

No. 88

**PUTTING THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK
IN ITS PLACE**
**THE POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE LOGICAL
FRAMEWORK TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF DONOR FUNDED
URBAN MANAGEMENT PROJECTS**

Caroline Pitt
March 1998

Working Paper No. 88

**PUTTING THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK
IN ITS PLACE**
**THE POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE LOGICAL
FRAMEWORK TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF DONOR FUNDED
URBAN MANAGEMENT PROJECTS**

Caroline Pitt*

March 1998

***Caroline Pitt
ARQUITUDO
CP 1461
Beira, Sofala
Mozambique
AFRICA**

Tel: 00 258 3 328677 Fax: 00 258 3 329390

PUTTING THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK IN ITS PLACE

The potential contribution of the logical framework to the sustainability of donor funded urban management projects

CONTENTS

Acronyms

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2. | DONOR FUNDED URBAN MANAGEMENT PROJECTS | 2 |
| | 2.1. Donors and Urban Development | 2 |
| | 2.2. Project Management and Stakeholder Participation | 2 |
| | 2.3. Management and Participatory Tools | 3 |
| 3. | EVALUATION CRITERIA | 4 |
| | 3.1. Development Criteria | 4 |
| | 3.2. Evaluation Criteria | 4 |
| | 3.3. The debate surrounding Logical Frameworks | 5 |
| 4. | ORIGINS OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK | 6 |
| | 4.1. USAID and their Log Frame | 6 |
| | 4.2. Format of the LogFrame | 6 |
| | 4.3. Use of the Log Frame | 6 |
| 5. | GTZ AND THEIR PROJECT PLANNING MATRIX | 7 |
| | 5.1. GTZ and its Approach | 7 |
| | 5.2. Format of the Project Planning Matrix | 9 |
| | 5.3. Use of the Project Planning Matrix | 9 |
| 6. | ODA AND THEIR PROJECT/LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS | 12 |
| | 6.1. ODA and its Approach | 12 |
| | 6.2. Format of the Project Framework | 14 |
| | 6.3. Format of the Logical Framework | 14 |
| | 6.4. Use of the Frameworks | 15 |
| 7. | COMPARING AGENCIES AND THEIR LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS | 18 |
| | 7.1. ODA and GTZ as Development Agencies | 18 |
| | 7.2. The Framework and Project Management | 18 |
| | 7.3. Format of the Frameworks | 19 |
| | 7.4. Use of the Logical Frameworks | 20 |
| 8. | CONCLUSION | 24 |
| Appendices | | 25 |
| 1. | GTZ Accra Waste Management Project Planning Matrix | 25 |
| 2. | ODA Cochin Urban Poverty Logical Framework | 28 |
| 3. | Sources of GTZ and DFID Information | 33 |
| References | | 34 |

*This paper is taken from a dissertation written to satisfy
the requirements of study towards the award of a
Master of Science at the Development Planning Unit.*

ACRONYMS

| | |
|------------|---|
| AMA | Accra Metropolitan Authority |
| BMZ | Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (German Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development) |
| CoC | Corporation of Cochin |
| DFID | Department for International Development (formerly ODA) |
| EC DG VIII | European Commission Directorate General for Development |
| GTZ | Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Technical Co-operation Agency) |
| KfW | Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (German Bank for Reconstruction) |
| MOV | Means of Verification |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| NORAD | Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation |
| ODA | (British) Overseas Development Administration |
| OVI | Objectively Verifiable Indicator |
| PCI | Practical Concepts Incorporated |
| PCM | Project Cycle Management |
| PPM | (GTZ's) Project Planning Matrix |
| PRA | Participatory Rural Appraisal |
| TeamUp | Team Technologies Ltd |
| UK | United Kingdom |
| UNCHS | United Nations Centre for Human Settlements |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WMD | (Accra's) Waste Management Department |
| ZOPP | Zeilorientierte Projektplanung (GTZ's Objectives-Oriented Project Planning) |

PUTTING THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK IN ITS PLACE
The potential contribution of the logical framework
to the sustainability of donor funded urban management projects

1. INTRODUCTION

Following a gradual change in donor policies from modernisation to the rhetoric of sustainability, and the acceptance of urbanisation in developing countries, the sustainability¹ of donor funded urban management projects is now the subject of academic and professional debate. This paper examines the potential of the logical framework² in providing a standardised methodology to support the process approach to these projects, and to involve stakeholder participation³, as contributory factors to transform the rhetoric of sustainable urban management into reality. The sustainability of these projects relies on the transfer of donor roles to the recipient, or continued donor intervention.

The paper compares the formats of logical frameworks and their use as a management tool (the experience of ODA, the British Overseas Development Administration) and a participatory tool (the original intention of GTZ, the German Technical Assistance Agency). The logical framework is an objectives based, tabular summary of a project. It is one of various management and participatory tools used on donor funded urban management projects. It was originally developed and introduced by USAID (United States Agency for International Development) in 1971, and has since been adopted and adapted by various donor agencies and NGOs (Non-Governmental Organisations). Its use is now often a donor requirement for many projects, although to date much of the logical framework experience relates to rural projects. This popularity derives from its clarity in providing a project summary following rigorous analysis of a problem, contributing to communication between stakeholders. It also allows project planning to be revised in response to the project, its stakeholders and its context throughout the project cycle⁴.

Apart from limitations regarding certain aspects of development which the logical framework was not intended to address, there has been further criticism.

¹ The use of the term 'sustainability' in this context is elaborated below in section 3.3.

² The 'logical framework' is used here as a generic term. The frameworks of USAID, GTZ and ODA are discussed below in sections 4,5 and 6 respectively. Completed examples are shown in the Appendices 1 and 2.

³ The 'process approach' and 'stakeholder participation' in projects and their contribution to project sustainability are discussed below in section 2.2.

⁴ The 'project cycle' refers to the stages in a project defined by the World Bank as "identification, preparation, appraisal, negotiation, implementation/supervision and evaluation" (Rondinelli, 1983, p66), but regrouped by other agencies. The project cycles of GTZ and ODA are discussed below in sections 5 and 6 respectively.

There has been a tendency to neglect revision, and complexity in its use (hidden by the simplicity of its format) has compounded the barriers to participation. This has necessitated extensive training of managers in management use, and facilitators in participatory use. The complexity has also contributed to the professional mystique surrounding the logical framework, provoking further interest and perceived value. Current discussions suggest that weaknesses experienced in the use of logical frameworks can be overcome by improvements to the donors' various formats. This paper suggests that these weaknesses lie in the way it is used rather than the format itself, and different 'improvements' by various donors can cause further confusion.

The paper begins by outlining the nature of donor funded urban management projects, in the context of donor policies, urban development, project management, stakeholder participation and the tools used. The next section selects evaluation criteria (efficiency, effectiveness, equity and sustainability) and establishes their relevance to the logical framework in the context of urban management. Having described the USAID LogFrame (the antecedent of other logical frameworks), the evaluation criteria are used to analyse the debate surrounding the logical framework: whether its limitations derive from its format or its use (as a management or a participatory tool). This is done by comparing the management systems, formats and use of the GTZ Project Planning Matrix (with reference to the "Improvement of Accra Solid Waste and Nightsoil Disposal System Project") and the ODA Project Framework (with reference to the "Cochin Urban Poverty Reduction Project").

A literature review indicates that ODA used their 'Project Framework' as a management tool and GTZ used their 'Project Planning Matrix' as a participatory tool, each in a standardised management procedure. However, different departments in ODA have developed management use of their Project Framework in different ways, and it has recently been replaced in ODA Instructions by a 'Logical Framework' and participatory use encouraged. Meanwhile new GTZ guidelines reduce the emphasis on the Project Planning Matrix as a participatory element of their project management system.

With regard to empirical evidence, concern was expressed by agency staff both in London (ODA headquarters) and Eschborn (GTZ headquarters) that the example of one project may not be representative, and that individual stakeholders hold diverse opinions.

Project staff were concerned that their logical framework did not provide a 'good' example of use of the tool. Due to the recent introduction of the logical framework in urban (as opposed to rural) projects, relevant documentary evidence is rare, especially with regard to project sustainability. The limitations of time available, the ongoing changes in approach by both GTZ and ODA (now known as DFID), and their rules on confidentiality have led to difficulties in accessing empirical evidence in the urban context. Therefore the two case studies have been chosen by default, and are limited to the point of view of the donors and facilitators.

The experience of writing this paper confirms the description of the logical framework as 'deceptively simple' (MacArthur, 1994), and the research has only scraped the surface of wider debate. It appears that 'improved' formats have not demonstrated significant advantages and contribute to confusion, not only for beneficiaries, but also for donors and intermediaries. The logical framework is a valuable management tool but its use as a truly participatory tool is questionable, although other participatory activities can contribute to its preparation. The logical framework is currently used to satisfy donor rather than beneficiary management requirements and the potential of the logical framework to support sustainable urban management has not been exploited.

The debate surrounding the format of the logical framework contributes to the wider discussion of the value of standardised methodologies. The debate surrounding its use contributes to wider discussions on the compatibility of management tools and participatory tools, and the value of rigorous analytic processes in the development context. However, it appears that the debates surrounding the logical framework itself have been superseded by those on project management systems and the 'place' of the logical framework within them. This indicates that, with increased rhetoric from donors regarding project sustainability, this paper could be supplemented by further research on sustainable urban management systems and the role of donors and recipients within them.

2. DONOR FUNDED URBAN MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

2.1. Donors and Urban Development

In response to increasing urbanisation (acknowledging the positive role of cities in development) and the unsustainability of previous donor interventions, donor aid for urban areas is now being directed at urban policy and urban management. Development projects are "*discrete activities, aimed at specific objectives with earmarked budgets and limited time frames*" and

provide a mechanism for translating donor policies into actions (Honadle and Rosengard, 1983, p300). The logical framework is concerned with the definition and evaluation of project objectives.

The urban management approach, through policy and projects, is emphasised not only by multilateral agencies, in the World Bank Urban Management Programme and the UN Sustainable Cities Programme, but also in individual projects funded by bilateral agencies such as BMZ (German Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development) and DFID (British Department for International Development - formerly the ODA). Sustainable development (combining economic sustainability, social sustainability, political sustainability and environmental sustainability with development), has become the 'new agenda' for urban management. Sustainable development in cities is envisaged through an urban management approach, capacity building and enabling combined with increased participation (UNCHS, 1996). A definition of urban management which is appropriate in the context of sustainable development is the "*exercise of continuing responsibility for actions to achieve sustainable improvements in living conditions and productivity*". This involves management processes (planning, co-ordinating, developing, resourcing, operating and maintaining) and management tasks (water, waste, transport etc.) (Mattingly, 1995, p8).

Donor policies now include rhetoric emphasising recipient (rather than donor) social, political and economic needs (UNCHS, 1996). Donor projects reflect the increased interest in their sustainability through a shift of emphasis from efficiency to effectiveness and renewed efforts to include participation of beneficiaries. The donor-recipient relationship provides three important elements⁵ of successful urban management being leadership (donor), resources (donor) and the participation (beneficiary) considered essential for sustainability. Project sustainability relies on the transfer of the donor roles to the recipient, or continued donor intervention. This paper looks at the potential contribution of the logical framework towards 'project sustainability', which also depends on institutional sustainability and organisational sustainability⁶ which are all only parts of wider sustainable development⁷.

2.2. Project Management and Stakeholder Participation

⁵ Contributory factors to successful urban management were discussed further in the seminar series Urban Management Implementation held by Michael Mattingly at the Development Planning Unit in 1997.

⁶ 'Institutional' refers to public sector legal and regulatory bodies. 'Organisational' refers to structures, process, resources and management styles. (Grindle & Hildebrand, 1995).

⁷ 'Sustainable development' refers to "*meeting the needs of the present ... without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs*" (UNCHS, 1996, p422).

Project management by donors has evolved away from the conventional approach (defined outputs, budget, duration and contextual assumptions) towards the process approach (continuous revision in response to the context and stakeholder participation) to improve project sustainability. Due to funding and logistical requirements, the approach to most donor funded urban management projects falls between these two extremes. The Integrated Approach adopted by the EC DG VIII (European Commission Directorate General for Development) was an attempt to provide a standardised procedure (associated with conventional projects) for process projects, and used elements of the logical framework in its management. (Eggers, 1992).

Despite the motivation of development staff there has been a lack of achievement in donor funded development projects, and a lack of learning from experience gained through project evaluation. Meanwhile pressures from donors for a high turnover oblige agency staff to combine quantity with quality. Projects can be improved by rapid implementation, and can be implemented faster if they are well planned, although this takes time. (Eggers, 1992). Use of the logical framework can make a positive contribution to both the planning and evaluation of project. However it can be argued that lengthy analysis and planning processes can be inappropriate in the development context, particularly in urban environmental management which has a direct impact on urban health (Stephens, 1997).

Stakeholder participation in development projects can be seen as the *"process whereby those with legitimate interests in a project influence decisions which affect them"* (Eyben & Ladbury, 1995, p192). Donors recognise that participation not only enhances equity and strengthens civil society, but that it also contributes project efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability (through a sense of ownership, capacity building and local accountability) (Eyben & Ladbury, 1995). Implementing agencies use participation to engender political support, reduce costs and delegate responsibility, while communities hope to gain through the response to appropriate needs, the acquisition of skills and empowerment⁸.

In evaluating projects, the crucial questions with regard to participation are 'Who participates?' and 'Who benefits?' especially in the case of donor funded urban management projects where 'participation' can be limited to donor representatives (Chambers, 1996). Despite investment in participation, project achievements have not reflected the diversity of end-users, due to intervention by more powerful stakeholders. Donor agencies are therefore looking at ways to remove barriers to inclusive participation through revised management systems and

methodologies. The introduction of the logical framework as a participatory tool was one such attempt. The compatibility of the extremes of successful participation (a long-term process) and successful management (short-term results)

⁸ 'Empowerment' refers to access and control over resources and knowledge.

remains a debate (Goebel et al., 1996). These issues are relevant to the use of the logical framework.

