

# MFF India National Training Course on Project Cycle Management (Small Grant Facility)

India Habitat Center, New Delhi, 4-5 July 2013



Title	MFF India National Training Course on Project Cycle Management (Small Grant Facility)
Author	Ms. Nisha D'Souza and Dr. N.M. Ishwar Mangroves for the Future, IUCN India Country Office
Date created	2013–07–10
Main subject	Project Cycle Management (PCM) training
Keywords	Project Cycle Management (PCM)
Purpose	Report on MFF India National Training Course on Project Cycle Management (PCM) for Cycle III of the Small Grant Facility
Contents	<p>Introduction – pp. 3</p> <p>Pre-workshop engagement with partners – pp.3</p> <p>PCM training workshop – pp.4</p> <p>Achievements and Challenges – pp.5</p> <p>Annex 1 (NCB recommendations for shortlisted projects) – pp. 7</p> <p>Annex 2 (Agenda) – pp.12</p> <p>Annex 3 (Participants list) – pp.13</p> <p>Annex 4 (Reference materials sent to potential grantees prior to workshop) – pp.16</p>
Date distributed	2013–07–16

## Introduction

The call for cycle III of the small grant proposals was published on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2013 on the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), Government of India, Confederation of Indian Industries (CII), IUCN and MFF websites, as well as disseminated through the IUCN members and MFF partners' networks. By the due date on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2013, MFF India received 51 concept notes.

The NCB sub-committee met on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2013 at the IUCN India Country Office to evaluate and shortlist the concept notes for recommendation to the NCB. The sub-committee members (constituted by the NCB), represented by MSSRF (Dr. J. D. Sophia), UNDP (Ms. Ruchi Pant), TCSR (Mr. Satish Trivedi), BOBP-IGO (Dr. Y. Yadava) and IUCN (Ms. Meenakshi Datta Ghosh) along with an invited representative from SDMRI (Dr. J. K. Patterson), were present; the meeting was chaired by Dr. J. R. Bhatt, Member Secretary NCB India. 14 projects were shortlisted; in order to address the themes of resilience and to encourage more community participation as outlined in the call for proposal. The NCB sub-committee suggested that four sets of projects be combined and developed under a single proposal. This subsequently brought the total number of shortlisted projects to 10 (please refer to Annex 1 for further details).

The shortlisted projects were then presented to the NCB who approved the list at the 11<sup>th</sup> NCB India meeting, on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2013 at the IUCN India Country Office.

## Pre-workshop engagement with partners

MFF India subsequently contacted all partners and specifically engaged in discussions with those partners whose projects were recommended for integration by the NCB. The concept notes submitted from GUIDE and CEE partners (each having submitted 2 concept notes respectively), as well as APOWA and Annamalai University (who were requested to join together), confirmed that they would work with each other to integrate their proposals into a single project (within the budget limit of USD 20,000).

With respect to the fourth partnership, Shri Gram Gujarat Uttar Trust agreed to work with Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS). However, TISS had reservations of working with them for the following reasons:

1. Shri Gram Gujarat Uttar Trust has no previous experience in working with fishing communities and have no experience in working on environmental related issues
2. The geographical focus of the two projects, although both within the larger landscape of the Gulf of Kutch area, differs
3. The livelihood and income generation activities that Shri Gram Gujarat Uttar Trust proposes are not in line with those conducted by SIFFS (South India Federation of

Fishermen Societies) and MASS (Machimar Adhikar Sangharsh Samiti) – trade unions for fisher workers in the Kuchchh who are closely associated with the majority of fishers unions and cooperative societies in the region. TISS had originally intended to work with both these organizations as part of their project.

In light of the above, TISS had shared their reservations of jointly working with Shri Uttar Gujarat Gram Vikas Trust. However, MFF (India) encouraged them to have further dialogues on possible joint interventions and invited both to be part of the PCM. Both parties verbally agreed to meet and discuss this at the PCM.

MFF India received email notification from the Center for Ecological Sciences (Dakshin Foundation) that they were withdrawing their project from the Small Grants Programme for their own reasons.

### PCM Training Workshop

The PCM training workshop was held on 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> July 2013 at the India Habitat Center, New Delhi.

