areas of the LFA.

Form a network of local LFA practitioners, or a community of practice, to provide support to participants to apply the LFA and review proposals.

Designate a local or regional LFA focal point as a mentor to provide support to participants to apply the LFA.

Annex 1 – Participant Feedback

Benefits of the training

- This training will help me a lot to accomplish given task related with project but not 100% sure on how to monitor and evaluate the project. Hopefully more practice to apply this approach will be helpful.
- Digging and analysing the problem is the main skill I learned from the LFA training which now contributes to a lot of solving problems strategies I can prioritise for timing interventions
- I can only say that the biggest benefit i gained from the training is about my own capacity building. What we have covered during the course are 100% related to my work as a senior rural development officer at the Rural planning division within the ministry of internal affairs. Since we are dealing with outer island councils' projects, our main works start from the identification stage until the acquittal stage in the project cycle. The training also highlight the importance of the monitoring during the process. Hence, it was very beneficial to take part in such a course as it totally build up our capacity in our main area of work.
- The LFA steps mostly the problem tree.
- Knowing and understanding the 8 inter-related 'systematic' steps of the LFA. Skipping one step is like lacking a tool to completing a task!
- The knowledge required to identify potential project areas and the step by step processes required to ensure a successful and sustainable project.
- understand of the Logframe process but minor assistance is needed
- I get to know some important steps for establishing new project proposals
- Developing logical framework matrix in a logic and coherent way.
- Involving other stakeholders in developing matrix which helps to learn and broaden my knowledge on current societal issues"
- The skills how to plan, sort activities in sequences, creating budget and developing of monitoring and evaluation methodology.
- Create budgets for proposals

Follow up support

- Refresh training on Project appraisal
- Developing a log-frame and knowing my stakeholders are still my gaps
- Whatever advanced methods and techniques relevant for adoption during the implementation process of the project. It would also of great help to conduct refresher course like such in future where colleagues could have the opportunity to join it as part of their capacity building.
- Co-planning or develop the funding proposals with the presence of the LFA team to facilitate and providence during the activity.
- I want to know whether Steps 1-3 can also be used to develop a baseline study of the project. I know that baselines are critical in developing proposals as they provide the current (baseline) problem/situation of which the proposed project aims to address the problem or improve the situation.
- "Donor analysis – to know and learn about the donor's priorities and then learn how to tweak our proposals in order to get high chance of funding.
- Tools/methodologies in collecting and analysing data that are relevant to project proposals."
- Further training needed on the use of Gantt Chart.
- Need more time

Other comments

- Extension of training time and facilitator will make sure that at the end of the training the participant will come up with project proposal.
- I strongly suggest that the same training / workshops will be conducted every year to let new participants gain new things to learn about logical framework approach steps. Making a lot of examples from the regional perspective and internationally will help trainees to understand the concept of LFA in general.
- Follow up workshop which focuses on assisting participants in developing a quality funding proposal.
- PREA provided LFA training to GoK. Should time allow you, it will be worthwhile contacting the National Economic Planning Office (NEPO) at the Ministry of Finance and inquiring whether proposals they received from Line Ministries (which ones and how many) use the LFA when they developed their proposals. A proposal using the LFA can be easily detected/identified because it will provide adequate and quality information, the flow of logic is present and well presented, and the language exhibits the LFA language. If the answer is yes with at least 50% of all proposals received, then there is some progress here. However, this has limitations also; this is because those who attended the training may not be those who are tasked to develop proposals and if those who had been trained did not use the LFA for some reasons, these are beyond the scope of evaluating the success of the training workshop. Hence, evaluating the success of the workshop in a broader sense is complex, unless the GoK has strict policies and rule of using LFA only when developing proposals; I know this is not currently the case.
- This workshop was interesting and fun
- The follow up on any funded projects on climate change adaptation and disaster risk management, especially those activities in the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan
- I suggest that the survey should be conducted every two months so each participants will keep updating their work and see how effective is the LFA approach. It also will provide time for them to request clarification to their works that relate to LFA Approach.
- Thanks for the training that is useful.