2.3. Management and Participatory Tools

The move away from the conventional approach towards the process approach has led to the development of new management tools, and the consideration of project sustainability has led to the introduction of more participatory tools. Conventional projects relied on management tools whose origins were based in commercial activities (Cordingley, 1995). Technocrats, using these management tools, can fail to appreciate the social and political implications of urban development projects. To avoid this eventuality, urban participatory tools have been developed. These derive mostly from methods used by NGOs in rural situations in developing countries (e.g. Participatory Rural Appraisal) or by urban authorities in developed countries (e.g. visioning⁹). These tools are used to promote dialogue between beneficiary groups and 'experts' and in the clarification, debate and exchange of knowledge. (Mitlin & Thompson, 1994). The adoption of participatory tools has been precipitated by the appreciation of the positive contribution of beneficiary participation in improving each stage of the project cycle (ODA, 1995).

The conventional approach to urban management projects concentrated on converting inputs and activities to outputs. For this 'administration' to become 'management' in the process approach, which requires complex monitoring and continual re-planning, the logical framework has been used to integrate the stages of the project cycle and consider the wider implications of the project. Most urban management projects use a combination of conventional management and innovative participatory tools resulting in duplication and/or gaps and perhaps unnecessary bureaucracy. This problem has been addressed by a number of consultants of whom TeamUp now dominate the market in software, publications and training in project cycle management. Their approach is based on the logical framework and its relationship to other tools. (Cordingley, 1995). Marketing by TeamUP has contributed to the popularity of the logical framework (DFID, 1997).

The frameworks adopted by USAID, GTZ and ODA are shown below in sections 4, 5 and 6 respectively and then compared. These are used to varying extents as management or participatory tools. The debate surrounding the logical framework contributes to the wider discussion on the compatibility of management tools (aimed at efficiency and effectiveness) and participatory tools (aimed at equity and sustainability).

⁹ 'Visioning' workshops discuss responses to the questions: "where are we now", "where do we want to be", and "how do we get there" (DFID, 1997).

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. Development Criteria

In response to the previous neglect of project evaluation, and acknowledging sustainability as central to development, various donor agencies identified development criteria which were processed by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and included in the 'Integrated Approach' adopted by the EC DG VIII. These can be summarised as concerning:

- Policy environment;
- Socio-cultural values;
- Gender needs;
- Environmental considerations;
- Technological feasibility;
- Institutional capacity;
- Economic viability;

which can be related to the evaluation criteria of "*efficiency, effectiveness, impact, relevance and sustainability*". (Cordingley, 1995, p106).

In the case of the contribution of the logical framework to the sustainability of donor funded urban management projects, Cordingley's *impact* should be an inherent part of *effectiveness* and *sustainability*; and *relevance* should relate to the degree of participation or *equity*. Therefore the criteria for evaluation of the contribution of the logical framework to project sustainability of urban management, as used in this paper, can be reduced to *efficiency* and *effectiveness* (which relate to the logical framework as a management tool) and *equity* and *sustainability* (which relate to the logical framework as a participatory tool).

3.2. Evaluation Criteria

Efficiency

Efficiency aims to make the best use of resources available, by producing the maximum output whilst minimising input and waste. Efficiency in urban management projects is based on private sector models (e.g. transparency in the use of resources) but urban managers also use participation to contribute to efficiency through cost sharing. Efficient urban management is aimed at short-term objectives and may be ineffective in terms of long-term goals, inequitable in terms of whose resources are used and who pays, and unsustainable in terms of externalities¹⁰ caused. (Devas & Rakodi, 1993).

Issues arising out of indicators of efficiency with relation to the logical framework and donor funded urban management projects revolve around:

- Clarity of project presentation
- Use of project resources
- Avoidance of bureaucracy

Effectiveness

Effectiveness aims to achieve long-term objectives. It requires clear responsibility for the different tasks and processes of urban management, and accountability of performance whilst linking implementation and policy formulation. Urban managers use participation to contribute to effectiveness through enablement¹¹, consensus in identification of objectives, local accountability and project relevance. Effective urban management arising out of participation is time-consuming and therefore inefficient in the short-term, and may be inequitable and unsustainable, depending on whose objectives are being met. (Devas & Rakodi, 1993).

Issues arising out of indicators of effectiveness with relation to the logical framework and donor funded urban management projects revolve around

- Project analysis
- Treatment of 'Objectives'
- Treatment of 'Indicators'
- Accountability of performance

Equity

Equity aims to provide a fair (but not necessarily equal) share of resources with respect to basic needs. Horizontal equity provides equal access without discrimination and vertical equity considers that the wealthy should make a larger contribution (whereas the benefit principle requires contributions according to benefits received). Urban managers use participation to contribute to equity through social inclusion and empowerment, which requires time and money, with results dependent on who participates. Although 'inefficient' in the short-term, a truly equitable approach should be efficient, effective and sustainable in the long-term. (Devas & Rakodi, 1993).

Issues arising out of indicators of equity with relation to the logical framework and donor funded urban management projects revolve around

- Who participates
- Consensus and diversity
- Who benefits

Sustainability

¹⁰ 'Externalities' refer to impacts outside the project.

¹¹ 'Enablement' refers to the provision of the means to achieve objectives.

Sustainability, in terms of projects, aims to *"engender, after the termination of external financing, a stream of benefits for the target group, which bears a reasonable relationship ... to the extent of investment"* (Eggers, 1992, p5). This is less than sustainable development which combines long-term economic, social, political and environmental sustainability with development (UNCHS, 1996). In relation to the sustainability of donor funded projects a more explicit definition is *"the extent to which partner country institutions will continue to pursue the objective after project assistance is over"* (NORAD, undated) which updates previous references to self-reliance (e.g. Cassen, 1994).

Sustainability of donor funded urban management projects depends on institutional sustainability and organisational sustainability, to which the project should contribute. Sustainability is neither in the interests of business (motivated by profit), as it may require increased costs to bring savings later for others (e.g. polluter pays). Neither is it in the interests of a government which requires short-term results to maintain political status. It can be argued that sustainability is an elite concern, addressing long-term concerns of the 'developed' world, as opposed to more urgent short-term concerns of the 'developing' world (Church, 1997). In practice, it has been found that there is a tendency for 'sustainable' projects to be supporting the most affluent (Clements 1995).

Urban managers use participation to contribute to project sustainability through local accountability and relevance which supports the maintenance of a project (Eyben & Ladbury, 1995). If used in a participatory and learning way, the continuation of the process approach should also create conditions for project sustainability. Sustainability also depends on efficiency, effectiveness and equity. Many developing countries lack capacity (institutional, organisational

and individual) to undertake sustainable urban management and thus many donor funded projects are aimed at building this capacity locally (Devas & Rakodi, 1993). It can be argued that continued donor intervention is required as part of the contribution of global sustainability to local sustainability (Stren et al, 1992). It can also be argued that project sustainability is anyway not in the donor interest due to economic and political motives reinforced by tied aid and conditions (Hanlon, 1991).

The issues arising out of indicators of sustainability with relation to the logical framework and donor funded urban management projects revolve around

- Treatment of 'Assumptions'
- Process approach
- Sustainable management

3.3. The debate surrounding the logical framework

The strengths and weaknesses of the logical framework with regard to each of these evaluation criteria refers to its use which contributes to the additional debate surrounding the format. The use of the logical framework also depends on approaches to urban management and donor funded development. Extremes of urban management have been described as *"commanding and controlling"* or 'top-down' and *"empowering and enabling"* or 'bottom-up' (Thomas, 1994, p13). Donor funded development can be polarised as two paradigms of *"things/planning/blueprints"* and *"people/participation/learning processes"* (Chambers, 1996, p10). In practice most projects fall somewhere between the two, but the emphasis of the approach influences how the logical framework is used in urban projects as a management tool or a participatory tool.

| APPROACH | EVALUATION CRITERIA | ISSUES RELATING TO LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
| Management | Efficiency | Clarity of project presentation Use of project resources Creation of bureaucracy |
| Management | Effectiveness | Project analysis Treatment of objectives Treatment of indicators Project accountability |
| Participatory | Equity | Who participates Consensus and diversity Who benefits |
| Participatory | Sustainability | Treatment of assumptions Process approach Sustainable management |

Figure 1. Author's Summary of Criteria relevant to the Logical Framework

4. ORIGINS OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

4.1. USAID and their LogFrame

In the late 1960s, USAID (the United States Agency for International Development) commissioned the consultants PCI (Practical Concepts Incorporated) to propose a systematic method to link project design and evaluation. This was the 'logical framework' of objectives, based on cause and effect, later known as LogFrame (Figure 2). This was adopted by USAID in 1971 for Technical Assistance and later for all projects. It was introduced primarily for evaluation, but the process of specifying goals and purposes (previously omitted from project design) as well as outputs made it a useful planning tool. The LogFrame was intended to be kept under review as the project was implemented, to facilitate monitoring. (MacArthur, 1994). The popularity of 'performance management' in the 1980s encouraged the rapid spread of logical frameworks (based on the LogFrame) to other donors, initially as a project tool and later as an administrative requirement (Wiggins & Shields, 1995). Its introduction and use was often supported by the US consultants TeamUp (DFID, 1997).

The LogFrame below was a 4x4 matrix which summarised the project, and strengthened the logic of planning and evaluation by clarifying objectives and their indicators, and recording assumptions. A hierarchy of objectives were stated in the 'Narrative Summary'. The highest, 'Goal', referred to the *"ultimate objective of*

the programme to which the specific project will contribute" (Wiggins & Shields, 1995, p3) being national or sectoral objectives. 'Purpose' described more precise immediate objectives, intended as a year after year state. 'Outputs' were specific results of the project and finally 'Inputs' were the additional resources required to carry out the project. All the levels of the 'Narrative Summary' were states and the causal links between them represented the processes, referred to as hypotheses. These linkages depended on 'Important Assumptions' which referred to the behaviour of the stakeholders and the risks in the social, economic and political environment. These might affect the project regardless of the quality of project design and management. The 'Assumptions' (those higher up on the LogFrame are more important) relate to the three linkages between the four rows of objectives, leaving the bottom right cell for pre-conditions. A column of 'Objectively Verifiable Indicators' (OVIs) were used to measure the achievement of objectives through a column of 'Means Of Verification' (MOVs). The vertical and horizontal logic of a completed LogFrame allowed the feasibility of projects to be checked at identification stage and enabled monitoring and evaluation at later stages. (MacArthur, 1994; Wiggins & Shields, 1995).

4.3. Use of the LogFrame

A brief summary of the acknowledged strengths and weaknesses of the LogFrame, with reference to the evaluation criteria selected above, follows. A more detailed analysis is included below in the sections relating to use by GTZ and ODA.

4.2. Format of the LogFrame

| NARRATIVE SUMMARY | OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS (OVIs) | MEANS OF VERIFICATION (MOVs) | IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| GOAL | Measures of Goal achievement | Sources of information Methods used | Assumptions affecting Purpose-Goal linkage |
| PURPOSE | End of project status | Sources of information Methods used | Assumptions affecting Output-Purpose linkage |
| OUTPUTS | Magnitudes of outputs Planned completion date | Sources of information Methods used | Assumptions affecting Inputs-Outputs linkage |
| INPUTS | Nature and level of resources Necessary cost Planned starting date | Sources of information | Initial assumptions about the project |

Figure 2. USAID LogFrame proposed by PCI (Wiggins & Shields, 1995)

LogFrame and Efficiency

- **Clarity of presentation**
Using a standardised format, the LogFrame made the key elements of the project explicit (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994) and this clarity facilitated mutual understanding and better communication between stakeholders (Wiggins and Shields, 1995).
- **Use of project resources**
The LogFrame was not concerned with project costs (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994) or economic analysis (Wiggins & Shields, 1995).
- **Creation of bureaucracy**
The LogFrame provided useful documentation but was only one of several tools to be used during the project (Cracknell, 1989).

LogFrame and Effectiveness

- **Project analysis**
The LogFrame ensured systematic and logical analysis of the project which introduced order and discipline into planners' thought processes (Clements, 1995). It can be considered one of the least econometric¹² tools available (e.g. compared to Cost-Benefit Analysis) (Wiggins & Shields, 1995). However, the LogFrame was methodologically and technically neutral with no guidance on proven strategies and techniques (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994).
- **Treatment of 'Objectives'**
The hierarchy of objectives implied that if the means are provided, the end would be achieved. The identification of only one 'Goal' and one 'Purpose' was recommended. It was found that additional levels for objectives might be needed, but alternative formats proposed within USAID in the 1980s were never adopted. (MacArthur, 1994).
- **Treatment of 'Indicators'**
Although the LogFrame established indicators for the project, it did not ascertain whether the project was the most effective means for achieving sector goals (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994).
- **Project accountability**
The analysis required to complete the Log Frame and its clarity in presentation helped to define tasks and communicate elements of the project contributing to the accountability of project performance (Wiggins & Shields, 1995).

¹² 'Econometrics' refer to the application of mathematical and statistical techniques to economic problems and theories.

LogFrame and Equity

- Who participates
The LogFrame provided "no guidance on popular participation in decision-making" (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994).
- Consensus and diversity
The LogFrame assumed consensus regarding measurable objectives (Clements, 1995) and did not cater for diversity.
- Who benefits
The LogFrame gave "no guidance on equitable income distribution, employment opportunities, access to resources" (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994).