The objective of workshop was to instruct potential grantees on how to write small grant proposals in line with MFF guidelines. Specific objectives of the course were to enable the potential project grantees to:

- Have an adequate understanding of MFF initiative, programs of work and other cross-cutting themes of climate change adaptation, gender equality, and knowledge management and communications;
- Grasp the basic principles of project cycle management using the logical framework approach,
- Make a realistic budgeting plan and work plan for the project, and
- Be fully instructed and comply with MFF SGF guidelines in preparation of proposals

The course was conducted in English, and translated when necessary into Hindi and Tamil, by Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala (Programme Manager, MFF) , Dr. N. M. Ishwar (Coordinator, MFF India) and Ms. Nisha D'Souza (Small Grants Officer, MFF India). Ms. Ruchi Pant (Programme Manager, UNDP and NCB India member) addressed the participants briefly, explaining the project selection process, the importance of PCM trainings and the significance of the Small Grants Programme in contributing to the overall conservation and restoration of coastal and marine ecosystems in India.

For a list of topics covered in the workshop please refer to the agenda in Annex 2.

12 potential grantees and 2 representatives, from the Ministry of Environment and Forests and IUCN respectively, participated in the workshop. For a detailed list of participants please refer to Annex 3.

Material including the guidelines and templates for developing a logframe and SG proposal were sent to potential grantees prior to the workshop in preparation of the activities to come. Please refer to Annex 4 for more details. Two potential grantees (from APOWA and SMDRI) had already been through a PCM training (as successful grantees in Cycle II of the SGP) and were able to provide guidance and advise to the other participants.

### Achievements and Challenges

- Whilst recalling the process and criteria by which the concept notes were evaluated by the NCB sub-committee several of the potential grantees raised questions concerning the resilience framework and its definition with respect to MFF needs. Whilst MFF India was able to elaborate on the components and concepts of resilience that MFF hopes to address, it is clear that a comprehensive framework of resilience for reference should be developed soon.
- It was realized in the session on Situation Analysis and Problem Identification that some of the potential grantees had not completed a detailed in-situ situation analysis and therefore may have 'perceived' a problem based on inadequate and sometimes secondary information. All the participants agreed that given the extensive knowledge available on the problems they wish to address through their projects, it was difficult to distinguish between causes and effects and hence simplify the whole scenario in to a concise problem statement.
- There was some trouble, in part due to the language barrier, in ensuring that what the potential grantees were saying and what the audience understood was in conjunction. As such, time consuming discussions were necessary to establish an understanding, particularly between the grantees and MFF.
- As the workshop progressed it was clear that TISS and Shri Uttar Gram Vikas Trust could not find common ground to work on. As such, both proponents are developing their proposals individually. MFF India will present this to the NCB at the next meeting with its recommendations. A final decision on this will be taken at the upcoming NCB meeting.
- APOWA and Annamalai University were able to reach an agreement resulting in the development of a single logframe, integrating components of both concepts to focus more on involving local communities. Although the initial concepts did not share the same geographical area it was tentatively decided to conduct research in the originally

proposed site of Kalibhanjadia and to work with communities in the Rajnagar district of Bhitarkanika. Both parties are worried however, that funding will be insufficient. The proposals also need to be approved by the respective institutions and discussions between both parties will be carried out in the interim period till the revised and completed proposal is due.

- GUIDE is experiencing trouble integrating the two concepts submitted by the respective departments within their institute but has agreed to work around this by expanding the education and awareness component. They are further worried that the funding will be insufficient and are attempting to work through this by cutting down on some proposed project activities.
- Although cross-cutting themes including gender and communities were very briefly touched upon given the constraints of time, it was apparent that the majority of partners had a good understanding of these considerations and had already integrated them in to their proposals and logframes.
- Detailed discussions were had on the project budgets. It came as a surprise to MFF India that there should be mandatory co-financing of 10% or more in all budgets (financial or in-kind); as a result of this it was not mentioned in the Call for Proposals either. However possible ways to include co-financing were subsequently discussed with the partners to ease their worries. Further to the discussions on budgets, MFF India reiterated to the partners that we would only allow a maximum of 7% in overheads.
- Discussions were held on the next steps of the process. The final proposals are due on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2013 although all participants were encouraged to contact MFF should the need arise. Following this, the NCB will once more meet to choose the proposals to take forward. MFF will then work through the Due Diligence Assessment with the partners prior to contracting the projects.

