CONNECTION BETWEEN THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND NGO-IDEAs

The objective of this document is to support the partner organisations that seek a connection between the tools of NGO-IDEAs and the logical framework or for those who want to include the target group's perspectives from the beginning before the planning of the project starts.

Do you wish a more horizontal relation with your target groups so that it promotes the principles of participation?
Do you work with attitude and behaviour changes?

The implementation of the tools of NGO-IDEAs supports the analysis and measurement of change for the target groups, i.e. of the effects and impacts during the process of the project. They can also be used for the planning. The information extracted during the implementation of some NGO-IDEAs tools can be as well used as a baseline. **Periodical measuring** is a requirement for the monitoring of effects and impacts.

How can the NGO-IDEAs approach encourage an orientation regarding the planning and follow-up when the "Logical framework" is being or was used for planning?

With the tools of NGO-IDEAs changes that undertake or realise persons or groups directly linked to the project can be recognised, measured, analysed and monitored. According to the vision of NGO-IDEAs local persons are the main actors as they define the responsibilities they want or can assume.

These changes can be appreciated at two levels:
On one hand they are <u>changes on knowledge, ability and behaviour</u> (what can change in me or the way we can change as group)
- Empowerment and skills development (rights, health, education)
- Own obligations
- Concrete improvement in life conditions

On the other hand they can be <u>changes as a result of actions of the target group</u>; including those influenced by other actors (what I can change as an already changed person):
- Recover or obtaining rights
- Results of own actions, including advocacy and lobby work.

<u>What NGO-IDEAs tools cannot measure or monitor are those changes that happen and the target groups are not able to influence at all or very little.</u>

- Changes related to other people outside the target group or typical actions of the target group.
- Changes that are not in the responsibility of the project's target group.

NGO-IDEAs and "Logical Framework" can be linked: in practice, the "Logical Framework" indicators can be measured or implemented directly through the implementation of NGO-IDEAs.
This is why we have to take into account the following aspects when applying PWR (Participatory Well-being Ranking), SAGE (Situational Analysis and Goal Establishment) and PAG (Performance Appraisal by Groups) presented in the next three cases. Regarding the

connection and compatibility of these tools with the "Logical Framework" and its monitoring NGO-IDEAs also offers PIAR (Participatory Impact Analysis and Reflection), a tool that works as a bridge between the other tools and the "Logical Framework".

Case 1

If there is already a planning[1]and there was a binding agreement with the funding partners:
1. **Appropriate indicators** for monitoring have to be identified (see above).
2. It should be agreed with the target group which indicators refer to the change in their situation, whether it is at an individual or group level.
3. The topic or objective fixed in the "Logical Framework" should be taken into account with the agreed indicators.
4. If possible, if the work will be done with groups of similar characteristics but not all their agreed goals on SAGE and PAG coincide, there are two possibilities:
   a. Compare between those target groups that are similar or add the goals under a common concept (such as health, education, coexistence, etc.).
   b. A second option, maybe more complicated, is to discuss with the target groups if they can agree on their goals so they coincide for the validation. This can be done democratically if they can agree on some common goals with the groups' representatives.
5. Some of the individual goals of the SAGE or collective goals of the PAG can be different to those reflected in the established indicators in the logical framework of the project. Meaning that these are additional goals highly valid depending on their commitment to get changes, but do not really need a contribution from the project. They express their own commitment, whether it is individual or collective.
6. On the opposite case, some SAGE and PAG goals can be included in the project strategy and be reflected in the configuration of the effect and impact indicators of its logical framework. This is how it could be proposed the inclusion of more precise indicators to the partner for its monitoring plan.

Example at a product level (output): Implementation of the products or performance, PIES, Guatemala

Main goal: Through supplementary training of traditional midwives there will be short-term reduction of maternal and child mortality.

Goal of the project: 2000 families from Guatemala have strengthened their sexual and reproductive health and their rights.

Indicator: 100 skilled traditional midwives accompany 1000 pregnant women and mothers respecting established standards.

---

[1] The NGO IDEAs gives added value to a project, even if it has already been planned, because it visualises the group's perspectives that the project seeks to contribute to. Search for connection and compatibility of planning instruments and participatory tools also stresses the importance of reflection spaces for the involved components. People have the autonomy to change their behaviours, the project cannot decide for them!

Target group: traditional midwives

SAGE: "I carry out healthy and secure labours. I inform pregnant women about preventive check-ups in medical centres.

PAG: We, midwives, work together for the community and regularly attend trainings."

Example of Kolping International

Main goal: The project contributes to reducing the poverty, strengthening social inclusion of marginalised population and gender equity through a fair and violence-free civil society.

Goal of the project: women and youth between 18 and 27 years from marginalised population groups are provided with knowledge and skills to be integrated in the job market.

Target group: members (women, men and youth) from self-help groups

Indicator: Until the end of the project at least xx% of the beneficiaries of small businesses regularly offer their goods or services.