LogFrame and Sustainability

- Treatment of 'Assumptions'
The 'Assumptions' established the limits of project responsibility (MacArthur, 1994). In practice, there was a tendency to treat these 'Assumptions' casually (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994).
- Process Approach
The LogFrame was a powerful tool for integrating project stages. If revised regularly in response to progress and external circumstances, it allowed modification of planning as well as implementation (Cameron, 1993). However, due to a tendency to complete the LogFrame at a late stage, rather than as part of the process, it often became a 'blueprint' (USAID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994).
- Sustainable Management
The LogFrame gave "no guidance on feasibility of replication, or effects on the environment" (AID, 1980 in MacArthur, 1994). In practice, 'Purpose' was inadequately emphasised as a 'year after year state' and confusion between 'Outputs' (specific results) and 'Purpose' (immediate objectives) hindered sustainability (Eggers, 1992).

5. GTZ AND THEIR PROJECT PLANNING MATRIX

5.1. GTZ and its Approach

GTZ (the German Technical Co-operation Agency) implements programmes for BMZ (the German Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development) and other donor agencies. GTZ sees development as a "structured process of transition from a current situation considered unsatisfactory to a future situation ... considered ... an improvement" (GTZ, 1996, p7). Projects are regarded as sustainable if the "desired impacts of the project continue to be effective after its

completion" (Lang & Dreschler, 1989, p31). Stakeholder participation is held to be central to German co-operation, where it is "the active involvement of individuals, social groups and organisations in the planning and decision-making processes that affect them" (GTZ, 1996, p8).

GTZ sees management as "structuring social processes in order to achieve a predetermined objective" (GTZ, 1996, p4) and has included ZOPP (Objectives-Oriented Project Planning) since 1983. ZOPP was developed by GTZ and centres on the logical framework. The system involved different participants for at least five workshops (feasibility, proposal, with project partners, plan of operations and re-planning) to coincide with the stages of the project cycle. Each workshop followed prescribed steps of stakeholder analysis¹³, problem tree¹⁴, objectives tree¹⁵ and alternative solutions. The results were charted on a logical framework called the Project Planning Matrix (PPM) which was revised through participatory processes using the same system at subsequent workshops (O'Donovan, 1995). Although the PPM was the principal management tool of ZOPP, it was gradually supplemented by other management tools (e.g. Operational Planning) forming a comprehensive management system (Goebel et al., 1996).

However, ZOPP workshops became 'events' which did not allow for reflection before preparation of the PPM or for flexibility between workshops (Gagel, 1996). 'Participation' only took place after appraisal and tended to impose realities of "uppers" on "lowers" including donors on beneficiaries (Chambers, 1996, p6). Although ZOPP contributed to better participation of partner agencies, the participation of target groups in decision-making did not materialise. This led to the introduction of other participatory tools (e.g. Participatory Rural Appraisal) and the recent integration of ZOPP into a new Project Cycle Management (Donner, 1996).

The new PCM (Project Cycle Management) emphasises partnership and includes more flexible use of ZOPP in the stages of the project cycle (specified as identification, conception and implementation).

¹³ 'Stakeholder analysis' involves the identification of stakeholders, their roles and their inter-relationships.

¹⁴ The 'problem tree' identifies a core problem and its causes and effects.

¹⁵ The 'objectives tree' relates problems to objectives, and identifies goals and how to achieve them.

Planning is seen as a process which continues throughout implementation (GTZ, 1996). PCM provides both a framework for participation (mutual definition of roles, objectives and responsibilities of GTZ, partner organisations and target groups) and flexible management (processes and tasks performed regularly throughout the project cycle) (Goebel et al., 1996). PCM has introduced new positive features (e.g. participation in transparent analysis and decision-making) but still contains negative features of the old approach (e.g. pre-defined target orientated procedure) which cannot respond to the uncertainties of development. It does not clarify who participates or when, and omits other issues (e.g. empowerment, behaviour, attitudes) essential to development (Chambers, 1996). These issues prompted the workshop "ZOPP marries PRA?" which discussed whether the constraints of management based on the logical framework were compatible with participatory learning approaches (Forster, 1996).

GTZ are currently preparing a new 'standard procedure' which reduces the five ZOPP stages to four subprocesses (BMZ and GTZ co-ordination; BMZ, GTZ and partner co-operation agreement; implementation; follow-on). All affected parties participate throughout the process and re-planning responds to the delay between preparation and implementation (Göbel et al., 1997). The major change is the addition of a 'follow-on' phase. It also abandons the idea that the 'expert' must have everything under control. It proposes that, based on existing capacities of partner organisations, simplified project planning should "satisfy the desires of all major actors ... correspond with their capabilities and be within their power" (Göbel & Helming, 1997, p6). It recognises the need to distinguish between participation of different stakeholders at different stages and warns against arousing false expectations through participation, and any investment in participation must justify the benefits. (Göbel & Helming, 1997).

5.2. Format of the Project Planning Matrix

| SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES/ ACTIVITIES | OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS (OVIs) | MEANS/SOURCES OF VERIFICATION (MOVs) | IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| OVERALL GOAL to which the project contributes | INDICATORS that OG has been achieved | Sources of information | for sustaining objectives in the long-term |
| PROJECT PURPOSE | INDICATORS that the PP has been achieved (end of project status) | Sources of information | for achieving the overall goal |
| RESULTS/OUTPUTS | INDICATORS that the results/outputs have been achieved | Sources of information | for achieving the project purpose |
| ACTIVITIES | SPECIFICATION of inputs/costs of each activity | Sources of accounts | for achieving the results/outputs |

Figure 3. Author's summary of the Project Planning Matrix (GTZ, 1987)

The Project Planning Matrix (Figure 3) used by GTZ since 1983 is a modified format of the PCI LogFrame (Figure 2). Perhaps influenced by the increased attention given to project management and network analysis at the time, GTZ recognised that 'Inputs' were transformed into 'Outputs' via activities. The substitution of 'Inputs' with 'Activities' (the substance of a project) has a strong logical appeal. (MacArthur, 1994). This format is more useful for project implementers but the matrix is inconsistent as activities are a process (hypothesis in the PCI version) whereas the other cells in that column are states (Wiggins & Shields, 1995). The bottom OVI is replaced by 'Inputs',

and the bottom MOV by resources and budgets. The 'Assumptions' relate to the three linkages between the four rows, leaving the top right cell for conditions for sustainability. The sequence for completion is clearly prescribed: down the summary of objectives to 'Activities', up 'Assumptions', down OVIs to 'Results/Outputs', then down MOVs, and finally inputs, costs and their accounting. (MacArthur, 1994). However, this format has not always been rigidly applied, as in the case study of Accra (Box 1. and Appendix 1) where 'Activities' were listed separately, and 'Inputs' included in the Plan of Operations.

The new GTZ 'standard procedure' recommends that if the PPM is inappropriate to the socio-cultural context¹⁶, the planning process should be recorded in a different participatory way, and the information transferred later to the PPM. This should be done without it becoming an intellectual exercise or a piece of bureaucracy. The new 'standard procedure' recognises the value of the PPM in providing information for absent stakeholders at higher levels and recommends that information is limited to that which is relevant to its readership. It also suggests that the format can be flexible (e.g. more objectives in the hierarchy). (Göbel & Helming, 1997).

5.3. Use of the Project Planning Matrix

Project Planning Matrix and Efficiency

- **Clarity of presentation**
The PPM provides a clear and unified structure for projects facilitating decision-making and control. However, too much attention was given to producing the perfect plan (as opposed to facilitating a process to form a consensus) neglecting revision. Meanwhile the value of standardised methodologies has been questioned within GTZ, together with the feasibility of categorising elements into single cells and condensing the complexity of development projects onto one page. (Goebel et al., 1996).
- **Use of project resources**
The complexity of the ZOPP system and the PPM within it necessitates extensive training of all participants (MacArthur, 1994). Holding ZOPP workshops and training sessions, is an expensive and time-consuming operation (Göbel & Helming, 1997) as described in Accra. GTZ will now have to invest in retraining of personnel and moderators in the new ZOPP system (Goebel et al., 1996).
- **Creation of bureaucracy**
In practice ZOPP workshops were reduced to ritualistic two-yearly 'events', as in Accra, and the PPM ceased to be a process and became an instrument (Goebel et al., 1996). The 'Use of English' by German moderators in GTZ workshop documentation and PPMs has led to tautology on many pages (GTZ, 1997).

Project Planning Matrix and Effectiveness

- **Project analysis**
As part of a rigorous procedure, the PPM enabled more effective planning and management. The ZOPP system also initiated dialogue and contributed to understanding throughout the life of the project (O'Donovan, 1995). However, it was found that planning was given too much attention in the

technocratic belief that a well planned project would be well implemented (Goebel et al., 1996).

- **Treatment of 'Objectives'**
A strength of the ZOPP approach is its potential for joint identification by stakeholders of objectives (O'Donovan 1995). GTZ training emphasised the need for only one 'Goal' and one 'Purpose' (MacArthur, 1994), as specified for Accra, although it is now recognised that more levels may be needed (Göbel & Helming, 1997).
- **Treatment of 'Indicators'**
Indicators are also defined in a participatory way at ZOPP workshops, but there has been a tendency towards specifying inappropriately quantitative indicators (Goebel et al., 1996). Also, through concentration on the pre-specified indicators in the PPM during monitoring and evaluation, other achievements on the project can be ignored (Göbel & Helming, 1997), as found in Accra.
- **Project accountability**
All steps in the planning and decision-making process are accountable because they are well documented in the PPM, providing a formal method of transferring information (Goebel et al., 1996). However, it is now acknowledged that this accountability is in an upwards direction in the management hierarchy (Göbel & Helming, 1997).

Project Planning Matrix and Equity

- **Who participates**
ZOPP relies on wide participation in the planning process, which is dependent on the composition, capacity and bias of participants, and the information available to them (Cordingley 1995). It was found that there was no 'genuine' participation of stakeholders in ZOPP workshops with some reluctance to have commitments formally expressed (Goebel et al., 1996): exclusion of certain stakeholders was noted in Accra. Despite the introduction of other participatory tools and techniques into ZOPP, the formal situation of the

¹⁶ This is elaborated below in section 5.5. on PPM and equity.

workshops can be inappropriate in many developing countries (GTZ, 1996). This is compounded by the frequent use of the English language (and/or translation) at the workshops which are usually conducted in a 'top-down' sequence (Chambers, 1996). The PPM relies on the written language and its tabular format which excludes not only the illiterate (Goebel et al., 1996).

- **Consensus and diversity**
A major feature of ZOPP is forming a consensus for the entries in the PPM cells (MacArthur, 1994) which depends on the skill of the moderator (GTZ, 1997). The reduction to one core problem and the imperative of consensus (often led by the most powerful participants) does not reflect the diversity of potential beneficiaries and it has been found that in the end "GTZ knows best" (Chambers, 1996, p10).
- **Who benefits**
The PPM facilitates effective planning and management, but this is often aimed at public managers due to exclusion of other stakeholders at different workshops (O'Donovan, 1995).

Project Planning Matrix and Sustainability

- **Treatment of 'Assumptions'**
Another strength of the approach is the participatory identification of assumptions (O'Donovan 1995) and risks with a reasonable

chance of occurring are also included (Wiggins & Shields, 1995). This leads to more realistic planning (Goebel et al. 1996).

- **Process approach**
It was found that planning was overemphasised, although monitoring and evaluation are central to the PPM (Cameron, 1993). It is seen by some as a 'strait jacket' but by others as a flexible dynamic tool contributing to common understanding and resulting in clear sustainable project design (O'Donovan 1995). However, the two-yearly workshops have neglected the potential of the PPM to support the process approach through more frequent revision (Chambers, 1996). Also, it can be considered that the identification of specific objectives is incompatible with the process approach (Gagel, 1996).
- **Sustainable management**
Project sustainability is seen to derive from stakeholder participation in the process preceding the PPM. More specifically, the PPM includes a cell relating to assumptions regarding project sustainability, but current use of the PPM itself revolves around donor funded workshops and moderators, as demonstrated in Accra. The new 'follow-on' phase of the 'standard procedure' recognises the need for continued donor support after project 'completion' (Göbel & Helming, 1997).

Box 1. GTZ in Ghana: Improvement of Accra Solid Waste and Nightsoil Disposal System (Continuation and Consolidation Phases)

Project background

By the early 1980s, the solid and liquid waste disposal system in Accra had collapsed. In 1985 the AMA (Accra Metropolitan Assembly) established the WMD (Waste Management Department) which launched a waste collection and treatment programme with technical assistance from GTZ (German Technical Co-operation Agency) and financial assistance from KfW (German Bank for Reconstruction). At ZOPP (Objectives-Oriented Project Planning) workshops the 'Goal' of technical assistance was defined as "Environmental sanitation of Accra improved" and the 'Purpose' as "Improved waste management of Accra consolidated" while financial assistance concentrated on the supply of equipment. (Cofie-Djangmah, 1994).

Continuation Phase ZOPP Workshop

A seven-day workshop was held at the end of 1991 to address the issue of project sustainability through "enhanced training of personnel, improved private and community participation and careful ... waste handling technologies" by preparing a PPM (Project Planning Matrix) for the Continuation Phase, a long-term strategy and a plan of operations. The 28 participants were key secondary stakeholders, 15% representing AMA, 55% WMD, the remainder being within the 45% representing GTZ. Many of the participants had attended previous ZOPP workshops (stakeholder analysis, problem tree, objectives tree, alternatives and PPM) and therefore the stages preceding the PPM were omitted. Using the previous 'Goal' and 'Purpose' they anticipated the following 'Results':

1. *Efficiency of management and organisation improved*
2. *Financial management improved*
3. *Sustainable waste collection service improved*
4. *Appropriate waste treatment improved*
5. *Privatisation of waste collection improved*

6. *Community participation improved*
7. *Maintenance of equipment and machinery improved (Nkum, 1991)*

Project Review Mission

In 1994 a Project Review Mission assessed the performance of the project on the basis of the previous PPM. They found that delayed procurement had resulted in 50% reduction in solid waste collection and equipment since 1992 and that dumping sites and treatment plants were substandard. Fees collected only covered 50% of the costs, and AMA had not fulfilled their commitments. The accumulation of solid waste led to other agencies using private contractors, and donors preparing project proposals: both without reference to WMD. (Cofie-Djangmah, 1994).