## Annex 1

### NCB recommendations for shortlisted projects

Organization	Project title	Geographic al focus	Proposed budget (INR)	Proposed project duration (months)	Comments
<b>Recommended</b>					
Annamalai University	Studies on a mangrove genetic paradise of the world (Kalibhanjadia of Bhitarkanika), for effective conservation of it genetic diversity	Orissa	13,50,000.00	12	<b>Recommended.</b> It is suggested that the two concepts, submitted by Annamalai University and APOWA respectively, be integrated. Although two separate contracts may be granted for the purpose of independent fund distribution, the projects could/should share the same objectives and project activities and timeline considerations should be split between the organizations accordingly so as to meet the project goal. The reasons for this are that Annamalai University has a strong technical research background and APOWA has extensive experience in working with local communities. Hence, the project will be greatly strengthened from an integrated effort. The activities and budgets will therefore need to worked upon to meet MFF requirements
Action for the Protection of Wild Animals (APOWA)	Community-led mangrove restoration, conservation and sustainable management in Odisha coast.	Orissa	10,21,680.00	12	

Center for Environmental Education (CEE)	Education for Mangrove Restoration along coast of Tamil Nadu	Tamil Nadu	11,73,900.00		<b>Recommended.</b> As CEE has extensive experience in the field of education and awareness generation, it is suggested that the two concepts be merged under a single contract to focus on increasing awareness and education amongst school and university students in both the states of Gujarat and Tamil Nadu. It was felt that the research and restoration related objectives have/are already being addressed and worked upon by organizations and should therefore not be included in this project. The activities and budgets will need to worked upon to meet MFF requirements
Center for Environmental Education (CEE)	Education for Conservation of Marine Ecosystems along the Coastline of Gujarat State including Gulf of Kachchh	Gujarat	18,17,000.00	24	
Gujarat Institute of Desert Ecology (GUIDE)	Developing a practicable model through corporate-community participation for successful Mangrove restoration activities in Kachchh, Gujarat	Gujarat	10,88,640.00	12	<b>Recommended.</b> It is suggested that the two projects be combined under a single project/contract, to integrate economic evaluation of carbon with raising awareness amongst corporations and local communities. It was further advised that the project should not address carbon sequestration as this work has already been conducted in this region and is too expensive to be considered under a small grant project. The activities and budgets will need to worked upon to
Gujarat Institute of Desert Ecology (GUIDE)	Economic evaluation of carbon sequestration in Mangrove Ecosystems of Kachchh	Gujarat	10,34,399.70	12	



					meet MFF requirements
Save the Children	Building the resilience of vulnerable communities to natural disasters through the restoration, protection and sustainable management of the mangrove ecosystem in coastal villages of Odisha	Orissa	10,80,000.00	18	<b>Recommended.</b> A well prepared concept note with good partnership arrangements and co-financing components. The project has the potential to build resilience, particularly of children and youth of vulnerable coastal communities in Orissa.
Shri Uttar Gujarat Gram Vikas Trust	Enhancing the awareness and incomes of fisher families through handicraft production	Gujarat	10,80,000.00	18	<b>Recommended.</b> It is suggested that the concepts submitted by Shri Uttar Gujarat Gram Vikas Trust and TISS should be combined under one project with two contracts in order that they can build on each others institutional strengths to have more meaningful outputs in terms of improved socio-economic change amongst fishing communities and policy interventions. It is envisioned that TISS can address the technical aspects of the project whereas Shri Uttar Gujarat Gram Vikas Trust can oversee the community and livelihood related aspects. The activities and budgets will need to be worked upon to meet MFF requirements
Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS)	Building Capacities And Fostering Leadership among Coastal Communities on The Kutch Coast	Gujarat	4,50,432.00	18	
SuganthiDevadason Marine Research Institute (SDMRI)	Seagrass habitat rehabilitation in degraded areas in Gulf of Mannar, Southeastern India	Tamil Nadu	9,52,600.00	18	<b>Recommended.</b> The project builds on the partners work in Cycle II of the SGPs, in documenting the status,