SAGE: "Depending on my interests and capacities, I regularly offer my goods and services as an independent or employed person."

PAG: "We (as a self-help group) have access to credits to support our own small business."

Case 2

These tools help discover the indicators if there is no planning or no agreement with the funding partners yet:

1. The implementation of PWR and SAGE-PAG as tools for a baseline demands a very critical analysis, which can imply some limitations. A self-assessment at the beginning of the process is not always based on given knowledge and values during the project, but reflect the level of knowledge and aspirations of the members of the group. For example, at the beginning of a project the members of the group are not aware enough of their rights but, towards the end of the project, they can assess very well the degree of reach of their rights. This is why it is not always possible to define the goals on this basis. In a retrospective way (for example after some time past the implementation of the project) the achieved changes can be assessed in SAGE and/or PAG when, as in the example, the target group "is aware of their rights".

2. On the other side, it is valid that the group identifies – already more aware of their rights – and formulates other goals and can assess their level at that moment.

3. If PWR is chosen as a baseline tool it could be applied to a new project or a new period of it, while the Trend Analysis[2] could be applied to a project already in progress.

4. The NGO and the target group should prioritize the goals and agree them in the project plan, which will be presented to the funding partner. Goals and indicators for the logical framework can be identified from the SAGE and the PAG. Generally different tools should be implemented for the project design and these should be triangulated with information from other tools that generate specific information. Normally, a project deals with more than one group and therefore the results of a PWR or an SAGE with a group can only be added to other tools and perspectives. Therefore it is recommended to extend the implementation of the tools to several groups with different features regarding the project. Only this way it can be achieved to generate enough information to measure the established indicators and achieve an assessment of the degree of contribution to the project regarding their effects and impacts.

---

[2] In the Trend Analysis the members of the group determine together the most important criteria of their life quality in the community. Each criterion is classified by the group during the last years, so that a trend arises from the community in different aspects. (NGO-IDEAS, Tiny Tools http://www.ngo-ideas.net/tiny_tools/index.html)

Example 1:

SAGE: "I carry out healthy and secure labours. I talk to pregnant women about preventive check-ups in medical centres.

What may lead to:

Indicator: 100 skilled traditional midwives accompany pregnant women and mothers with rules that will be commonly agreed.

PAG: "We, midwives, inform families in our communities about family planning."

What may lead to:

Indicator: 100 traditional midwives actively inform about family planning methods.

Example 2:

SAGE: "I build my own business."

PAG: "We organise sale activities to generate income."

What derives from it:

Indicator: At least xx% of the beneficiaries of small businesses regularly offer their goods or services in sale activities.

Case 3

After the planning, the tools for the follow-up can be implemented.
Measuring the reach of the goals (SAGE-PAG) = measuring the indicators (logical framework). For example the PIAR tool which allows to assess changes (effects and impacts) and compare the results of the measuring . PIAR is related and generated from the previous application of other tools and from using the information and the team analysis of the real project contributions. PIAR is linked to the logical framework because it is the base for reporting, consolidating information, comparing and making conclusions and decisions.

This reflection, together with a **deepening analysis with PIAR** after periodical measuring, **enables the team and the management to visualise the changes and take the necessary decisions** throughout the project, so that the **planned effects and impacts are reached**. Furthermore, it allows getting valuable information about the target groups.
Where am I? What changes in the target group can we observe as NGO?
This allows as well a solid base for the management of the NGO with **an approach towards their effects and impacts regarding the decision-making in necessary adaptations**.

Example 1:

Initial situation:

100 traditional midwives do not collaborate with medical centres.

Change 1:

100 traditional midwives exchange their experience with medical centres.

Change 2:

100 traditional midwives inform at least 1000 pregnant women about preventive check-ups in medical centres.

Change 3:

100 traditional midwives report accompanying and carrying out labours for at least 1000 women and inform medical centres.

Example 2:

Initial situation

Women and youth cannot be integrated in the job market (self-employed and dependent).

Change 1:
xx women and xx youth know the skills they need to access the job market.

Change 2:
xx women and xx youth know the training offer in their region.

Change 3:
xx women and xx youth know the job demand in their region.

Apart from that, did any other changes happen?
What contributed to this change, what hindered it?

General reflections

The tools allow knowing the target groups better. Through their implementation project managers can get important additional information for their work, which is obtained from the measuring during dialogue with target groups.

> Example:
> The interviewed midwives answered negatively about their situation using the third person and the positive answers were in first person ("One felt insecure handling the risks. I have learned a lot.")

The reflection capacity of the target group grows and throughout the years the people assess the developing measures differently. For this reason it is very likely that cooperation improved the quality of the work.

Despite the fact that a project can concentrate in a working area, the information about the target group's necessities can complement the measures beyond the established goals by the project strategy or the target groups can manage other contributions in cooperation initiatives with other organisations.