Consolidation Phase ZOPP workshop

A four-day ZOPP workshop was held in 1994 to consolidate the operations of WMD and define strategies for the final phase and after donor withdrawal in 1998. The 28 participants were key secondary stakeholders, 15% representing ministries, 10% AMA and 55% WMD, the remainder being within the 30% representing GTZ. The workshop commenced with discussion of the recommendations made in the Progress Review, leading to the preparation of a new PPM (Appendix 3) using the previous 'Goal' and 'Purpose'. This commenced with 'Results' agreed as:

1. *Institutional strengthening consolidated*
2. *Equipment availability improved*
3. *Community participation expanded*
4. *Waste collection activities coordinated*
5. *Waste treatment concept implemented*

This was followed by identification of 'Activities' (listed outside the PPM) and then 'Assumptions' relating to co-ordination of other donors, institutions, politicians, NGOs and the community. OVI's (both quantitative and qualitative) were then agreed, followed by MOV's based on official records, visual inspections, media reports and project records. Finally milestones were set and a plan of operations (with 'inputs' column not completed) was charted. (Cofie-Djangmah, 1994).

Project Planning Matrix and efficiency

Although the project is clearly presented in the format, both PPMs fill four A4 sheets (with 'Activities' listed separately but not elaborated for the consolidation phase). The continuation workshop occupied 196 person-days and the consolidation workshop 92 person-days, both including participants from Germany. (At the consolidation workshop the days were shortened to allow local staff to attend to their workload). This investment also covered preparation of the plan of operations, but excluded workshop preparation, logistics and reporting costs. It was noted at the continuation workshop that 28 participants was too many, prolonging discussions (Nkum, 1991), but this number was maintained for the consolidation workshop.

Project Planning Matrix and effectiveness

The 'Goal' and 'Purpose' were not revised. It was noted that the achievement of introducing low cost techniques should be acknowledged, although it did not arise from the previous PPM. The Progress Review described an overall underachievement of the 'Results' due to uncoordinated competition from private contractors and lack of donor/ministry co-ordinations, funding, institutional support, equipment and publicity.

Project Planning Matrix and equity

Although many of the under achievements derived from financial arrangements, KfW (the funding agency) were only represented through GTZ (Nkum, 1991). The absence of end-users and private contractors was noted at the continuation workshop (Nkum, 1991). Despite reference to privatisation and community participation, these sectors were again unrepresented at the consolidation workshop. It was noted that there was a high level of participation from those attending (Cofie-Djangmah, 1994), but the PPMs primarily benefited project managers and GTZ although the inclusion of local moderators offered the opportunity of using the PPM in future beneficiary management .

Project Planning Matrix and sustainability

'Assumptions' had included commitments by AMA (unfulfilled) and private and community sectors but not KfW.

The highest 'Assumption' (relating to sustainability) refers to supportive Ghanaian government policies, and the co-ordination of ministry and AMA policies. Only 'Outputs' and 'Activities' were revised during the project, assuming that the 'Goal' and 'Purpose' remained the same, omitting initial stages of ZOPP. The majority of problems arose through lack of finance perhaps implying that sustainable project management depends on continued financial support from donors.

Note

This case study is used to illustrate points raised in the literature, rather than to influence conclusions. It should not be regarded as a 'typical' example.

6. ODA AND THEIR PROJECT/LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS

6.1. ODA and its Approach

The Overseas Development Administration (now the Department for International Development) was responsible for funding British government development projects and arranging their implementation by others. ODA policies evolved from 'aid' to 'development' seen as the *"attainment of sustainable improvements in economic growth and the quality of life"* (ODA, 1995, p2). Sustainable overseas development assistance was considered as providing *"benefits that will continue after the project has ceased"* (ODA, 1995, p138) and participation as the *"process whereby ... (stakeholders) play an active role in decision-making and in the consequent activities which affect them"* (ODA, 1995, p94). ODA operated a system of project cycle management, with stages summarised as identification,

planning and implementation with monitoring/evaluation informing the other stages of the process. ODA has been moving away from the conventional approach to project management towards the process approach, characterised by the overlap of these stages and the promotion of stakeholder participation. This is to *"enhance beneficiary ownership and therefore greater sustainability"* (ODA, 1995, p138).

The 'Project Framework', based on the PCI LogFrame, was introduced by ODA in 1985 to improve the effectiveness of projects, by identification of objectives and performance targets for evaluation. The practice of preparing a new framework during evaluation (Cracknell, 1989) was later formally adopted, changing the emphasis from evaluation to project preparation (MacArthur, 1994) but neglecting implementation (DFID, 1997). Completion of the Project Framework was limited to ODA personnel, and its potential was

limited by standard government procedures (e.g. competitive tendering and exclusion of stakeholders) (O'Donovan, 1995).

In 1994, ODA adopted a new approach centred on a 'Logical Framework' for design and evaluation, linked to action-planning¹⁷ and other TeamUp procedures (O'Donovan, 1995). The Programme Manager prepared a Logical Framework at an early stage, with comments from ODA and other government departments, to assist project formulation and appraisal. The Logical Framework, regularly reviewed, was then used for monitoring and evaluation, contributing to a Project Completion Report. The Logical Framework became compulsory for projects over £250,000 (and recommended for others). (ODA, 1996). Despite ODA guidelines, the Project/Logical Framework has been formatted and used differently by different departments with varying degrees of stakeholder participation (DFID, 1997).

DFID is currently preparing a new PCM (Project Cycle Management) procedure which aims to clarify and further support the participatory process. The stages in the project cycle are specified as identification, clearance, design appraisal, approval, implementation, completion, post-completion and evaluation, with lessons learnt informing the other stages. Stakeholder workshops are held to undertake stakeholder analysis, risk assessment, problem trees and visioning. At this stage the beneficiary agency may be in a position to proceed without the assistance of DFID. The Logical Framework then combines stakeholders' objectives with DFID technical appraisals to clarify the project and commitments made. During implementation, quarterly project reports follow the Logical Framework, providing opportunities to revise inputs/activities (and outputs if necessary). A revised purpose implies a new project which requires negotiation at a higher level. Project

Completion Reports are based on the Logical Framework together with impact studies and the output-purpose review. Evaluation is a long-term study based on the whole process of the project. (DFID, 1997).

The ODA 'Project Framework' (Figure 4) from the 1995 Social Development Handbook was based on the PCI LogFrame (Figure 2), with adaptations of cell functions and names, and combination of some cells. The 'Narrative Summary' of PCI became the 'Project Structure', 'Goal' became 'Wider Objectives', and 'Purpose' became 'Immediate Objectives'. The words "*and value*" were added to the OVI; MOV was reworded; and "*risks and conditions*" included with 'Assumptions'. Judging the indicators for 'Inputs' and 'Outputs' unnecessary, the OVI columns were omitted on these rows, although strangely their MOVs remain. The prescribed sequence was planning downwards from 'Wider Objectives' to 'Immediate Objectives' to 'Outputs' to 'Activities' (all through assumptions) and to 'Inputs', followed by thinking upwards, always considering cause and effect (ODA, 1995). The introduction of the word 'Activities' here is confusing as it does not appear on this version of the Project Framework.

The ODA 1996 Office Instructions contain the 'Logical Framework' (Figure 5.) which supersedes the 'Project Framework' and aims to define a project in terms of Goal, Purpose, Outputs and Activities. The format and nomenclature reverts to the PCI version, but replaces 'Inputs' with 'Activities' (using its OVI and MOV cells for 'Inputs') and alters the levels of the assumptions. The inclusion of 'Activities' is to reinforce the logic of the framework, because how the objectives are achieved are important to ODA. This framework is similar to that used by GTZ. Although the example of Cochin (Box 2 & Appendix 2) uses this Logical Framework, the majority of ODA experience discussed below is with the previous Project Framework.

¹⁷ 'Action-planning' refers to the identification of actions and strategies to overcome present problems and to achieve future objectives.

6.2. Format of the Project Framework

| PROJECT STRUCTURE | INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT AND VALUE | HOW INDICATORS CAN BE QUANTIFIED OR ASSESSED | ASSUMPTIONS, RISKS (AND CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO AID) |
|---|--|---|--|
| WIDER OBJECTIVES (i.e. Sectoral or National) | Quantitative ways of measuring, or qualitative ways of judging | Sources of information | External conditions for Immediate Objectives to contribute to Wider Objectives |
| IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES: Immediate benefits, dis benefits, improvements, changes and for whom | Quantitative measures or qualitative evidence | Sources of information | External factors affecting the conversion of Outputs to Immediate Objectives |
| OUTPUTS Produced by the project to achieve Immediate Objectives. | | Sources of information | External factors to obtain Outputs |
| INPUTS What materials/equipment/services, when and from whom | | Sources of information | Pre-conditions |

Figure 4. Author's summary of the ODA Project Framework (ODA, 1995)

6.3. Format of the Logical Framework

| NARRATIVE SUMMARY | MEASURABLE INDICATORS (OVIs) | MEANS OF VERIFICATION (MOVs) | IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| GOAL Wider problems which the project helps resolve | Quantitative ways of measuring, or qualitative ways of judging: quantity, quality, time | Sources of information | Goal to supergoal Factors for sustainability |
| PURPOSE Immediate effects: benefits/disbenefits and improvements/ changes: for whom | Quantitative measures or qualitative evidence: quantity, quality, time | Sources of information | Purpose to Goal |
| OUTPUTS Produced by project to achieve Purpose. | Type and quality of outputs and when: quantity, quality, time | Sources of information | Output to Purpose |
| ACTIVITIES required to accomplish outputs and when | INPUTS Materials/equipment/ services, costs, when and from whom | Budgets etc. | Activity to Output |

Figure 5. Author's summary of the ODA Logical Framework (ODA, 1996)

6.4. Use of the Frameworks

The Frameworks and Efficiency

- Clarity of presentation
ODA used the Project Framework because it presented "*key components ... in a systematic, concise and coherent way*" in one document (ODA, 1995, p81). This enhanced communication between decision makers and project personnel (O'Donovan, 1995). There was general satisfaction with the summarised format (especially for ODA planning and evaluation personnel) although some used more than one page which detracted from its concision (Cracknell, 1989), as shown at Cochin.
- Use of project resources
Early users of the Project Framework in ODA were untrained and unconvinced of its value which led to late completion, wasting its potential and staff time (Cracknell, 1989). ODA now invests in regular staff training on the Logical Framework and more recently, in project based workshops, as held at Cochin. The costs involved in holding workshops was initially compounded by the involvement of TeamUp facilitators from the US, prompting the training of UK based facilitators. (DFID, 1997)
- Creation of bureaucracy
It was recognised that the Project Framework could be used inflexibly and bureaucratically, especially when completed late or when monitoring/evaluation failed to be fed back into the process (Cracknell, 1993). It was also pointed out that an accumulation of separate documents led to unnecessary duplication of basic project data (Cordingley, 1995) which has now been rationalised (ODA, 1996).

The Frameworks and Effectiveness

- Project analysis
The Project Framework "*clarifies and exposes the logic of how the project is expected to work*" (ODA, 1995, p81). However, the quality of completion varied and although some personnel found that completing the matrix led to greater understanding of the project [as found at Cochin] others found it too mechanical (Cracknell, 1989).
- Treatment of 'Objectives'
The Project Framework clearly "*separates the various levels in the hierarchy of objectives*" (ODA, 1995, p81). This is straightforward for the conventional approach to project management but more complex for the process approach involving beneficiaries (Harding, 1991). There were misunderstandings regarding 'Inputs' and 'Outputs' (e.g. mistaken as cost and equipment) (Cracknell, 1989) and also difficulties in distinguishing between 'Output' and 'Purpose' (MacArthur, 1994). There

was also a tendency to overspecify objectives (Wiggins & Shields, 1995).

- Treatment of 'Indicators'
Underachievement of indicators necessitated revisions of the Project Framework (Harding, 1991). There was discussion regarding whether indicators should be realistic or idealistic, and initially the use of qualitative indicators was discouraged by the addition of the word "*value*" (Cracknell, 1989). ODA later recommended quantitative and qualitative indicators (ODA, 1995), as used at Cochin.
- Project accountability
Use of the Project Framework has increased accountability of project performance through the clarification of objectives and indicators (O'Donovan, 1995).

Project Framework and Equity

- Who participates
At its introduction, the Project Framework was completed for project appraisal by ODA personnel or consultants (Cracknell, 1989) without beneficiary participation. Later, ODA held separate negotiations with different stakeholders at different stages, resulting in a lack of continuity (O'Donovan, 1995). Beneficiary involvement has been primarily with the public sector, as involved at Cochin, although following project clearance, beneficiary participants could include private and community sectors (DFID, 1997). As well as the usual barriers to participation, successful use of the Project Framework was dependent on adequate training which might not reach end-users or others unfamiliar with tabular forms (Cracknell, 1989).
- Consensus and diversity
Experience of 'participatory' use of the Project Framework was limited mostly to recipient government agencies, and therefore the problems of forming consensus among diverse stakeholders have not been addressed.
- Who benefits
The Project Framework was used as a management tool addressing the concerns of ODA administrative officers rather than project managers (Cordingley, 1995), and more appreciated by those higher up in the management hierarchy (Cracknell, 1989). There were no discussions with real beneficiaries until after project identification or tender awards, and revisions were made as a result of ODA's own monitoring (O'Donovan 1995). Feedback was to donors rather than recipients (Cracknell, 1993). This emphasis continues, although the Logical Framework has the potential to be used in beneficiary management processes (DFID, 1997).