					distribution and threat of seagrass beds in the Gulf of Mannar and Palk Bay. As seagrass restoration techniques have not been widely addressed in India and seagrass beds have high biological and economic values, it is recommended that this project be adopted as a pilot study to investigate potential restoration techniques.
Sonamukhi College, The University of Burdwan	Study of diversity of Blowflies (Calliphoridae,Diptera) and Flesh flies (Sarcophagidae,Diptera) and their impact on man and animals in Bhitarkanika National Park, Orissa	Orissa	11,75,000.00	18	<b>Recommended.</b> This project addresses a pertinent need in this region with respect to the detrimental impacts that blowflies are having on coastal communities in Bhitarkanika. However, extensive research has already been conducted on blowflies along the East coast of India, therefore it is suggested that existing research be used to raise awareness amongst local communities of this problem and to explore adaptation techniques, through this project. The budget will need to worked upon to meet MFF requirements.
Society for people education and economic development (SPEED)	Participatory Community engagement and education for conservation of mangroves in Ramanathapuramdistrict's coastal areas in Tamilnadu	Tamil Nadu	9,00,000.00	18	<b>Recommended.</b> A well prepared concept note with the potential to help mangrove-dependent communities in Ramnathapuram, Tamil Nadu. Particularly note-worthy in

					mainstreaming gender throughout the concept.
WWF India	Mangrove restoration and livelihood support through community participation, in Bhitarkanika of Odisha	Orissa	10,41,000.00	18	<b>Recommended.</b> A well prepared concept note with strong community engagement and local stakeholder participation (important considerations in an MFF project). It has the potential to help mangrove-dependent communities in Bhitarkanika.
Center for Ecological Sciences (Dakshin Foundation)	Promoting community based eco-tourism with olive ridley turtles at Rushikulya, India	Orissa	12,40,850.00	12	<b>Recommended.</b> Orissa hosts one of the largest aggregations of nesting Olive Ridley turtles in the world. This project addresses the conservation of an important marine resource in a vulnerable landscape through a novel community-based tourism and monitoring programme. This concept is strong on local stakeholder participation, planning, monitoring and evaluation, all of which are important considerations in an MFF project. The budget will need to worked upon to fulfill MFF requirements.

## Annex 2

### Agenda

# MFF India National Training Course on Project Cycle Management (Small Grant Facility)

4<sup>th</sup> and 5th July, 2013

Venue: India Habitat Center (IHC), New Delhi

4<sup>th</sup> July 2013

Magnolia Hall

08 45	Registration	
09 00	Opening remarks a. NCB India	
09 15	Self-introduction of participants	
09 30	MFF Overview	Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala <i>MFF Programme Manager</i>
09 45	Setting the Context	MFF India
10 00	The Project Cycle: project design, appraisal, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and Introduction to the Logical Framework Approach (LFA): A tool for planning, implementation and monitoring	Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala <i>MFF Programme Manager</i>
10 45	Tea/Coffee Break	
11 00	<b>Interactive discussion on situation analysis and on problem identification</b>	<i>Facilitated by MFF Secretariat</i>
13 00	Lunch	
14 00	Gender perspectives	MFF India
14 20	Proponents work on the Situation Analysis and Log frames [with a break for refreshments]	<i>Facilitated by MFF Secretariat</i>
16 00	Presentations of revised log frames by the proponents	

	followed by a discussion	
17 50	<b>Closure</b>	
<b>5<sup>th</sup> July 2013</b> <b>Maple Hall</b>		
09 00	Output-based Budgeting – An introduction	Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala <i>MFF Programme Manager</i>
09 30	<b>Proponents work on Output-based budgets</b>	<i>Facilitated by MFF Secretariat</i>
10 45	Refreshment break	
11 00	Presentation and discussions on the budgets	
12 30	Lunch	
13 30	<b>Presentation and discussions on the budgets</b>	
14 30	Communications; Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning	Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala <i>MFF Programme Manager</i> MFF India