The Frameworks and Sustainability

- **Treatment of 'Assumptions'**
The consideration of 'Assumptions' and ways to reduce risks at project identification stage has brought realism to the process (MacArthur, 1994) especially when ODA included assumptions regarding donor funding (Cracknell, 1989). With the move away from 'tied aid' most 'Assumptions' now relate to beneficiary commitments, as included at Cochin (DFID, 1997).
- **Process approach**
The Project Framework was originally proposed by ODA to provide lessons for future projects (Cracknell, 1993). It was observed that ODA should have recognised the value of monitoring to revise implementation and used a more participatory approach (Harding, 1991). Although regular revision of the Logical Framework is now included in DFID's Project Cycle Management, there is a danger that the process could be blocked by technocratic beneficiaries (DFID, 1997).
- **Sustainable management**
The Project Framework clarified the relationship between efficiency and effectiveness (through identification of objectives and their measurement), contributing to sustainability. ODA in theory recognised the importance of constant revisions especially for social development projects (Cracknell 1989) although in practice revisions were rare (Harding, 1991). ODA acknowledged that participation of stakeholders (especially from an early stage) in the preparation of the Project Framework contributes to sustainability (ODA, 1995). Project sustainability is now seen to derive from the activities at the stakeholder workshops preceding the Logical Framework combined with capacity building, as proposed at Cochin, rather than the process of revision of the Logical Framework (DFID, 1997). This may reflect the ODA definition of sustainable projects which refers to sustainable benefits rather than sustainable management. In addition, ODA has to combine the rhetoric of sustainability with the realities of competitive tendering, delays between negotiation and tender awards, and the difficulties of consensus (O'Donovan, 1995).

Box 2. ODA in India: Cochin Urban Poverty Reduction Project (Appraisal Stage)

Project Background

One third of the 200,000 population of Cochin (in Kerala state) were described as 'poor' at project identification in 1992. The Cochin Project aims to overcome the supply driven approach to previous ODA (British Overseas Development Administration) 'slum improvement schemes', by offering "*a wider range of interventions; increased participation by primary stakeholders; integration with other government programmes; better targeting of vulnerable groups and those living outside recognised slums; and capacity building of beneficiaries, service deliverers and planners*" to improve effectiveness and sustainability. (DFID, 1997)

Initial Planning Workshop

After project clearance in 1995, a two-day workshop was held to identify the 'Goal' and 'Purpose' of the project. The 38 participants were key secondary stakeholders, 20% representing the state, 40% the district (civil servants and politicians) and 40% ODA (12 from UK). After preliminary discussions, 5 groups prepared problem trees which were then combined. These groups then individually discussed the project goal, purpose and later indicators, which were presented in plenary. Finally there was a brief discussion of MOVs, risks and assumptions. The 'Goal' was established as "*urban poverty in Kerala reduced*" and the 'Purpose' as "*replicable and responsible approaches to urban poverty reduction in Cochin established with the full participation of the urban poor and achieving sustainable improvements in livelihoods, opportunities and provision of basic needs*" although the precise wording could not be agreed. Due to limitations on time, preliminary 'objective' and 'subjective' indicators were not finalised. The workshop was only partially successful. The number of participants was double that anticipated resulting in an emphasis on the problem tree rather than the elements of the Logical Framework. (Jones, 1995)

Logical Framework Workshop

Following 8 months work (assessments and community participation) by a multi-disciplinary planning team, a five-day workshop was held in 1996 to prepare a draft Logical Framework. The 19 participants were key secondary stakeholders (as before but bringing information from NGOs) of which 45% represented ODA (4 from UK). They reached consensus on the previous 'Goal' and revised the 'Purpose' as *"sustained improvements in livelihoods, opportunities and living conditions of the urban poor in Cochin achieved with active support of CoC (Cochin Corporation) and full participation of beneficiaries"*. The six 'Outputs' identified were:

1. *Special needs and priorities of the most vulnerable groups identified and addressed*
2. *Needs and priorities of urban poor people identified and addressed*
3. *City wide or larger area components which address the needs and priorities of the urban poor implemented*
4. *Capacity of Community Development Societies, Neighbourhood Groups, NGOs, Community Based Organisations and CoC field staff to develop and implement a demand led approach to urban poverty alleviation, and provide a bridge between communities and agencies working for the urban poor, strengthened*
5. *Capacity of CoC to develop and implement community-based poverty alleviation strategies on a sustained basis strengthened*
6. *Project monitoring and evaluation system established and operational*

with six corresponding sets of 'Activities' (Jones, 1996).

The majority of OVIs were statistical changes, but some were quantitative (numbers) and others qualitative (for 'Outputs' only), with specific values to be added later by the community. MOVs refer to official statistics, project monitoring and evaluation reports and participatory studies (market research). 'Assumptions' for the 'Goal' were omitted whilst those for the 'Purpose' and 'Outputs' related to the macro-economy and commitments of Government of Kerala and CoC with the addition of the undermining of participatory processes and the operation of Community Development Societies for 'Outputs'. 'Assumptions' for 'Activities' relate to project management, funding, social inclusion, and dependence on a water project. The Logical Framework was finalised by a small group from CoC and ODA. (Jones, 1996)

Project Approval

The Logical Framework presented for project approval (Appendix 6) included the contents described above with the exception of the 'Goal' redefined as *"sustained improvements in livelihoods in Cochin, and replication of model throughout Kerala"* and the 'Purpose' as *"better access by the poor of Cochin to improved livelihood opportunities and services"*.

Logical Framework and efficiency

DFID staff agreed that the Logical Framework presented a clear overview of the project. Although ODA Instructions recommend that a Logical Framework uses only one or two A4 sheets plus appendices, this covers six sheets, which is considered inevitable by the DFID staff involved. There was inadequate time allowed for the workshops and too many participants with insufficient facilitators, which prolonged discussions. The first workshop occupied 76 person-days, the second 95 person-days and included participants from the UK. These costs exclude workshop preparation, logistics, and reporting. (DFID, 1997)

Logical Framework and effectiveness

DFID personnel observed that the Logical Framework ensured a strong analysis of the project with the tabular format relating different elements. As objectives were dealt with first at the workshops, they received more attention with difficulties in categorising objectives into subsets. Indicators were dealt with hurriedly and many rely on specific market research. (DFID, 1997)

Logical Framework and equity

The workshops were attended by civil servants, local politicians and ODA, without NGOs or end-users, assuming that their interests would be pursued by other participants. This exclusion was justified to avoid unfulfilled expectations. Although many stakeholders were unrepresented, the large number of participants at the first workshop increased diversity leading to difficulties with consensus. The importance of an independent facilitator (although inevitably ODA funded) was stressed as local facilitators (if available) may not have the capacity to take a broad view and be beholden to other interests. (DFID, 1997)

Logical Framework and sustainability

'Assumptions' were discussed last (with time running out) and concentrated on beneficiary rather than donor commitments. 'Activities' and 'Outputs' will be updated at annual review missions. It was surmised that there would be informal 'shadow logframes' with different objectives etc. for different Government of Kerala departments (e.g. civil servants eager for physical infrastructure or local politicians supporting the social emphasis of ODA). Sustainability is seen to derive from the activities in the workshops and the capacity building specified in 'Outputs'. The 'Purpose' refers to sustainability but the assumptions relating to 'Goal' (usually conditions for sustainability) have been considered "not applicable". (DFID, 1997)

Note

This case study is used to illustrate points raised in the literature, rather than to influence conclusions. It should not be regarded as a 'typical' example.

7. COMPARING THE AGENCIES AND THEIR LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS

7.1. ODA and GTZ as Development Agencies

The potential contribution of the logical framework to the sustainability of donor funded urban management projects is influenced by the focus of each agency, and their approach to projects with respect to development, project sustainability, stakeholder participation and project management.

Although the rhetoric is similar, the application with reference to the logical framework has been different in practice. Its use by ODA (a funding agency) was concerned with the management of project appraisal and evaluation. Its use by GTZ (an implementing agency) was concerned with participatory planning and

implementation. Changes in use of their logical frameworks have reflected changes in the organisations as well as their experience with the frameworks. DFID is now aiming to increase participation (at management level) in the process preceding the framework. GTZ is aiming to increase participation (especially end-users) in projects and see this as incompatible with the framework, which could consequently limit its use to management. These changes have been influenced primarily by rural experience and further research is required into the use of the logical framework in urban situations.

7.2. The Frameworks and Project Management

Project management systems and the 'place' of the logical framework within them are currently undergoing change in both DFID and GTZ.

| APPROACH | GTZ | ODA |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Role of Agency | Implementation | Funding |
| Development Projects | <i>"structured process of transition from a current situation considered unsatisfactory to a future situation ... considered ... an improvement"</i> (GTZ, 1996, p7). | <i>"attainment of sustainable improvements in economic growth and the quality of life"</i> (ODA, 1995, p2). |
| Sustainable Projects | <i>"desired impacts ... continue to be effective after its completion"</i> (Lang & Dreschler, 1989, p31) | <i>"provides benefits that will continue after the project has ceased"</i> (ODA, 1995, p138). |
| Stakeholder Participation | <i>"active involvement of individuals, social groups and organisations in the planning and decision-making processes that affect them"</i> (GTZ, 1996, p8). | <i>"process whereby ... (stakeholders) play an active role in decision-making and in the consequent activities which affect them"</i> (ODA, 1995, p94) |
| Project Management | <i>"structuring social processes in order to achieve a predetermined objective"</i> (GTZ, 1996, p4) | |

Figure 6. Author's Summary of Agency Approaches

| GTZ | ODA |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardised procedures now being made more flexible • PPM introduced as participatory tool now being encouraged as management tool | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different departments used diverse procedures: to be standardised in DFID • Project Framework introduced as management tool, later encouraged as participatory tool by Social Development Department |

Figure 7. Author's Comparisons of the Frameworks in Project Management

GTZ pioneered ZOPP which included systematic participatory analysis before developing the PPM, which was then revised as part of a set routine during implementation. GTZ have recently introduced PCM and are preparing a 'new' ZOPP, both with more flexible management processes. These reduce the emphasis on the PPM because it may not be compatible with participatory processes or with systems developed from existing beneficiary planning and management. However, GTZ still consider the PPM a useful management tool in the analysis, clarification and communication of projects. (Göbel & Helming, 1997).

The Project Framework was introduced in ODA as a management tool and developed differently by different departments. Procedures are now being standardised by DFID in their PCM using the Logical Framework to document participatory processes (initially at management level) throughout the project cycle. The Logical Framework is now a compulsory element, central to project management and its 'place' will be clearly defined in the DFID PCM.

The introduction by EC DG VIII of the Integrated Approach using elements of the logical framework may have further influence on its 'place' in DFID and GTZ.

7.3. Format of the Frameworks

Recommended formats are also undergoing change. Like USAID, despite difficulties, both GTZ and ODA emphasised the importance of specifying only one 'Goal' and one 'Purpose' (although the PPM of GTZ is now more flexible). GTZ previously recommended a standard format for the PPM, based on the PCI format but with the addition of 'Activities' and the inclusion of conditions for sustainability instead of pre-conditions. However, the value of standardisation was questioned, and the 'new' ZOPP recommends a flexible format. ODA used different 'Project Frameworks' in different departments - some following the PCI version (but omitting OVIs for outputs), and others using a version similar to PPM. These have now been replaced by a 'Logical Framework' similar to PPM.

Both GTZ and ODA specified a sequence for completing the matrix starting with 'Goal' and working downwards although GTZ was more specific thereafter. The importance of the sequence has been demonstrated by the case studies, as the initial elements (or the process preceding these) receive most attention.

| USAID LogFrame (PCI version) | GTZ Project Planning Matrix (pre 1996) | ODA Project Framework (pre 1994) |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Goal and one Purpose recommended (abandoned experimentation with more objectives) • Inputs in bottom left cell • OVIs included for Outputs • Bottom right cell spare for pre-conditions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Goal and one Purpose recommended (but now introducing flexible format) • Activities in bottom left cell (OVI replaced with Inputs) • OVIs included for Outputs • Top right cell spare for sustainability • Sequence: down objectives, up assumptions, down OVIs and MOVs, finally Inputs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Wider Objective and one Purpose recommended • Inputs in bottom left cell • OVIs omitted for Outputs • Bottom right cell spare for pre-conditions • Sequence: plan downwards, think upwards |

Figure 8. Author's Summary of the Format of the Frameworks

It has been observed that USAID, GTZ and ODA needed to promote more understanding of their method (MacArthur, 1994), but changes by different agencies have ignored the potential contribution of standardised documentation to low capacity environments. Proposals to change the wording and layout of the PCI matrix (referred to in MacArthur, 1994 and individual references) have made it more complicated, reducing its clarity and thus its contribution to communication between stakeholders (Cordingley, 1995). There is no evidence that variations to the format have overcome the acknowledged weaknesses of the PCI version (MacArthur, 1994). 'Improved' formats contribute to confusion, not only for beneficiaries, but also for donors and intermediaries using the Logical Framework, LogFrame, Project Planning Matrix, Project Framework and back to the Logical Framework! Team Up, as promoters of the Logical Framework and ZOPP techniques, have encouraged standardisation across agencies but also contributed to compounding professional mystique (it is in the interests of those who

have mastered the system to perpetuate it). GTZ will now be experimenting with developing a specific format for each project.

7.4. Use of the Logical Frameworks

Logical Frameworks and Efficiency

The contribution of the logical framework to the efficiency of urban management projects depends on the clarity it gives to communication between stakeholders, its use of resources and the usefulness of the documentation provided.