### Annex 3

#### Participants list

	Name	Organization/type	Contact details
	<i>Potential grantees</i>		
1	Dr. R. Jayalakshmi	Annamalai University (Research Institute)	+91 9442634261 <a href="mailto:jayacas@gmail.com">jayacas@gmail.com</a>
2	Mr. Braja Sundar Mishra	Action for the Protection of Wild Animals (APOWA) (non-profit organization)	+91 9999297613 <a href="mailto:braja.mishra@gmail.com">braja.mishra@gmail.com</a>
3	Ms. Harpreet Bhullar	Save the Children, India (NGO)	+91 9716651330 <a href="mailto:h.bhulla@savethechildren.in">h.bhulla@savethechildren.in</a>
4	Dr. Shriji Kurup	Center for Environmental Education (CEE) (Center of Excellence, supported by MoEF)	+91 9442541513 <a href="mailto:shriji.kurup@ceeindia.org">shriji.kurup@ceeindia.org</a>
5	Dr. G. Alagiri Thivakaran	Gujarat Insitute for Desert Ecology (GUIDE) (Public trust & Society)	+91 9427438803 <a href="mailto:athivakaran028@gmail.com">athivakaran028@gmail.com</a>
6	Mr. Hardik Dave	Shri Uttar Gujarat Gram Vikas Trust (Public Trust)	+91 990431125 <a href="mailto:davein1983@gmail.com">davein1983@gmail.com</a>
7	Ms. Adya Shankar	Tata Institute for Social Sciences, (TISS) (Research Institute)	+91 9930528389 <a href="mailto:adya.shankar@tiss.edu">adya.shankar@tiss.edu</a>
8	Mr. Vivk Coehlo	Tata Institute for Social Sciences, (TISS) (Research Institute)	+91 7498520700 <a href="mailto:vivekcoelho@gmail.com">vivekcoelho@gmail.com</a>
9	Dr. J. K. Patterson	Suganthi Devadason Marine Research Institute (SMDRI) (Research Institute)	+91 9443337172 <a href="mailto:edwardjkpatterson@sdmri.in">edwardjkpatterson@sdmri.in</a>
10	Dr. S. K. Sinha	Department of Zoology, Sonamukhi College	+91 9434651747 <a href="mailto:suvrosinha@gmail.com">suvrosinha@gmail.com</a>

		<i>(Research Institute)</i>	
11	Mr. S. Devaraj	Society for People, Education and Economic Development (SPEED) <i>(Public Trust &amp; Society)</i>	+91 9486651535 <a href="mailto:speed.devipattinam@gmail.com">speed.devipattinam@gmail.com</a>
12	Mr. Michael Peters	World Wildlife Fund (WWF) India (NGO)	+91 9437076597 <a href="mailto:mpeters@wwfindia.net">mpeters@wwfindia.net</a>
	<i>Other participants</i>		
13	Ms. Ruchi Pant	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	
14	Ms. Amrita Chakraborty	Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF)	
15	Dr. Ranjith Mahindapala	MFF, IUCN, Asia Regional Office	
16	Mr. Viswaranjan Sinha	IUCN, India Country Office	
17	Mr. Sandeep Gaur	IUCN, India Country Office	
18	Dr. N.M. Ishwar	MFF, IUCN, India Country Office	
19	Ms. Nisha D'Souza	MFF, IUCN, India Country Office	

## Annex 4

### Reference materials sent to potential grantees prior to workshop

#### Annex 2: Template for Full Proposals for Small Grant Facility

[May be prepared either in English or in a local language]

#### A. Proposal Summary Sheet [1 page] (Should be attached with each proposal)

1. **Date of Proposal Submission**
2. **Project Title:**
3. **Project Site:** Exact location (village, province etc), District/State, Country
4. **Project Scale :** National/ regional
5. **Implementation agency (Name and Address):**
6. **Implementing Partners, if any:**
7. **Authorized representatives from Implementing Agency:** Name and designation of a key person from the proponent
8. **Project Objective:**
9. **Project start date:** DD/MM/YY
10. **Project duration:** In months, not exceeding 18 months
11. **Brief Project description** (with Deliverables):
12. **Total Project Cost (in local currency) and Financing Plan:**

Total Budget	Financing Plan		
	Request from MFF	Grantee Contribution	Other Contributions
100%	XX%	YY%	ZZ%



**B. Full Proposal Template:** The entire document should not exceed 15 pages.

1 **Project Summary:** a brief statement of the problem, Objective(s), Results, main Activities and the 'change' sought by the project;

2 **Introduction**

2.1 **Rationale of the project:** Situation Analysis, Main problem(s) to be considered

2.2 **Context:** Geographical context; climate, altitude, main ecological and socio-economic characteristics; policy context: relationship to national policies; community context

2.3 Description of project Area including map

3 **Project Description**

3.1 **Project's Logical Framework:** Please provide a logical framework of the project (see Annex 6) which should reflect the following:






- Goal (long term vision) towards which the project will contribute;
- Objective(s) of the Project that will be achieved by the project;
- Results that will contribute to each Objective together with Indicators;
- Key activities that will help achieve the Results, including deliverables.

3.2 **A narrative of the Key Activities:** This section should provide the details of how activities will be carried out, and should include the methodologies. This description should follow the following format:

Key Activity	Description on how it will be done, with whom etc.
<b>Result # 1:</b>	
Activity 1.1	
Activity 1.2	
etc.	
<b>Result # 2</b>	
Activity 2.1	
Activity 2.1	
etc.	

3.3 **Benefits and Beneficiaries:** What are the expected benefits of the project, and who are the beneficiaries; highlight any livelihood linkages, if any.

- 3.4 **Participation of local people and communities:** Participation of local stakeholders including women and specific disadvantaged group, if any, in the project planning and implementation.
- 3.5 **Cross Cutting themes:** Describe how would the project address the cross-cutting areas [climate change, gender equality & project communications]? [see Section A of the Guidelines].
- 3.6 **Project's risks, if any, and mitigation plans:** Describe briefly the project's risks and how these are to be managed.
- 3.7 **Work-plan:** Please provide a time frame in a Gantt chart as below, for each activity; the project should start immediately after the contract is signed. If there is special seasonal requirement (for example monsoon) it should be clearly expressed here.

Activities	Month																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Activity 1.1																		
Activity 1.2																		
etc.																		

#### 4 **Project Management:**

- 4.1 **Management:** How will the project be managed (institutional structure, other organizations involved)? If other organizations are involved, describe the responsibility of each partner and how they will work together to achieve the project objectives.
- 4.2 **Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation:** How and when will the internal monitoring and evaluation take place? What is the process for capturing the lessons from the project? What is the situation about the baseline of the Indicators? If the baseline is not available, what is proposed to generate the baseline?

#### 5 **Continuation of project activities:** Exit strategy/ Phase-out mechanism and how project results will continue to be sustained after the funding ends.

#### 6 **Budget:** Create a detailed Results/Activities-based budget based on the logframe (See Annex 6); this budget should also include co-financing, both cash and in-kind. The budget should contain all direct costs relating to activities; the management component should not exceed 10% of the total budget.

#### 7 **Proponent Description:** In addition to the information provided in Annex 5, please provide the following information:

- 7.1. **Organisational background:** [Up to 150 words]

- 7.2. **Capacity of the proponent to undertake this work** – indicate briefly the roles and responsibilities of proponent's staff members, their qualifications and experiences for the tasks to be performed.
- 7.3. **Prior experience in the related projects:** Describe, in 100-150 words for each project, up to a maximum of three projects that have been completed most recently, the Outcomes/Impacts of the projects completed.

## Annex 5 – Information on the Proponent Organization

NOTE: Please fill in this form and send it with the Proposal

Project Title	
Name of the Organization	
Mailing Address	
Visiting Address (if different from above)	
Telephone	Fax
Email	Website
Mission and Goal of the Organization	
About the Organization	Registration date Category Contact person Number of staff
Bank Account details	Account name Bank name Bank address Account No.: SWIFT or other routing code Signatories names
References	Name, address and Tel no. (Referee 1)  Name, address and Tel no. (Referee 2)
Projects implemented during the last 5 years relevant to the theme of the current	

proposal		
Title of the Project	Donor/Amount	Reference (Name/tel/email)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

## Annex 6: Principles of Logframe Thinking, Linking Objectives to Activities, and Results-based Budgeting

Logical framework, or logframe, thinking starts out with a simple but extremely important principle: first, one decides where to go (the objective) and, secondly, how one will get there (the activity). Objectives are formulated which can be achieved by performing a set of activities. , But because activities are at a much lower level than Objectives, each activity normally contributes to a Result; one or more Results are needed to enable the Objective to be achieved.