The clarity of summarising the project in a logical framework and its contribution to stakeholder communication (although usually upwards in the development machinery hierarchy) has been recognised by both GTZ and ODA. However, GTZ has recognised a tendency towards encapsulating the 'perfect plan' in the PPM and found difficulty in condensing the complexity of development projects into the format of discrete cells.

| | USAID | GTZ | ODA |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| CLARITY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project summary explicit • Facilitates mutual understanding and better communication • Standardised presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity contributes to decision-making and control • Too much attention to preserving perfect plan • Cannot categorise or condense complexity of development projects • Communication usually upwards • Value of standardisation questioned | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concise, coherent presentation (key components on one page) • Communication usually upwards • Standardisation not rigorous throughout ODA |
| RESOURCES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not concerned with economic analysis or project costs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High expenses of training and logistics (now to be balanced against benefits) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neglect of training resulted in inefficient use |
| BUREAUCRACY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful document but only one of several tools | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Became instrument not process (reduced to two-yearly workshops) • Tautology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure of M&E to be fed back to provide lessons • Late completion cancelled out potential value • Duplication of information (now rationalised) |

Figure 9. Author's summary of the Frameworks and Efficiency

Successful use of the logical framework requires constant revision which represents significant investment if done in a participatory way. Both ODA and GTZ acknowledge that the training and time involved in the preparation of a logical framework is costly, but necessary to avoid it becoming a piece of bureaucracy (as in the two-yearly ZOPP workshops). GTZ now emphasise that the benefits of any participatory elements should be carefully considered before implementation. The logical framework itself is not concerned with economic analysis or project costs.

Logical Frameworks and Effectiveness

The contribution of the logical framework to the effectiveness of urban management projects depends on the analysis of the project it requires, the treatment of objectives and indicators and its contribution to accountability.

The rigorous analysis required to complete the matrix can promote dialogue between stakeholders through understanding of the project. The logical framework is a powerful tool which can introduce order and discipline to the analysis of projects. However, ODA found that the quality of completion varied in practice, whilst GTZ found that planning was given too much attention (with a technocratic belief that good planning results in good implementation). Further research is required to ascertain whether lengthy analytic processes are of real benefit to all participants (including end-users) and whether rigorous systems are appropriate or cost-effective in the development context (Cordingley, 1995). These issues have been addressed by Rapid Assessment Procedures, and are especially relevant to urban environmental management which has a direct impact on urban health.

| | USAID | GTZ | ODA |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| PROJECT ANALYSIS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous procedure introduces order and discipline to analysis • Powerful tool (least econometric available) • Methodologically and technically neutral: no guidance on proven strategies and techniques | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous analysis contributes to dialogue and understanding • Planning given too much attention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical and concise • Quality of completion varies |
| OBJECTIVES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional levels may be needed • Assumes that if means provided, desired ends will be achieved | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in definition • Difficulties in specifying single objectives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separates levels of objectives (but can be misunderstandings regarding type) • Definition complex with participation • Tendency to overspecify objectives |
| INDICATORS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not assure project most effective way of achieving goal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in definition • Does not record achievements previously unspecified • Tendency to specify quantifiable indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No guidance on type of indicators • Tendency to specify quantifiable indicators |
| ACCOUNTABILITY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis, clarity and definition contribute to accountability (upwards) of project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability increased | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability increased • Difficulties of |

| | | | |
|--|-------------|--|---|
| | performance | | combining development issues with UK government procedure |
|--|-------------|--|---|

Figure 10. Author's Summary of the Frameworks and Effectiveness

By identifying and evaluating objectives, the logical framework shifts the emphasis of projects from efficiency to effectiveness. The hierarchy of 'Objectives' assumes that if the means are provided, the end will be achieved. It has been suggested that these could be presented more clearly as lists (MacArthur, 1994) but the tabular format has advantages for managers who can assess the implications of the vertical and horizontal logic. There have been difficulties in identifying a single core problem, and also misunderstandings regarding the type of objectives and indicators (realistic or idealistic, quantitative or qualitative, vague or specific) with a tendency to overspecify objectives and use quantitative indicators. If objectives are not achieved, further revision of the framework is required, whilst unanticipated achievements are not recorded. 'Objective', 'Goal' and 'Purpose' etc. take advantage of the wide vocabulary in English, making distinctions which cannot be made in other languages, relying on explanation by the facilitator, often in translation (DFID, 1997).

Both organisations found that the use of the logical framework contributed to accountability of project performance, although this may only be in an 'upward' direction, whereas accountability in relation to sustainability should be 'downward'.

Logical Frameworks and Equity

The contribution of the logical framework to equitable urban management projects depends on who participates, the difficulties of consensus and who

| | USAID | GTZ | ODA |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| WHO PARTICIPATES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No guidance on popular participation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 'participatory' tool but no genuine participation 'Top down' workshop sequence (and workshop can be socio-culturally alien) Some end-users do not have capacity to participate Possibility of participants' reluctance to commit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously filled in by ODA personnel (no participation until after tenders awarded) Participation now initially limited to beneficiary government agencies |
| CONSENSUS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes consensus (does not cater for diversity) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single problem does not reflect diversity Consensus derives from most powerful participants | [Not addressed because no diverse participation] |

benefits which are common issues relating to participation in all aspects of development projects.

Although USAID acknowledged that the LogFrame gave no guidance on popular participation, GTZ considered the logical framework to be a participatory tool whereas it was prepared by ODA as a management tool. GTZ now recognise that their 'top down' sequence of workshops did not include genuine participation, whilst DFID recognise that beneficiaries should be more involved throughout the project cycle, including preliminary stages. GTZ found that the PPM could be inappropriate in end-user situations, as ZOPP workshops can be socio-culturally alien and the tabular format (reliant on the written language) may lead to further exclusion. 'Participatory' processes for GTZ in logical frameworks referred to end-user participation (which did not materialise), whereas ODA referred primarily to public sector participation (which did not necessarily involve end-users or their representatives). This affected the consensus formed while the identification of single objectives (influenced by the most powerful) did not cater for diversity.

'Participatory' use of the logical framework to date has benefited the most powerful participants and management use also benefits the planners more than the "planned for" (Crittenden & Lea, 1992). Donor management structures benefit most from the use of the logical framework, and its complexity implies that it cannot contribute to the communication and participation required to provide empowerment of end-users.

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | (GTZ knows best) | |
| WHO BENEFITS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No guidance on equitable income distribution, employment opportunities, access to resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits planners (public managers) more than 'planned for' Tends to serve interests of more powerful Communication should contribute to empowerment (but communication upwards) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Management' tool for donor Benefits Administrative Officers rather than project managers Feedback to donors |

Figure 11. Logical Frameworks and Equity
Logical Frameworks and Sustainability

The contribution of the logical framework to the sustainability of urban management projects depends on the treatment of the assumptions, the use of the process approach and the potentials for sustainable management.

The inclusion of 'Assumptions' has led to realism, especially when ODA included donor conditions. However, 'Assumptions' can be seen from different viewpoints, and usually the donors' point of view dominated (MacArthur, 1994). Both GTZ and ODA 'Assumptions' tended to ignore the dependency of their projects on donor resources and leadership.

One of the most valuable assets of the logical framework is its capacity to support the process approach through revision. Used in an iterative way, the logical framework should be a flexible and dynamic tool at all stages. However, GTZ has found that revision was limited to the 'event' of the ZOPP workshop with the PPM used as a blueprint in the interim. ODA initially found that a tendency towards late completion of the Project Framework and technocratic approaches also resulted in a blueprint. ODA previously concentrated on evaluation to inform future projects, whereas the use of the logical framework should facilitate revision during

implementation to contribute to the process approach as now included in the DFID PCM. Neglect of revision reduces the possibilities of flexible implementation and learning processes (Wiggins & Shields, 1995). Concentration on 'Objectives' can also be seen as incompatible with the process approach.

In theory, if conditions for all the vertical and horizontal linkages in the logical framework are present the project is sustainable (Cordingley, 1995) but this has been hampered by the confusion between 'Outputs' and 'Purpose', with inadequate emphasis on the 'Purpose' as a year after year state (Eggers, 1992). Ideally the logical framework could contribute to institutional and organisational sustainability providing knowledge for policy formulation. GTZ include conditions for sustainability as the most important 'Assumption' but these have not been emphasised. DFID now consider that sustainability derives from the preceding process rather than the logical framework itself, despite the fact that the process is donor led. However, in practice, the early stages have been omitted from subsequent workshops ('Goal' and 'Purpose' are not generally revised) due to constraints on time or perhaps to avoid upsetting co-operation agreements and financial arrangements. Project sustainability, as an idealistic concept promoted by donors, has tended to emphasise the benefits (tasks) rather than the management (processes) of their urban management projects.

| | USAID | GTZ | ODA |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| ASSUMPTIONS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumptions establish limits of project responsibility Tended to be treated casually | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumptions contribute to realism Tended to be seen from donor point of view | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumptions contribute to realism Previously included donor conditions (now mostly beneficiary commitments) |
| PROCESS APPROACH | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can respond to project/context through revision Allows modification of plan rather than implementation Must be constantly revised | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexible dynamic tool Reduced to 'the' workshop | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially lessons for future projects Tendency towards late completion resulted in blueprints Constant revision during implementation contributes to process approach |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No guidance on feasibility of replication or effects on environment • Standardisation contributes to continuity of approach (but other agencies changed it) • Inadequate emphasis on project purpose as 'year after year' state • Confusion between 'Outputs' and 'Purpose' | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes conditions for sustainability • Management system dependent on donor leadership and funding • Confusion between 'Outputs' and 'Purpose' | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory use not documented • Management system dependent on donor leadership and funding |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|

Figure 7.7. Author's summary of the Logical Frameworks and Sustainability

8. CONCLUSION

Characteristics of the logical framework are interpreted differently (some critics' 'strengths' e.g. simple, are others' 'weaknesses' e.g. simplistic) and a standardised format can be seen as a positive or a negative property. Alternative framework proposals have concentrated on revisions of the format to reinforce the logic rather than reduce the complexity. These have failed to confront the more fundamental issues regarding its use (the compatibility of management and participation) and regarding its context (the nature of development projects and donor/recipient mutual dependency). It appears that 'improved' formats have not demonstrated significant advantages and variants contribute to confusion, not only for beneficiaries, but also for donors and intermediaries. There has also been attention to the omissions of the logical framework in terms of development, rather than seeing it as one of many tools in the management process. The framework itself has been overemphasised, ignoring the difficulties of separating the characteristics of the management system and its context from the use of the logical framework.

environments of the understanding arising out of standardisation. Partner

In an attempt to try and reduce the perceived weaknesses of the logical framework, both GTZ and ODA have modified the PCI format in different ways, and use it differently. Although their experiences have similarities, the approaches of the two agencies are continually converging and diverging. The logical framework has now been 'put in its place': in both agencies as part of a process, but either compulsory and standardised (DFID) or as a flexible optional extra (GTZ).

Having examined different logical frameworks and their use, it is easier to understand the description 'deceptively simple' (MacArthur, 1994) because the format is simple, but 'improvements' have led to more complexity in use, which cannot be appropriate for development projects. The evolution of the logical framework in different directions has implications for the sustainability of donor funded urban management projects, neglecting the benefits in low capacity

agencies must adapt to the current management systems of a particular donor (although GTZ now recommend more attention to beneficiary systems). The relationship and competition between different donors (especially bilateral agencies) perhaps contributes to the lack of dialogue between agencies on common methodologies. A specialist consultant could contribute, but TeamUp have concentrated on marketing their own systems. The emphasis on donor use has neglected the potential of transferring the leadership role to beneficiaries, and the omission of the 'Assumption' that donor resources will be forthcoming has neglected the contribution of long-term donor intervention to project sustainability.

The logical framework can contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency (associated with management) of donor funded urban management projects, but neglects equity and sustainability (associated with participation). However, project sustainability (dependent on efficiency, effectiveness and equity) has to date been more concerned with benefits (tasks) than with management itself (processes) witnessed by the change in the logical frameworks from 'Inputs' to 'Activities'. The potential of the logical framework to support sustainable urban management (through the process approach and beneficiary use) has not been exploited.

The research involved in the preparation of this paper has only scraped the surface of the debate surrounding the value of the logical framework. The debate surrounding its format contributes to the wider discussion of the value of standardised methodologies. The debate surrounding its use contributes to wider discussions on the compatibility of management tools and participatory tools, and also the value of rigorous analytic processes in development projects. However, it appears that debates surrounding the logical framework have been superseded by those on project management systems and the 'place' of the logical framework within them. This indicates that, with increased emphasis by donors on project sustainability, this paper could be supplemented by further research on sustainable urban management systems to demonstrate the commitment of donors to this end.

APPENDIX 1

The Project Planning Matrix of GTZ Improvement of Accra Solid Waste and Nightsoil Disposal System (Consolidation Phase) (Cofie-Djangmah, 1994).