Logframe thinking requires clear (or at least plausible) specifications of the intended effects of planned Results. Thus, the "hierarchy of objectives" is linked by a set of hypotheses indicating the intended impact, i.e., the utilisation of *Results* and, ultimately, the accruing benefits. The linkages have to be "tight", i.e., chances to reach higher level objectives must be good. Realism and consistency refer to scientifically sound hypotheses and to available resources. By linking resources, r, and long-term effect (=impact) in a realistic and consistent manner, logframes create a high degree of transparency and thus they provide a sound basis for efficient management, meaningful evaluation, and enhanced credibility.

The logframe process also includes a reflection on important external factors which are crucial for the success of a given project. "*Assumptions*" are hypotheses about factors which are outside the managerial control of a project, centre, or the system as a whole.

The "logframe matrix" which summarises all important planning decisions, assumptions, and resource allocations is a frame which has to be specified for operational purposes. It has, therefore, to be supplemented by detailed (operational) plans specifying activities, *milestones*, responsibilities, time schedules, resources, etc.

The terminology used world-wide in logframes is chaotic. It is therefore necessary to understand the hierarchy, rather than being confused with different terms used by different agencies. In this we use the term **GOAL**<sup>1</sup> to denote long term achievements which are not expected out of this project, but it will contribute towards it. Goal is followed by **OBJECTIVES**<sup>2</sup> which should be achieved by the Project. A set of **RESULTS**<sup>3</sup> enable one to achieve the Objectives, while each Result is achieved through a set of **ACTIVITIES**.

A sample logframe of a hypothetical project is provided below together with a budget linking Results/ Activities to expenditure, for guidance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Other terms used for Goal are: Long Term Objective; Overall Objective; Strategic Objective; Development Objective

<sup>2</sup> Other terms used for Objectives are: Immediate Objective; Project Purpose; Medium Term Result; Intermediate Result

<sup>3</sup> Other terms used for Results are: Outputs; short term Result

## (SAMPLE) LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

Restoration of coastal mangroves in Abeecce Village, Beedee Province, [country]

Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Source of Verification (SoV)	Assumptions
<b>Goal</b>			
Peoples' lives and property are protected from storms and flooding	➤ Deaths and economic losses from storm surges	➤ Village administration reports	➤ Mangroves are effective against storms and waves
<b>Objectives</b>			
1. A coastal protection zone of mangroves in Abeecce Village in Beedee Province is created	➤ Extent of new mangrove planting (3 km)	➤ Village reports	➤ Village coastline is suitable for mangrove planting
	➤ Trained guards undertake village protection	➤ Village reports	➤ Guards are willing
	➤ Village Disaster Risk Reduction Plan contains Mangrove protection guidelines	➤ Village DRR plans	➤ Authorities willing to include mangrove protection in DRR
2. Project Management functioning well.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of a project team with the requisite competencies for work described earlier.</li> <li>Establishment of a system for regular consultation with the stakeholders;</li> <li>Day-to-day management of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Team;</li> <li>Stakeholder consultation reports</li> <li>Project Office reports</li> </ul>	

Intervention Logic	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Source of Verification (SoV)	Assumptions
	Project, including reporting		

### Results/Key activities per Objectives

Results	Key Activities	Deliverables/Responsibility
<b>Objective # 1 - A coastal protection zone of mangroves in Abeecce Village in Beedee Province is created</b>		
(a) A 3-km mangrove plantation along the coastline of the village	(i) Establishment of a mangrove nursery;	➤ Proper Mangrove nursery
	(ii) Collection of planting materials to raise 60,000 seedlings	➤ 60,000 seedlings
	(iii) Planting mangroves	➤ 3 km length planted
	(iv) Quarterly monitoring of planting (2 years)	➤ Seven (7) monitoring reports
	(v) Gap filling	➤ No. of plants used in gap filling
(b) Trained village guard team in mangrove protection	(i) Construction of two guard posts to accommodate mangrove guards and procurement of basic equipment	➤ Two Guard posts ➤ Basic equipment (torches, tools, water-proof clothing)
	(ii) Developing a training module for guards	➤ Training module
	(iii) Conducting two training course for guards (10 per team)	➤ Two training events
(c) Mangrove protection regulations integrated into the village Disaster Risk	(i) Workshop to develop mangrove protection regulations	➤ Mangrove protection regulations
	(ii) Consultative meeting with	➤ Incorporating mangrove



Reduction Plan	relevant agencies to incorporate mangrove protection regulations in village Disaster Risk Reduction Plans	protection regulations into DRR
	(iii) Radio broadcasts to inform people about the importance of protecting mangroves and penalties for not following regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Content of awareness broadcasts;</li> <li>➤ Ten (10) broadcasts over a period of three months</li> </ul>

**Objective # 2 - Project Management functioning well.**

(a) Project Team	(i) Appointment of a project team with the requisite competencies.	➤ Project cell
	(ii) Establishment of a system for regular consultation with the stakeholders;	➤ Meeting reports
(b) Project Management	(i) Day-to-day management of the Project, including reporting	➤ Reports

**Restoration of coastal mangroves in Abeecce Village, Beedee Province, [country]**

N o.	Category & Item of Expenditure	Unit	Unit Price (USD)	Quantity	Cost	Sub Total	Remarks
<b>Objective # 1 - A coastal protection zone of mangroves in Abeecce Village in Beedee Province is created</b>							
<b>Result# 1: A 3-km mangrove plantation along the coastline of the village</b>							
<b>Activity 1.1: Establishment of a mangrove nursery</b>						<b>1,250</b>	
	Land preparation & maintenance	day	5	100	500		
	Fencing	lump			250		
	Construction of room	lump			500		
<b>Activity 1.2; Raising seedlings</b>						<b>2,300</b>	

	Planting materials	Unit	0.03	60000	1,800		
	Other materials	lump			250		
	Miscellaneous costs	lump			250		
<b>Activity 1.3: Planting mangroves</b>						<b>2,500</b>	
	Payment for planting	person day	5	500	2,500		
<b>Activity 1.4: Quarterly monitoring of planting (2 years) &amp; Gap Filling</b>						<b>786</b>	
	Planting materials	Unit	0.03	1200	36		
	Monitoring by community	day	5	100	500		In kind from community
	Payment for planting	day	5	50	250		
<b>Result# 2: Trained village guard team in mangrove protection</b>							
<b>Activity 2.1: Construction of guard posts and providing basic equipment</b>						<b>1,050</b>	
	Construction costs	Lump			750		In kind from Partner
	Basic equipment	Lump			300		
<b>Activity 2.2: Developing a training module for guards</b>						<b>1,250</b>	
	Technical advice	day	50	25	1,250		In kind from Partner
<b>Activity 2.3: Training of Guards</b>						<b>550</b>	
	Venue	day	25	2	50		
	Training materials	Lump			100		
	Refreshments	pax	5	20	100		
	Technical support	day	50	6	300		In kind from Partner
<b>Result # 3: Mangrove protection regulations integrated into the village</b>							

Disaster Risk Reduction Plan						
<b>Activity 3.1: Workshop to develop mangrove protection regulations</b>						<b>400</b>
	Venue	day	25	1	25	
	Refreshments	pax	5	25	125	
	Technical support	day	50	5	250	
						In kind from Partner
<b>Activity 3.2: Consultative meeting with agencies</b>						<b>200</b>
	Meeting costs	Lump			100	
	Technical support	day	50	2	100	
						In kind from Partner
<b>Activity 3.3: Radio broadcasts</b>						<b>750</b>
	Development of content	day	50	5	250	
	Broadcast costs	Unit	50	10	500	
<b>Objective # 2 - Project Management functioning well.</b>						
<b>Project Management</b>						<b>5,350</b>
	Reporting	Year	250	2	500	
	Other costs	Year	250	2	500	
	Project Manager	Month	100	24	2,400	
	Mangrove Guard	Month	50	24	1,200	
	Miscellaneous labour	day	5	150	750	
						In kind from Grantee
<b>TOTAL</b>						<b>16,386</b>
<b>FINANCING PLAN (USD)</b>						
<b>In kind from Partner</b>						<b>2,650</b>
<b>In kind from Community</b>						<b>500</b>

<b>In kind from Grantee</b>	<b>2,400</b>
<b>Mangroves for the Future Grant</b>	<b>10,836</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16,386</b>

MFF document tracking form

*Required to be filled up by author of this document*

Title	
Author	(Name) (Office and Unit)
Date created	YYYY-MM-DD
Main subject	
Keywords	
Purpose	(what is this document for?)
Summary	(outline or table of contents)
Distribution	(who was this document sent to?)
Date distributed	YYYY-MM-DD