92.27 93.8/AMA

Project Planning Matrix for Phase V (8/95 - 7/98)

ZOPP - Workshop 10/94 in Accra

| NARRATIVE SUMMARY | OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS | VERIFICATION | ASSUMPTIONS |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>OVERALL GOAL</p> <p>Environmental sanitation of Accra improved</p> | <p>Occurrence of Cholera, Typhoid, Worm diseases, Malaria reduced compared with 1991 level</p> | <p>Hospital and Poly-Clinic Records</p> | <p>FOR LONG-TERM SUSTENANCE OF OVERALL GOAL</p> <p>- Policies of central government (MEST, EPC, MLG, MWH, Reg. Admin, MFEP, MOH) are supportive</p> <p>- Govt and allied agencies are co-ordinating decisions on environment with Metropolitan/Authorities and District Assemblies.</p> |
| <p>PROJECT PURPOSE</p> <p>Improved waste management of Accra consolidated</p> | <p>Beginning Dec. 1996 onwards no unauthorised, uncontrolled dumping sites exist within 90% of developed urban areas of Accra metropolis.</p> <p>Beginning Dec. 1996 no unauthorised, uncontrolled disposal of liquid waste by corporations and private contractors, in Accra metropolis.</p> | <p>- Visual inspection</p> <p>- WMD records</p> <p>- Inspection records</p> <p>- Private contractor records</p> | <p>FOR ACHIEVING OVERALL GOAL</p> <p>- Related agencies are co-operating and integrating (waste related) activities with WMD:</p> <p>MOH: GWSC, AESC MLG: AMA</p> <p>MEST: EPC, TPD MFEP: Int. Econ. Rel. Div. Reg. Admin NGOs</p> <p>- Related AMA departments and sub-districts are co-operating: MOH, MWD, ARMD, Medical Officer of Health</p> |
| <p>RESULTS/OUTPUTS</p> <p>1. Institutional strengthening consolidated</p> | <p>Updating of long-term plan not later than mid-September each year</p> <p>No. of defaulters prosecuted according to bye-laws: Non-participation - 20 Non-payment - 20 per month from August 1995 onwards</p> <p>Coverage of operational Expenses: 60% - 1995/6 65% - 1996/7 70% - 1997/8 Fee by Collection</p> <p>Cost reduction in privatised cent. cont. areas in proportion to area covered</p> <p>5 local training courses for an average of 10 participants for an average of 2 weeks annually</p> | <p>WMD Reports</p> <p>MOH Records</p> <p>MIS & Budget</p> <p>MIS</p> <p>Training Records</p> | <p>Gov policy on recruitment favourable</p> <p>- Donors are prepared to co-operated</p> <p>- AMA support positive</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>2. Equipment availability improved</p> | <p>Rehab. of Equipment : 10 multilifts by Dec. 1995 4 multilifts by Dec. 1996 2 H/D Equip. by Dec. 1995 2 H/D Equip. by Dec. 1996</p> <p>Assemble metal containers: 120 by Dec. 1995 Add. 70 by Dec. 1996</p> <p>Availability of waste collection vehicles & equipment not below 80% by Dec. 1995 and maintained from Jan. 1996</p> <p>90% of locally available spare parts made available within a month of request as from Jan. 1996</p> <p>100 containers maintained annually</p> <p>Every vehicle maintained at least 4 times annually</p> | <p>Workshop Records</p> <p>Workshop Records</p> <p>MIS</p> <p>Stores Records (EDP)</p> | <p>Delay in delivery of equipment and spares considerably reduced</p> <p>Workshop Records</p> <p>Workshop Records</p> |
| <p>3. Community participation extended</p> | <p>In each of 6 sub-districts at least 100 persons attached sanitation education rallies once every two months from 1995</p> <p>Sanitation competition in schools organised once yearly in each of the 6 sub-districts</p> <p>In each of 6 sub-districts at least one clean-up each month involving NGOs/CBOs, Youth clubs from 1995 onwards</p> <p>Manual developed in collaboration with GBOs, NGOs by Dec. 1996</p> <p>2 PRO and 4 PRO-Assistants trained and given equipment to operate by March 1995</p> | <p>WMD-PRO Records</p> <p>Records of officers in charge of education at district offices</p> <p>WMD-PRO Records</p> <p>WMD-PRO Records</p> <p>WMD-PRO Records</p> <p>WMD-PRO Records</p> | <p>- Political structures (sub-district councils, co-ordinating councils and unit committees) are established and willing to co-operate with AMA</p> |
| <p>4. Waste collection activities coordinated</p> | <p>All existing heaps removed by end of 1995, and no major heaps thereafter</p> <p>Liquid waste collection per month (by private sector & WMD) 1995: 8,000 m3 1996 : 8,500 m3 1997 : 9,000 m3 1998 : 9,000 m3</p> <p>Refuse collection. House-to-House service per month: (private contractors & WMD) At least 6,000 customers from the end of 1995 onwards</p> <p>Refuse collection service (private & WMD): 1995: 37,000 m3/month 1996: 39,000 m3/month 1997: 40,000 m3/month 1998: 41,000 m3/month</p> | <p>WMD Records</p> <p>Media Reports</p> <p>WMD Records and Records from private contractor</p> <p>WMD Records & Records from private contractor</p> <p>WMD Records & Records from private contractor</p> | <p>- Donors are willing to co-operate</p> <p>- Hospitals willing to co-operate</p> <p>- Public and other organisations (Army, GNTC, Police, PWD, SSNIT, VRA) co-operate</p> <p>- Private contractors perform according to contract</p> <p>- NGOs/CBOs co-operate with AMA</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 5. Waste treatment concept implemented | <p>At least 2 sanitary landfill sites in operation throughout the project phase</p> <p>Compost production: 1995 : 12,000 m³/year 1996 : 15,000 m³/year 1997 : 15,000 m³/year 1998 : 15,000 m³/year</p> <p>3 FTP available throughout the project phase</p> | <p>WMD Records visual inspection</p> <p>WMD Records</p> <p>WMD Records visual inspection</p> | <p>- Govt, other district assemblies, and community accept sites for waste treatment and disposal.</p> <p>- Donors provide support for development and implementations.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

Activities

- 1.1 Update the Long-Term Plan Annually
 - 1.2 Initiate Donor Co-ordination
 - 1.3 Co-ordinate Activities of Allied Agencies
 - 1.4 Intensify Liaison with MOH for Bye-Law Enforcement
 - 1.5 Organise Handing-Over Workshops
 - 1.6 Address Manpower Requirement of WMD
 - 1.7 Intensify Staff-Training
 - 1.8 Reduce Absence from Duty Staff
 - 1.9 Expand Incentive to Non-Monetary Measures
 - 1.10 Improve Financial Performance
 - 1.11 Integrate Privatisation into Waste Management Concept
-
- 2.1 Rehabilitate Equipment
 - 2.2 Elaborate Long-Term Procurement Programme
 - 2.3 Continue Container Assembly Programme
 - 2.4 Accelerate Container Maintenance Programme
 - 2.5 Complete Computerisation of Workshops/Stores
 - 2.6 Procure & Stock Adequate Spare Parts
 - 2.7 Procure Special Tools and Equipment
 - 2.8 Improve Workshop/Stores Infrastructure
 - 2.9 Speed Up KfW Vehicle Support
 - 2.10 Complete Equipment Orders (KfW Budget)
-
- 3.1 Complete Development of Community Participation Concept
 - 3.2 Improve Efficiency of PR Unit
 - 3.3 Implement Community Participation as Pilot Project
 - 3.4 Develop Manuals for CP Campaigns
 - 3.5 Intensify Public Education on Waste Disposal
 - 3.6 Promote Sanitation Education in Schools
 - 3.7 Promote Simple Waste Reduction Measures
 - 3.8 Liaise with Sub-Districts and CBOs for Protection of Sanitary Sites
 - 3.9 Form Sanitation Clubs
-
- 4.1 Evaluate/Monitor Privatisation of Solid and Liquid Waste Collection
 - 4.2 Develop and Implement Decentralisation Concept
 - 4.3 Develop Low-Cost Collection Methods
 - 4.4 Assess Feasibility of Night Collection of Solid and Liquid Waste
 - 4.5 Review Schedule for Phasing Out Pan-Latrines
 - 4.6 Implement Hospital Waste Management
 - 4.7 Participate in Development of Drain Cleansing Concept
 - 4.8 Assist EPC in Industrial Waste Management
-
- 5.1 Implement Long-Term Strategy for Sanitary Landfill Site
 - 5.2 Recultivate Old Dumping Sites
 - 5.3 Increase Compost Production
 - 5.4 Promote Compost Use
 - 5.5 Promote Recycling by Private Sector
 - 5.6 Implement Long-Term Strategy for FTP

5.7 Review KVIP Policy/System

APPENDIX 2

The Logical Framework of ODA Cochin Urban Poverty Reduction Project (DIFD, 1997).

2. The Logical Framework

| Narrative Summary | Verifiable Indicators | Means of Verification | Important Assumptions |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>GOAL: 1. Sustained improvements in livelihoods in Cochin, and replication of model throughout Kerala.</p> | <p>1.1 Model in Cochin sustained. 1.2 GoK uses model elsewhere</p> | <p>1.1 Official statistics</p> | <p>(Goal to Supergoal): 1. Not applicable</p> |
| <p>PURPOSE : 1. Better access by the poor of Cochin to improved livelihood opportunities and services</p> | <p>1.1 Reduction from A% to B% in families measuring 6 or more on Alleppey Index and from C% to D% measuring 4 or more by EOP. 1.2 Participatory planning process meeting primary stakeholders' felt needs by EOP. 1.3 Ward Councillors increasingly responsive to needs of the poor. 1.4 UPAD remains fully staffed and plays and increasingly influential role in planning a coordinated strategy for urban poverty reduction. 1.5 CoC increases its own contribution to UPAF from baseline to baseline + F% by EOP.</p> | <p>1.1 Year 3 and 5 IAS, AMR 1.2 Year 3 and 5 IAS 1.3 AMR inc. PAES, and Year 3 IAS. 1.4 AMR, FPE 1.5 Year 3 and 5 IAS</p> | <p>(Purpose to Goal): 1. Government of Kerala willing, and has access to funds, to implement project approach in other cities in Kerala. 2. CoC responds to increasing pressure to enhance poverty reduction from primary and secondary stakeholders resulting from project activity.</p> |
| <p>OUTPUTS 1. Special needs and priorities of the most vulnerable groups identified and addressed.</p> | <p>1.1 Participatory user group plans prepared covering A% of vulnerable people by end PY1; B% end PY2; C% end PY3; D% end PY4; and E% end PY5. 1.2 Participatory user group plans implemented covering F% of vulnerable people by end PY1; G% end PY2; H% end PY3; I% end PY4; and J% by end PY5. 1.3 Benefits expected from user group plans achieved and on schedule (eg increased incomes of user group households; nos. of street children in night shelters).</p> | <p>1.1 AMR 1.2 AMR 1.3 PAES</p> | <p>(Output to Purpose): 1. Other changes outside project (eg macro-economy, job situation in Gulf, population) do not negate positive changes resulting from project. 2. CoC maintains its commitment to a community based approach. 3. Vested interests within CoC do not undermine UPAD's role. 4. ADS and NHG committees adequately represent poor people's interests.</p> |
| <p>2. Needs and priorities of urban poor people identified and addressed.</p> | <p>2.1 Participatory user group plans prepared covering K% of poor people by end PY1; L% of poor people by end PY2; M% by end PY3; N% by end PY4; and P% by end PY5. 2.2 Participatory user group plans implemented covering R% of poor people by end PY1; S% end PY2; T% end PY3; U% end PY4; and V% end PY5. 2.3 Benefits expected from participatory user group plans achieved (eg no of multi-functional community facilities in active use; no of new jobs, no of new latrines in use) and on schedule.</p> | <p>2.1 AMR 2.2 AMR 2.3 PAES</p> | |
| <p>3. City-wide or larger area components which address the needs and priorities of the urban poor implemented.</p> | <p>3.1 Drinking water supply to West Cochin increased from 7.7 M ltrs/day to 26.3 M ltrs/day by end PY2 and sustained. 3.2 Water available in standpipes in West Cochin tripled by end PY2.</p> | <p>3.1 QMR and AMR 3.2 QMR, AMR</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>3.3 Flooding substantially reduced in 37 severely affected and 19 less severely affected slums.</p> <p>3.4 X no poor people make use of market information, Y no use business units and Z no enjoy increased security of tenure by EOP.</p> | <p>3.3 QMR, AMR</p> <p>3.4 AES</p> | |
| <p>4. Capacity of CDS, NHGs, NGOs, CBOs and CoC field staff to develop and implement a demand led approach to urban poverty alleviation, and provide a bridge between communities and agencies working for the urban poor, strengthened.</p> | <p>4.1 UPAD fully staffed (including specialist advisors) and resourced by start of project (SOP).</p> <p>4.2 Quantity and quality of participatory user group plans facilitated by NHGs, NGOs and CoC field staff increases over time.</p> <p>4.3 NHGs, NGOs, CBOs participating in project maintain satisfactory financial and other records.</p> <p>4.4 Increase year-on-year in activities of-for urban poor funded by outside agencies (eg: NGOs).</p> | <p>4.1 AMR, QMR</p> <p>4.2 AMR, PAES</p> <p>4.3 AMR</p> <p>4.4 PAES</p> | |
| <p>5. Capacity of CoC to develop and implement community-based poverty alleviation strategies on a sustained basis strengthened.</p> | <p>5.1 Strategy for community-based poverty alleviation developed by end PY! and revised annually in light of lessons learned.</p> <p>5.2 Annual budgets spent in line with strategy from SOP.</p> | <p>5.1 AMR</p> <p>5.2 AMR</p> | |
| <p>6. Project monitoring and evaluation system established and operational.</p> | <p>6.1 Computers and other equipment for M&E unit procured and operational by end month 3.</p> <p>6.2 UPAD ensures documentation of project progress in timely way.</p> <p>6.3 Project design and logframe revised as lessons learnt.</p> | <p>6.1 QMR</p> <p>6.2 QMR</p> <p>6.3 QMR, AMR</p> | |

| ACTIVITIES | INPUTS (Rs lakh or £'000) | | (Activity Output) |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>1.1 Participatory needs and priorities identified with specific vulnerable groups.</p> <p>1.2 Participatory development and implementation of vulnerable user group plans selected from a menu including activities listed in 1.3 to 1.8.</p> <p>1.3 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: skill training, job clubs, outworker schemes, micro-enterprise development for female headed households, muslim women, the disabled, sex workers, ethnic minorities, street children.</p> <p>1.4 LIVING SECURITY: Night shelter provision for street children and adults, legal awareness training and monitoring of rents paid by tenants, addressing problems of multi-family dwelling occupants.</p> <p>1.5 FINANCIAL SERVICES: Research into local services the poor could access and establishing pilot savings clubs for the poor selected through NHGs, based on successful local models and replicate if successful.</p> <p>1.6 HEALTH SERVICES: Develop through NGOs acute and longer term medical and social support agencies for battered women, adolescents, sex workers, homeless, physically and mentally disabled, those at risk from suicide.</p> <p>1.7 SANITATION: Improved access to sanitary latrines for individual households or defined user groups.</p> <p>1.8 SOCIAL CAPITAL: Support NGOs working on community organisation (eg literacy groups).</p> | <p>Employment action developed with Vgs 100</p> <p>Night shelter consultancy 10 Street children project 50 Legal awareness training for tenants 10 Planning for multi-family dwellings 75</p> <p>Pilot savings clubs 20 Review of credit providers 20</p> <p>Grants and TC for NGOs working with Vgs 150</p> <p>Latrine subsidy 320</p> <p>NGO Social Capital activities 75</p> | <p>(All inputs monitored through QMR, AMR)</p> | <p>1. Local politicians and contractors do not undermine the participatory processes.</p> <p>2. KWA willing and able to transfer adequate water supplies to W Cochin.</p> <p>3. Staff appointed.</p> <p>4. Funds provided in a timely way to CoC and from CoC to UPF and CDS.</p> <p>5. CoC meets its share of project costs.</p> |
| <p>2.1 Participatory needs and priorities assessment with poor people.</p> <p>2.2 Participatory development and implementation of user group plans selected from a menu including activities listed in 2.3 to 2.6.</p> <p>2.3 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: promote wage employment, skill training and micro-enterprises, including for targeted groups (eg coolies, carpenters, fishermen, construction workers).</p> <p>2.4 LIVING SECURITY: Enhance community security and long-term self-help capacity by promoting a programme of community management and enhancing access to legal support.</p> <p>2.5 HEALTH SERVICES: ADS/CDS supported in managing aspects of primary health services (eg. employ doctors, establish essential drugs programme), running pilot health insurance scheme and piloting community led environmental cleaning and maintenance.</p> <p>2.6 IN SLUM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS: Increase number of standposts and handpumps for drinking water, improve pedestrian access; localised drainage and flood protection; security lighting; multi-functional community facilities.</p> | <p>Apprentice Schemes 5 Vocational Training 44</p> <p>Support for community management 50 Legal costs of dispute settlement 20</p> <p>Assistance to ADS/NHG 55</p> <p>Discretionary environmental improvements 1800 Flood protection in slums 219</p> | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>3.1 Plan design and implement city-wide environmental improvements detailed in 3.2 to 3.4.</p> <p>3.2 Increase KWA's capacity to deliver BULK WATER to West Cochin and improve WATER DISTRIBUTION capacity in poor areas by improving performance of pumping and booster stations and renewing leaking distribution mains to increase supply of drinking water.</p> <p>3.3 Improve FLOOD PROTECTION systems in poor areas of West Cochin by canal bank protection and drainage channel improvements.</p> <p>3.4 Improve SOLID WASTE management by provision of auto-trailers, skips and pick-up lorries.</p> <p>3.5 Plan and implement other city-wide activities as listed in 3.6 to 3.9.</p> <p>3.6 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: Develop labour market data base on opportunities for the urban poor, interface with GoI/GoK employment programmes, develop business advisory centre.</p> <p>3.7 HEALTH SERVICES: Target priority health problems (starting with TB and STDs) on a geographical zone basis, linked to national projects; ensure health information available to poorer groups.</p> <p>3.8 LIVING SECURITY: review and recommend changes to financial, administrative and legal constraints on enhanced security of occupancy.</p> | <p>Water supply improvements 1494</p> <p>Flood protection works and equipment 265</p> <p>SWM equipment 76</p> <p>Activities to be defined 104</p> <p>Activities to be defined 170</p> <p>Review of admin/legal constraints 25</p> | | |
| <p>4.1 Provide training for NHGs (eg in management, confidence building, communication, PRA, gender sensitivity, conflict resolution, knowledge of rights).</p> <p>4.2 Provide support for NGOs/CBOs to help deliver integrated development services to the urban poor.</p> <p>4.3 Strengthen CD's capacity to act as a channel of funding for neighbourhood based initiatives.</p> <p>4.4 Provide training and skilled development (including new skills in credit programmes and tenure security) to strengthen UPAD as a link agency between the community and CoC.</p> <p>4.5 Skill development training for CoC zonal staff and support to planning processes, including the role of ward-level committees.</p> <p>4.6 Assess at end PY2 the utility of a permanent Economic Development Unit, networking with local businesses and national and local NGO.</p> <p>4.7 Provide tapering finance for capital and running costs of UPAD and related CoC project staff.</p> <p>4.8 Provide services of specialist co-ordinators/consultants in and to UPAD.</p> | <p>Training for NHG members 32</p> <p>Training for NGOs/CBOs 2 Training for NGOs (LnTn) 25</p> <p>Training for CDS/ADS members 8</p> <p>Training for UPAD field staff 16</p> <p>Training for CoC zonal staff 16 In-India study tours 15</p> <p>ODA share of staff costs 97 Vehicles 15 Office equipment 22</p> <p>Training needs assessment 1 Training co-ordinator 23 Health design consultancy 10 Management consultants (Ec Devt) 79 Local consultant (in-slum) 30 Land tenure co-ordinator 23</p> <p>UK consultants (TC) (including management consultancy support to UPAD) £200 Local consultants (TC) £20</p> | | |
| <p>5.1 Enhance abilities of councillors, senior managers and policy makers in the CoC and outside agencies (eg. by</p> | <p>Senior managers and policy makers 3</p> | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>study tours, financial management and reporting, slum area legislation).</p> <p>5.2 Assist CoC and health authorities with strategic planning.</p> | <p>Councillors 1 Workshops for councillors etc (Lnd Ten) 10 Overseas training and study tours (TC) £200</p> <p>Activities to be defined</p> | | |
| <p>6.1 Design and implement Monitoring and Evaluation system by end PY1.</p> <p>6.2 Monitoring: Produce quality quarterly and annual monitoring reports in timely way.</p> <p>6.3 Evaluation: Review available baseline information at SOP and commission Annual Evaluation Studies by external organisation using participatory approaches at end PY1-PY5.</p> <p>6.4 Project learning: Ensure feedback lessons learnt from M&E system into project planning.</p> | <p>Project monitoring and evaluation 75 ODA monitoring visits £25</p> | | |

APPENDIX 3

Sources of GTZ and ODA Information

(GTZ, 1997) refers to documentation and information provided by GTZ Personnel:

John Barnes, Planning Assessor, PRRS, Beira, Mozambique

Michael Göbel, Quality Assurance, Eschborn, Germany

Knut Kröger, Project Officer Africa 2 Division, Eschborn, Germany

(DFID, 1997) refers to documentation and information provided by DFID Personnel:

Mel Blunt, Consultant Project Preparation Facilitator, London, UK

Cormac Davey, Assistant Physical Planning Adviser, London, UK

Robin Ellison, Evaluation Department, London, UK

Steve Jones, Consultant Logical Framework Workshop Facilitator, London, UK

Michael Mutter, Physical Planning Adviser, London, UK

REFERENCES

GTZ documentation

Chambers R, Donner F, Gagel D, Goebel M et al., in Forster R, ed., 1996, ZOPP marries PRA?, Workshop Documentation, GTZ, Eschborn, Germany

Cofie-Djangmah G, 1994, Improvement of Accra Solid Waste and Nightsoil Disposal System (Consolidation Phase) ZOPP V Re-Planning Workshop Report, GTZ/PAS, Accra, Ghana

Göbel M, Teimeier J, Weller-Molongua C, 1997 (mimeo draft), The Ways of Co-operation, Standard Procedure and How it Works, GTZ, Eschborn, Germany

Göbel M & Helming S, 1997 (mimeo draft), ZOPP A Planning Guide for New and Ongoing Projects and Programmes, GTZ, Eschborn, Germany

GTZ, 1987, ZOPP (an introduction to the method), GTZ Sonderpub. No 204, Eschborn, Germany

GTZ, 1996, Project Cycle Management (PCM) and Objectives-Oriented Project Planning (ZOPP), Eschborn, Germany

GTZ, 1997, undocumented conversations with GTZ personnel identified in Appendix 7

Lang H & Dreschler H-D, 1989, Managing On-Site Project Implementation, GTZ Sonderpub. No 204, Eschborn, Germany

Nkum J, 1991, Improvement of Accra Solid Waste and Nightsoil Disposal System (Continuation Phase) ZOPP V Re-Planning Workshop Report, GTZ/PAS, Accra, Ghana

DFID/ODA documentation

DFID, 1997, undocumented conversations with DFID personnel identified in Appendix 7

Jones S, 1995, Cochin Urban Poverty Reduction Project - Initial Planning Workshop 9-10 August, (mimeo), Delhi, India

Jones S, 1996, Cochin Urban Poverty Reduction Project - Facilitation of Logframe Workshop 20-24 May, (mimeo), Delhi, India

ODA, 1995, A Guide to Social Analysis for Projects in Developing Countries, HMSO, London, UK

ODA, 1996, Office Instructions Volume II, ODA, London, UK

Lectures

Church C, 1997, "Local Agenda 21" presented at the Conference "The Challenge of Environmental Management in Metropolitan Areas" organised by Development Planning Unit and the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London, UK

Stephens C, 1997, "Air? Water? Waste? Noise? Using Health to Guide Priority-Setting Processes towards Sustainable and Equitable Development - An Experiment in a Complex Metropolitan Area" presented at the Conference "The Challenge of Environmental Management in Metropolitan Areas" organised by Development Planning Unit and the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London, UK

Journals and Working Papers

Brinkerhoff D & Ingle M, 1989, "Integrating Blueprint and Process: A Structured Flexibility Approach to Development Management" Public Administration and Development, Vol. 9, pp. 487-503

Cameron J, 1993, "The Challenges for Monitoring and Evaluation in the 1990s", Project Appraisal, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 91-96

Clements P, 1995, "Poverty Oriented Cost-Benefit Approach to the Analysis of Development Projects", World Development, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 577-592

Cordingley D, 1995, "Integrating the Logical Framework into the management of Technical Co-operation Projects" Project Appraisal, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 103-112

Cracknell B, 1989, "Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Logical Framework System in Practice", Project Appraisal, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 163-167

Cracknell B, 1993, "Evaluation Feedback: So Important, yet so Neglected!" Project Appraisal, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 77-82

Crittenden R & Lea D, 1992, "Geographers and 'Logical' Development Practice: the Smallholders Markets and Access and Food Supply Programme in Papua New Guinea", Applied Geography, 12, pp. 47-64

Eggers H, 1992, "The Integrated Approach to Project Cycle Management", Project Appraisal, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 3-10

- Eggers H, 1993, "From Project Cycle Management to the Management of Development Co-operation", *Project Appraisal*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 91-96
- Grindle M & Hildebrand M, 1995, "Building Sustainable Capacity in the Public Sector: What can be done", *Public Administration and Development*, vol. 15, p441-463
- Harding P, 1991, "Qualitative Indicators and the Project Framework", *Community Development Journal*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp 294-305
- Honadle G & Rosengard J, 1983, "Putting 'Projectised' Development in Perspective", *Public Administration and Development*, vol. 3, pp. 299-305
- Jones G & Ward P, 1994, "The World Banks 'New' Urban Management Programme: Paradigm Shift or Policy Continuity?" in *Habitat International*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 33-51
- Mattingly M, 1995, "Urban Management in Developing Countries", *DPU Working Paper*, No. 72, London
- O'Donovan I, 1995, "Designing Effective Management Education Programmes: Issues and Concerns with the ODA Project Framework", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 8 No. 3 pp 39-51
- Thomas A, 1994, "What is Development Management", *DPP Working Paper* no 28, Open University, Milton Keynes
- Wiggins S and Shields D, 1995, "Clarifying the 'Logical Framework' as a Tool for Planning and Managing Development Projects", *Project Appraisal*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 2-12
- Devas N & Rakodi C, 1993, *Managing Fast Growing Cities*, Longman Scientific and Technical, UK
- Eyben A & Ladbury S, in Nelson N & Wright S, 1995, *Power and Participation*, ITP, London
- Hanlon J, 1991, *Who Calls the Shots*, Currey, London
- MacArthur J, 1994, "The Logical Framework: a Tool for the Management of Project Planning and Evaluation", in F Analoui (ed.) *The Realities of Managing Development Projects*, Avebury, UK
- Mitlin and Thompson, 1994, *Special Issue on Participatory Tools and Methods in Urban Areas*, RRA Notes, Number 21, International Institute for Environment and Development, London, UK
- Moser C, 1989, *Community Participation in Urban Projects in the Third World*, Pergamon, UK
- NORAD, (undated), *The Logical Framework Approach: Handbook for Objectives Oriented Planing*, Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation, Oslo, Norway
- Rondinelli D, 1983, *Development Projects as Policy Experiments, An Adaptive Approach to Project Administration*, Methuen, London, UK
- Stren R, White R & Whitney J, (eds.), 1992, *Sustainable Cities*, Westview Press, Boulder
- UNCHS (Habitat), 1996, *An Urbanising World, Global Report on Human Settlements*, Oxford University Press, England

Books and Manuals

- Cassen R et al., 1994, *Does Aid Work?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK