

# **A Tool for Project Management and People-driven Development**

**Part 1 : Main report**

**Proceedings of the INTRAC and South Research Workshop  
on LFA and OOIP  
Leuven, Belgium, 16 - 18 May 1994**



**SOUTH RESEARCH**





11

11

## Executive Summary

1. Over 40 participants from Belgium, Britain, Germany and the Netherlands, representing various development NGOs, university research departments, government donor agencies and the EC, spent three days sharing their views on critical issues surrounding the uses of the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) and Objective Oriented Intervention Planning (OOIP).
2. The report of the Workshop is divided into four sections:
  - Section 1 gives a brief history of the development of the LFA and OOIP methods and an introduction to the principal features of each approach.
  - Section 2 provides an overview of the key recommendations and suggestions that resulted from the workshop.
  - Section 3 lists the follow-up steps being considered by INTRAC and South Research, suggested by those present at the workshop.
  - Finally, Section 4 contains summaries of the main workshop presentations.
3. The use of LFA as a closed system for project management within development agencies.

The use of LFA has been instrumental in improving the performance of both governmental and non-governmental development administrations. When used correctly, logical frameworks can help staff define realistic objectives and indicators and draw attention to the assumptions that underlie a project design.

Presentations by the ODA, BADC and the EC Commission, drew attention to the benefits of using LFA in this context. But these presentations also revealed:

- the need to introduce LFA in such a way that its advantages are clearly perceived by those who are new to the approach.
- the need for training to be given to staff at all levels of the organisation, so that they understand how to use the tool, what it can accomplish and also what it cannot do.
- the need for managers to adjust their administrative procedures in such a way as to increase the usefulness and effectiveness of the LFA.
- the importance of incorporating new insights and experiences into the system to ensure that LFA procedures remain dynamic and do not become routine.

4. The use of LFA/OOIP as an open system for the management of development interventions.

It was generally recognised that local organisations and local groups should be involved in the design and execution of development projects that affect them. ZOPP/OOIP approaches, pioneered by GTZ and adopted by a growing number of NGOs, have linked the use of LFA with participatory planning techniques and efforts to strengthen local organisations, so that they may run their own projects when outside agencies leave.

The presentation by GTZ focussed on recent developments in its own use of ZOPP/OOIP. The four NGO presentations examined their application of OOIP methods at different stages of the project cycle: at the planning stage (in the case of Coopibo), for monitoring (SCF (UK)), for evaluation (Misereor) and as a tool for the analysis of local institutions (MDF).

The key points to emerge from these presentations and subsequent discussions were that:

- donors and NGOs need to move away from standard procedures and adopt a more open-ended process approach, that is better adapted to the specific cultural needs and capacities of the local people involved.
- project planners should not focus on the problems of local people. But instead begin by encouraging local people to create a vision of where they want to get to and then identify local strengths and potentials that could help them reach that goal.
- the involvement of local people should not be limited to their participation in planning workshops, but should be realised at all stages of the project cycle (planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation).
- openness and transparency on the part of the intervening agency are vital. It should be clear to local groups what the interests of the agency are. In addition, workshop moderators and local interveners should be aware of the different interests that exist between persons, groups and local organisations within the affected population, and be aware of the political repercussions and imbalances that might be caused by their actions. Participation should not be assumed to produce harmony.

5. It was felt that LFA/OOIP methods could be used to improve:

(a) **Monitoring:** LFA/OOIP methods can be used to help local staff and local people develop monitoring mechanisms that are accountable not only to donor agencies but also to affected groups.

(b) **Evaluations:** (Parts of) the OOIP approach can also be used to conduct participatory evaluations and help identify and analyse the underlying reasons for poor project performance.

(c) **Sustainability:** It was suggested that one could integrate a sustainability analysis into the OOIP procedure once the intervention logic and important assumptions had been defined. This analysis would consist of identifying the results and activities which should be continued after major external aid had stopped.

(d) **Strengthening Organisational Capacity:** The OOIP approach can be used to strengthen the organisational capacity of: (i) the development agency - through the operational definition of objectives and the basis it provides for monitoring and operational planning; and (ii) grassroots organisations - encouraged to undertake a situational analysis of their own strengths and weaknesses, relations with other organisations and so on.

6. The use of LFA/OOIP as a tool for people-driven development.

Looking to move beyond the agency-oriented logic of the project cycle, participants at the workshop argued that LFA/OOIP methods had the potential, if adequately used, to create a genuinely local dynamic of learning, exchange and organisation which could lead to a process of people driven development.

It was argued that for this to become a reality, various changes would have to be made to the 'classic' OOIP sequence (see Note Section 3.3).

- Project planners should not expect to set precise objectives from the very start. A long period of time (a year or more) may be needed before a logical framework can be completed, in order to finish the analysis phase, to build up confidence, to gauge real levels of commitment etc.

- Local groups should be allowed to identify the range and scope of the project. A variety of tools, not just OOIP methods, should be used to promote people's participation in such exercises.
- Where local groups are unable to give voice to their opinions, it may be necessary to delay the definition of project objectives and concentrate on awareness raising and capacity building.
- If local groups have successfully analysed their own problems and designed their own project to solve these problems, it may not be necessary to go through the 'problem tree', 'objective tree' and 'analysis of alternatives' phases of the classic OOIP method.
- Finally, periodic workshops are important opportunities for local people to involve themselves in the planning and design of the project, but they should not be relied on as the sole point of contact between programme managers and affected groups.

7. The follow-up steps being considered by INTRAC and South Research.

At the workshop, it was agreed that there should be a systematic exchange of experiences on people-oriented project management, focusing on the following major themes:

- the further development of the OOIP methodology
- the inclusion of other participatory approaches within the OOIP approach
- the development of other participatory methods (alternatives to OOIP)
- and capacity building related to OOIP.

## Contents

Preamble	1
1. Some introductory clarifications on the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) and Objective Oriented Intervention Planning (OOIP)	3
1.1. The Logical Framework Approach (LFA)	3
1.2. Objective Oriented Intervention Planning (OOIP)	5
2. An overview of the main results of the workshops	7
2.1. The use of LFA as a management tool for internal use within development agencies	7
2.2. The use of LFA/ OOIP as an open system for the management of development interventions	9
2.2.1. The use of LFA/ OOIP in the project cycle	9
Note : the role of moderators and local interveners in the project cycle	13
2.2.2. The use of LFA/ OOIP for ensuring the sustainability of project benefits	14
2.2.3. The use of LFA/ OOIP for organisational strengthening	15
2.3. OOIP/ LFA as a tool for people driven development	16
Note : Overview of suggested changes to the 'classic' LFA/ OOIP sequence	19
3. Exchange of experiences and follow-up of the workshop	22
4. Summary of the presentations	23
4.1. The use of LFA and OOIP as open systems : from management tool via participation to capacity building (Dirk Van Esbroeck, South Research)	23
4.2. LFA and OOIP - clarification or camouflage ? (Edith Sizoo, South-North Network Cultures and Development)	24
4.3. The History of the Use of the Logframe within the ODA (Vic Heard, Aid Policy Department, ODA)	25
4.4. The Project Cycle Management introduced in the European Commission (Gerard McGovern, Evaluation Unit D.G. VIII, Commission of the E.C.)	26
4.5. The introduction of OOIP in the BADC (Jos Dewint, Department of Organisation, Training and Evaluation, BADC)	27
4.6. Recent Developments in GTZ's use of the ZOPP (Volker Steigerwald, GTZ, Section O46 Quality Assurance)	28
4.7. The Use of OOIP in Coopibo-supported programmes in Zimbabwe (Jan Vannoppen, Coopibo)	29
4.8. The Use of the Logical Framework Approach by the Save the Children Fund in a rural development project in Pakistan (Louisa Gosling, Save the Children)	31
4.9. The Use of LFA/ OOIP/ ZOPP for Evaluation Purposes (Martin Dütting, Misereor)	32
4.10. Local organisations and project implementation : the use of the LF for structuring development interventions (Herman Snelder, MDF)	34

Annexes (in separate document)

1. Workshop Programme
2. The use of LFA and OOIP as open systems : from management tool via participation to capacity building (Dirk Van Esbroeck, South Research)
3. LFA and OOIP - clarification or camouflage ? (Edith Sizoo, South-North Network Cultures and Development)
4. Project Cycle Management: Yet another Fad ? (Gerard McGovern, Evaluation Unit D.G. VIII, Commission of the E.C.)
5. The introduction of OOIP in the BADC (Jos Dewint, Department of Organisation, Training and Evaluation, BADC)
6. Recent Developments in GTZ's use of the ZOPP (Volker Steigerwald, GTZ, Section O46 Quality Assurance)
7. The use of OOIP in Coopibo-supported programmes in Zimbabwe (Jan Vannoppen, Coopibo)
8. The Logical Framework and the Save the Children Fund (Louisa Gosling, Save the Children)
9. The Use of LFA/ OOIP/ ZOPP for Evaluation Purposes (Martin Dütting, Misereor)
10. Local Organisations and Project Implementation : the use of the LF for structuring development interventions (Herman Snelder, MDF)
11. Results of the Evaluation conducted at the end of the workshop
12. List of participants



## Preamble

INTRAC and South Research decided to hold a joint workshop on the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) and Objective Oriented Intervention Planning (OOIP) in order to assess the usefulness and adaptability of these tools for planning, monitoring and evaluating development programmes. While some NGOs have been very critical of what they see as the rigid use of logframes as project blueprints by certain donor agencies, other NGOs have been far more positive, arguing that the LFA/OOIP can be used to structure a process of participatory planning and needs assessment in which local people decide the scope and focus of any intervention.

The organisers hoped that the workshop would:

- provide an opportunity for donors and NGOs to think through their experiences of using LFA/OOIP/ZOPP;
- illustrate the creative potential and range of applications of the LFA when used in combination with other methods;
- produce a set of recommendations for future uses of LFA/OOIP.

As evidenced by this Workshop Report, these objectives have largely been achieved. Over forty participants from Belgium, Britain, Germany and the Netherlands, representing various NGOs, research departments, government donor agencies and the EC, spent three days sharing their views on critical issues surrounding the uses of LFA/OOIP.

The Report is broken into four sections:

- Section 1 gives a brief history of the development of the LFA and OOIP methods and a short description of the principal features of each approach.
- Section 2 provides an overview of the key recommendations and suggestions that resulted from the workshop, grouped according to the context in which the LFA tool is to be used; whether as a closed system for project management within development agencies; as an open system for the management of development interventions more generally; or as a tool for people driven development.
- Section 3 discusses the possible follow-up steps to be taken by INTRAC, South Research and others in the future.
- Finally Section 4 lists the nine presentations given at the workshop in summary form.

Both INTRAC and South Research hope that this Report will foster the sharing of the insights that emerged over the course of the workshop and each welcomes comments and feedback from readers.

INTRAC  
P.O. Box 563  
Oxford OX2 6RZ  
United Kingdom

tel : + 44 (0) 865 20 18 51  
fax : + 44 (0) 865 20 18 52

South Research  
Zwarte Zustersstraat 16/9  
3000 Leuven  
Belgium

tel : + 32 (0) 16 23 58 81  
fax : + 32 (0) 16 29 18 81

## 1. Some introductory clarifications on the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) and the Objective Oriented Intervention Planning (OOIP)<sup>1</sup>

### 1.1. The Logical Framework Approach (LFA)

The LFA was originally developed by Practical Concepts Incorporated for USAID in 1969 as a tool for project planning, management and evaluation. Since then it has been adopted by many bilateral and multilateral agencies. Many NGOs have also found it a useful tool for project planning.

LFA was described by its developers as "a set of interlocking concepts which must be used together in a dynamic fashion to permit the elaboration of a well designed objectively described and evaluable project". As such, the LFA is not an integrated set of procedures or guide-lines for planning, monitoring and evaluation; it is simply a tool which provides a structure for specifying the most essential characteristics of a project and the linkages between a set of means and ends. In this way, the LFA is an aid to logical thinking and a means by which a project may be structured and described for analytical purposes.

The logical framework consists of a 4 X 4 matrix in which the different rows represent the different levels of project objectives, including the means to achieve them, while the columns indicate how the achievement of these objectives can be verified. The matrix typically has the following rows and columns:

---

<sup>1</sup> Sources : G. Coleman, The Logical Framework Approach, University of East Anglia, 1987 ; GTZ, Zopp (an introduction to the method), 1988 ; NORAD, The Logical Framework Approach, Handbook for Objectives-oriented Project Planning ; BADC, Manual for the use of Objective Oriented Intervention Planning, 1991 ; South Research, An introduction to the OOIP, 1992 ; Commission of the European Communities, Manual Project Cycle Management, 1993 ; Save the Children, Assessment, Monitoring, Review and Evaluation, Tool kits, 1993.

<i>Narrative Summary</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</i>	<i>Means of Verification</i>	<i>Important Assumptions</i>
Project Goal (General Objective)	Measures of Goal Achievement	Sources of information to be used	
Project Purpose (Specific Objective)	Measures of Purpose Achievement	Sources of information to be used	Assumptions affecting Purpose-Goal linkage
Outputs (Results)	Measures of Outputs Achievement	Sources of information to be used	Assumptions affecting Outputs-Purpose linkage
Inputs (Activities)	Nature and level of resources necessary	Costs of the project	Assumptions affecting Inputs-Outputs linkage
			Initial assumptions about the project (preconditions)

The first column contains *the narrative summary* describing the different objectives of the project ordered in a hierarchical way : a development project is based on the *input* of resources and the implementation of activities, which will result in a number of *outputs*. If these outputs are realised, the *project purpose* will be achieved, which in turn will contribute to the realisation of the *project goal*.

The logic established in this column is based on a means-end causal relationship. There is a sequence of three causal relationships : *if* the inputs are realised *then* the outputs will be achieved ; *if* the outputs are achieved *then* the project purpose will be realised ; *if* the project purpose is realised *then* a contribution will be made to the achievement of the project goal.

The fourth column is the second one to be defined when constructing a logical framework. It lists *the important assumptions* which are defined as external factors outside the direct control of the project, which have to be fulfilled for the project to be successful. The important assumptions refer to the environment in which the project operates; changes in external conditions can significantly influence the development of a project. As such, they need to be acknowledged and thought through at the planning stage in order to be realistic about what is feasible.

The assumptions intervene at every level of the causal linkages of the narrative summary. So for example the inputs will lead to the realisation of the outputs only if the assumptions at that level are realised as well.

<sup>2</sup> The terms between brackets are alternative formulations.

For each level of the project structure (project goal, project purpose, outputs, inputs), there must be a way of measuring performance. As the narrative summary does not provide sufficient details for implementation or evaluation purposes, the objectives must be defined more precisely. This is done by defining *objectively verifiable indicators (OVI)* and their *means of verification (MOV)*.

The OVI formulate the objectives in an operational way and they represent a set of criteria which will indicate in concrete terms to what extent the expected results have been achieved. As such, OVI should specify the target groups, the quantity, quality, time, location, and other relevant characteristics of the activities that will be achieved by the project at different levels.

The MOV provide the information on how to measure or where to collect the information about each of the indicators.

## **12. Objective Oriented Intervention Planning (OOIP)<sup>3</sup>**

OOIP was initially developed by GTZ under the name of ZOPP. It uses the LFA but integrates it within a wider approach which:

- ensures the participation of the stakeholders in the planning process ;
- bases the definition of the logical framework on an analysis of the environment in which the project will be situated ;
- visualizes the main results of the process via a method elaborated by Metaplan.

OOIP workshops, led by an external moderator, are organised at specific stages of the project cycle (identification, appraisal, investigation, implementation and evaluation) with different levels of detail.

In general terms, the steps of an OOIP workshop can be described as follows :

- Preparatory steps :
  - . definition of the entity of the workshop (the subject which will be analysed) ;
  - . identification of the parties concerned by the entity
  - . identification of representatives of these parties

---

<sup>3</sup> Other denominations indicating the same approach are used, such as ZOPP (Ziel Orientierte Projekt Planung) and OOPP (Objective Oriented Project Planning).

- . practical preparation of the workshop
  
- The analytical phase :
  - . participation analysis (analysis of the position of all parties involved)
  - . problem analysis (analysis of the problems within the entity, leading to the establishment of a problem tree)
  - . objectives analysis (transformation of the problem tree into an objectives tree)
  - . analysis of the alternatives (identification of the different alternatives and selection of strategy to be adopted)
  
- The planning phase (definition of the four columns of the logical framework) :
  - . description of the narrative summary (based on the results of the analytical phase)
  - . identification and assessment of the important assumptions
  - . definition of the objectively verifiable indicators (OVI)
  - . definition of the means of verification (MOV)
  - . determination of resources and costs

## 2. An overview of the main results of the workshop

The workshop examined the potential and actual usefulness of LFA/OOIP in different situations and for different agencies. The three day meeting covered a wide range of possible applications of LFA/OOIP. The three key perspectives from which LFA/OOIP can be used were identified as follows:

- LFA as a closed system for project management within development agencies;
- LFA/OOIP as an open system for the management of development interventions; and,
- LFA/OOIP as a tool for people driven development.

The results of the workshop indicated clearly that LFA/OOIP can be useful at each of these three levels. What follows is an overview of the main suggestions and recommendations put forward by workshop participants, grouped under the above headings.

### 2.1. The use of LFA as a management tool for internal use within development agencies

*As a closed system, LFA is mainly responding to donor needs and requirements related to the various aspects of the management of development interventions such as appropriate design; objectives that are clear and suitable for monitoring and evaluation; standardized presentation of projects; effective control over the course of the intervention; and effective accountability mechanisms. As such, it is adopted and used in accordance with the organisation's own goals and perspectives.*

*Official development agencies and some larger NGOs have been eager to adopt the LFA in view of the doubtful results of developments projects which were (at least partially) attributed to poor organisational performance.*

The various presentations and the discussions provided unambiguous indications that the (closed) use of the LFA has been instrumental in improving the performance of both governmental and non-governmental development administrations. The following points were raised in this regard:

- LFA has lead to more systematic and rational planning, monitoring and evaluation. More precisely, LFA has allowed a more realistic definition of objectives. It makes all the important variables of a project explicit and aids the measurement of progress, quality control and evaluation.

- LFA has significantly improved communication and cooperation within development administrations ; it has contributed to the use of an uniform terminology related to the key concepts used in development work.
- LFA allows development administrations to become more accountable.

Notwithstanding the benefits that were brought by the introduction of LFA as a management tool, there still exists an enormous potential for improving practice. At the workshop several suggestions were made on this issue:

- An imposed introduction of the approach clearly leads to reluctance and even out spoken opposition. The LFA should be "sold" in such a way that its advantages are clearly perceived; this will also avoid LFA becoming a ritualised desk exercise, the filling in of a set of boxes solely to secure funding
- The introduction of LFA should be planned well beforehand. This implies the setting-up of monitoring mechanisms to identify emerging problems and the provision of a budget to take corrective action.
- Efforts to introduce LFA should not be limited to the staff of the development administrations but should also be geared to local counterpart agencies, external experts, NGOs, etc.
- It should be realised that an appropriate use of LFA, which requires a flexible and multi-disciplinary approach, may be incompatible with the existing administrative procedures and management culture within an agency. It is clear that in such cases additional actions will have to be taken to address this problem.
- Training is often given too low a priority in the introduction process (not enough people trained, training period too short, no refresher courses). On top of this, the effects of staff mobility are often not dealt with. Moreover the impact of training seems often to be overestimated. It is a necessary step in the introduction process, but we should realise that training cannot, and will not, solve all of our problems.
- Even if the LFA is introduced and adopted with enthusiasm, it will inevitably be co-opted by bureaucracies and adapted to their specific needs. This may lead to an oversimplified and inflexible use of LFA. Efforts should be undertaken to systematically 'redynamize' its use by adapting procedures and by incorporating new insights and experiences (for example, by raising questions on culture, gender, organisational capacity in the assumptions column of the logframe)
- The use of LFA for planning projects should preferably be preceded by the definition of a general policy framework which will allow projects to be situated in a more global development effort, which in turn constitutes a guarantee for the sustainability of project benefits.



- Administrations using the LFA should be fully aware that the LFA is an important but insufficient tool for project cycle management. Many important questions such as the structuring of an intervention are not addressed by the process.
- Finally, it should be realised that there exists a danger in using LFA without the proper participation of all groups affected by a project. Being a powerful tool, it might in such cases, gain a reputation it does not in fact deserve.

## 22. The use of LFA/OOIP as an open system for the management of development interventions

*The recognition that the involvement of local organisations and local affected groups in the design and execution of projects is an important factor for improving the effectiveness of projects, led to the development of LFA as an open system. ZOPP/OOIP, developed by GTZ, gave a lot of attention to the analysis of the project environment and linked the use of LFA with participatory planning techniques.*

*As such, the ZOPP/OOIP approach not only took into account the needs and perceptions of the intervening agency, but it also included the needs, skills and experiences of all other groups affected by the intervention, not only to increase project effectiveness but also to enhance the capacity of other structures affected by the project.*

For much of the workshop, attention was focussed on this area of application of LFA/OOIP. In particular, three issues came to the fore:

- the use of LFA/OOIP in the project cycle (including its use for monitoring and evaluation);
- the use of LFA/OOIP for assuring the sustainability of project benefits; and,
- the use of LFA/OOIP for organisational strengthening.

### 22.1. The use of LFA/OOIP in the project cycle

Although this topic was not dealt with in a systematic fashion, several interesting points were raised in the different presentations and discussions.

A distinction was drawn between three different perspectives on the role played by LFA/OOIP in the project cycle:

- First of all, LFA/OOIP plays a clearly defined role in the project cycle as a sequence of steps through which a project passes, from an initial planning stage towards a specific goal or end point, typically an output in terms of benefits for the people affected<sup>4</sup>.
- Secondly, LFA/OOIP can provide a basis for monitoring activities, cyclical processes within every project related to management functions, designed to ensure that the project realises its objectives and takes corrective action when necessary.
- Finally, LFA/OOIP techniques have a role to play bringing different parties together to cooperate and interact in a project. Relationships between affected groups are developed because OOIP intentionally brings these parties together at different moments in the project cycle and stimulates them to participate.

(i) The role of LFA/OOIP in the project cycle. The following points were made on this issue:

- The project cycle set-up often seems to reflect the needs of donors and development agencies for a procedure, rather than the needs of affected groups. If LFA/OOIP techniques are applied in a participatory way, this will allow the inclusion of their views and interests in the different phases of the project cycle. In turn, this will lead to new demands for a more flexible management of the project cycle (see below). Some donors seem less prepared for this than others.
- If local affected groups are to participate effectively in the different phases of the project, LFA/OOIP should be applied in a flexible way. This implies that the logframe should be produced gradually, starting with the definition of objectives, later on the planning of activities, and still later the development of relevant indicators. Such an approach will ensure that the planning is realistic and that the logframe is used as a "living system" by project staff and other involved parties.
- Project cycle management is often too explicitly linked to the organisation of OOIP workshops (often organised by outsiders). It is therefore suggested that workshops should be de-emphasized and better integrated into a more comprehensive project cycle management system. Changes in the organisation's culture, the development of management capacity and the provision of sufficient time and resources are needed for this to happen.
- The start of the OOIP process should be made less depressing. Problems should not be the exclusive focus of initial sessions. It was therefore suggested that agencies start with the creation of a vision (where people wish to get to) and then identify local strengths and potentials that could help reach that goal.

---

<sup>4</sup> Obviously, this doesn't exclude the possibility that the project constitutes the start of a broader development process that continues once the project has been finished.

- The analysis of the cultural, social, political, economic and environmental context is a weak point in the classic OOIP approach. It is therefore suggested that one should start with a wide scope and only focus gradually as one gains more insight. The analysis of the institutional setting should be included in the context analysis and should be performed before the actual OOIP process starts (see Herman Snelder's paper). Pilot projects should also be considered so as to learn about the interaction of a larger proposed project with the local context.
- LFA/OOIP and the (donor defined) project cycles should become more people oriented ; the following suggestions were put forward in this regard :
  - . the involvement of the people affected should not be limited to the planning workshops, but be realised at all stages of the project cycle (planning implementation, monitoring and evaluation) ;
  - . donors and NGOs need to be more flexible and to move away from standard procedures in favour of more open-ended processes, adapted to the specific culture, needs and capacities of the local people involved ;
  - . throughout the project cycle, local people should be empowered and stimulated to manage development actions effectively while outside agencies scale down their involvement ;
  - . the analysis of local strengths, capacities and potentials should receive much more weight in the process ;
  - . solutions to local problems should be based as far as possible on local knowledge and experience and be identified by the people concerned.

(ii) The role of LFA/OOIP in Monitoring Systems. The following points were brought to the fore in the workshop:

- The monitoring of progress at different levels (activities, results, project purpose, internal project organisation, etc.) should be organised differently. At each level the following questions should be carefully addressed:
  - . who needs the information? ;
  - . whose interests will it serve? ;
  - . who will collect the information? ;
  - . how will it be collected? ;
  - . who will have access to it? ; and
  - . who will take which decisions when and where alterations need to be made?
- Monitoring should include the analysis of the evolution of interests and (existing and potential) conflicts. The analysis of conflicts during the participation analysis (being

part of the overall context analysis before the project is planned) may provide a useful framework in this regard.

- Monitoring often tends only to be used as a means to comply with existing (donor imposed) procedures; in many cases an additional effort is requested to really use its outcomes for re-planning with all parties concerned.
- The development of (locally relevant) indicators is crucial. Choosing the correct indicators will allow the setting up of mechanisms that are accountable, not only to donor agencies but to affected groups as well.
- The inclusion of a monitoring system in an on-going project needs a considerable effort and might be reluctantly accepted by (often already overloaded) project staff. Strong commitment on the part of senior management (as in the SCF case) may be essential to overcome such difficulties.
- Participatory evaluations can use (parts of) the OOIP approach for different purposes, such as the (re)planning of the next project phase (see the Misereor case study). In such a situation, it is however necessary that all parties (and especially the project staff) accept the evaluation and the use of the OOIP approach in it and take an active part in the evaluation process.

(iii) The role of LFA/OOIP in bringing together affected groups at different stages of the project cycle. Here the following points were mentioned:

- True participation from all actors involved requires that all try to be as transparent as possible. However, most people will have hidden agendas of one sort or another. Greater openness will only be realised through a continuous process of interaction and the development of relations of trust among the different parties.
- It should be realised that participation does not equal harmony. Different interests and conflicts continue to exist and will not be solved by putting people together in a workshop. Organising (as a first step) workshops with socially and economically more homogeneous groups may allow more effective participation of weaker groups and a better insight into existing power relations.
- Local organisations and donors need to make their own analysis of the environment in which the project will operate and confront their views with those of the other parties involved.
- The issue of ownership should be addressed from the start by clarifying who (Government, NGO, village council, local people, etc) will own what and by clarifying the cooperation process (tasks and responsibilities of every party involved). Local (sense of) ownership will further be enhanced by conceiving external support as a complement to locally existing capacities.

Note : the role of moderators and local interveners in the project cycle

On several occasions, the role of the workshop moderator was discussed. With the tendency to de-emphasize the workshop and place greater emphasis on a process approach, the role of the workshop moderator was called into question by some participants. "Local interveners" responsible for the day-to-day tasks of liaising between different affected groups are seen to play a more important role.

The following general points were made in connection with this issue:

- It was felt that both workshop moderators and local interveners should be aware of their own culture, their own norms and values and how these interact with their practices. (See the paper given by Edith Sizoo). They should also be familiar with local values and beliefs and use local concepts to facilitate discussions.
- Local interveners should have a close relationship and be in continuous dialogue with the affected groups. Moderators should be accessible to these groups but preferably shouldn't have a direct interest in the intervention.
- Both moderators and local interveners should be as transparent as possible. It should be clear to the affected groups which role the moderator has in the process and what his or her interests are. The same applies to the local interveners and the structures they belong to (eg the project, local NGO, northern NGO, donor agency, etc).
- Local interveners should be aware of the different interests that exist between persons, groups, villages, between the local, the regional and national levels, between different organisations and so on. They should also be aware of the imbalances that might be caused by the effects of an intervention.
- The moderator should also be aware of the existence of these different interests and take care that every group has the opportunity to articulate its own point of view. At the same time, he/she should know that the participation of an affected group in the workshop does not guarantee that their interests will be sufficiently taken into account. He/she should also be aware that the unique dynamics of an OOIP session can produce results which "cross" the often invisible boundaries imposed by the local power constellation and lead people to say things they may later regret.

## 222 The use of LFA/OOIP for ensuring the sustainability of project benefits

Sustainability<sup>5</sup> was dealt with in different ways during the workshop.

Sustainability of the benefits realised by a development action can be increased by integrating a sustainability analysis in the OOIP *procedure*, once the intervention logic and the important assumptions (first and fourth column of the logical framework) have been defined<sup>6</sup>. This analysis consists of first identifying the results and activities which should be continued after major external aid has stopped and analysing these in view of the main sustainability factors. This analysis may lead to an adaptation of the existing activities, results and assumptions and/or to the formulation of additional ones.

Sustainability is further enhanced by identifying the general policy framework before engaging in actual project planning through the LFA/OOIP approach. Without this analysis, choices with regard to local partners will often have been made without proper assessment of their role, position and capacities which might endanger the eventual sustainability of project benefits.

Strong local organisations constitute a major factor for sustainability. As indicated elsewhere in this report, the OOIP process can be used to strengthen organisational capacity (see below: point 3.2.3). Furthermore, it has been stated that an OOIP approach which insures that the affected groups are the main actors of their own development (see point 3.3.), will contribute to the sustainability of project benefits.

As sustainability is very much affected by context factors, an appropriate context analysis is necessary. However, the classic LFA/OOIP approach tends to underrate context factors in some cases (e.g. by conducting a rather "closed" problem analysis). This can be avoided in several ways: by leaving many different options open at the start of an intervention and focusing gradually later on, by an active involvement of local actors in the identification and investigation of context constraints (before and between the OOIP workshops), and by starting activities on a pilot scale so as to learn about their interaction with the context.

---

<sup>5</sup> Sustainability is understood here in the following sense: "A development intervention is considered to be sustainable when it is able to deliver an appropriate level of benefits for an extended period of time after major financial, managerial and technical assistance from an external donor is terminated" (OECD, *Sustainability in Development programmes: a Compendium of Evaluation Experience*. Paris, OECD, 1989, p. 7). In this evaluation, six major factors affecting sustainability have been identified: appropriate policy environment, appropriate technology, environmental protection, socio-cultural aspects (including role of women), institutional and management capacity, and economic and financial aspects.

<sup>6</sup> Such a step is foreseen in the project cycle management adopted by the E.C.

### 223. The use of LFA/OOIP for organisational strengthening

LFA/OOIP can be instrumental for organisational strengthening both at the grassroots and within development organisations.

At the level of development organisations, both in the North and the South, the OOIP process can be used to strengthen organisational capacity in the following ways.

- LFA/OOIP can be used for general organisational review and internal project review ; a good example in this regard is the Solomon Islands case presented by M. Dütting where the OOIP approach was used to identify and analyse the underlying reasons for poor project performance.
- Through its well balanced and interactive approach, the OOIP is in many situations capable of "breaking through walls" (strained internal relations, deadlocks, etc.).
- The development of a monitoring system by the project team on the basis of the OOIP results enhances its capacities and strengthens the internal functioning of the project structure (see the SCF case, presented by Louisa Gosling).
- By clarifying essential project characteristics through a process approach, the OOIP/LFA improves communication within the project and between the project structure and other groups involved; furthermore it facilitates the handing over process when staff changes.
- The LFA/OOIP process continuously offers opportunities for creating trust and transparency among all actors; openness about the real objectives of the (northern and southern) development organisations involved can allow the development of appropriate accountability mechanisms which in turn can contribute to the strengthening of the organisations concerned.
- Through the operational definition of objectives and the basis it provides for monitoring and operational planning, OOIP/LFA techniques have proved to be a successful way to increase management awareness among development workers.
- As demonstrated in the MDF paper (presented by Herman Snelder), OOIP/LFA can also provide a basis for structuring interventions. This approach involves an analysis of the capacities of the organisations that might play a role in the implementation. This can lead to the definition of strengthening activities and/or to an adaptation of the activities and results defined through the OOIP process.

Two aspects are important if LFA/OOIP is to produce results at the level of development organisations :

- the senior management of an organisation has to be convinced that LFA/OOIP is an appropriate system for their organisation and they have to support its introduction to allow the process to produce results ;
- (following on from this) organisational or internal project reviews need to be properly planned and budgeted. Many interventions fail to allocate time and resources for these important management functions.

At the level of the grassroots groups affected, a flexible and "extended" use of LFA/OOIP has an important role to play in the process of capacity building and organisational strengthening <sup>7</sup>:

- The situational analysis (strengths/potentials and problems/constraints) increases people's awareness and readiness to begin activities that build on their perceptions and logic, and use their strengths and capacities.
- The incorporation of representatives of the grassroots groups in the presentation of OOIP results at the village level (for example in the Coopibo - Zimbabwean case) increases the self-confidence of local groups and contributes to the strengthening of village level structures.
- The inclusion of the OOIP/LFA process in the dynamics of local groups allows them to gradually acquire the necessary capacities to take control of the process themselves.

### 23. OOIP/LFA as a tool for people driven development

*In this approach, OOIP/LFA is embedded in a process directed at local organisations and affected groups allowing them to gradually increase control over the direction of their development. Their participation is no longer induced by an external coordinator, nor is it "guided" by previously established procedures.*

*From this perspective, OOIP/LFA are part of a very open approach allowing groups to take initiatives according to their own logic (vision, values, concept of development, and so on). If a project/programme emerges out of this process, its direction and characteristics will to a large extent be controlled by local groups and development will be tailored more to local experiences and capacities.*

---

<sup>7</sup> This issue will be dealt with more broadly under 3.3. where we will discuss the use of OOIP/LFA as a tool for people driven development.



The results of the discussions regarding "people driven development" concerned both general reflections on the appropriateness of the LFA/OOIP in such a context, and suggestions to change the "classic" OOIP sequence.

The following general observations and suggestions were formulated :

- People driven development should start from the concepts, values and perceptions of local people. The workshop participants disagreed whether the OOIP/LFA could provide a framework that is compatible with the logic and rationality of the people. Those having serious doubts stated that the "positivistic" LFA/OOIP approach is in sharp contrast with the rationality of people in the South. At its best, this incompatibility can be minimized. Those being more optimistic stated that the LFA/OOIP are indeed external tools, but that every culture assimilates exogenous values and practices. If adequately used, LFA/OOIP can contribute to the creation of a local dynamic of learning, exchange and organisation which will lead to a process of genuine development.
- It is clear that OOIP workshops allow a high degree of involvement of every participant. Nevertheless, many of the conflicts and different interests existing within a society are not adequately dealt with in the LFA/OOIP, because of the mistaken assumption that participation in the process equals harmony. It should also be realised that existing power structures and hidden agendas, prevent people from putting all their cards (problems) on the table. Nor should this become the ultimate aim of a workshop; the degree of transparency will only increase as mutual trust and understanding increase among the different parties involved during the cooperation process.
- Local organisations will play a very important role in ensuring people-driven development. However, formal organisations are often very scarce in the South, important parts of the social, political and economic life being organised through institutions that are not "tangible" organisations. Other approaches need to be used (or developed) that allow an analysis of the potential of these other institutions.
- Explicit efforts should be undertaken to highlight assumptions that could endanger people-driven development (or an evolution in that direction). Local actors should investigate these context constraints and be invited to come up with alternative solutions.

Using the LFA/OOIP in the setting of a people driven development was seen to necessitate various changes to the "classic" OOIP/ZOPP sequence :

(1) Project planners should not expect to set precise objectives from the very start. They should begin with very general objectives and only focus on particular goals once local people are ready to do so. A long period of time (a year or more) may be needed before a LogFrame can be filled in; to complete the analysis phase, to build up confidence, to gauge real levels of commitment and develop a group dynamic.

(2) Local groups should be allowed to identify the range and scope of the project. They should be invited and encouraged to:

- \* discuss their vision of the future;
- \* identify existing and potential resources that could be built upon; and,
- \* analyse blocks and constraints.

A variety of tools exist to stimulate such discussions and to promote people's participation in such exercises: Community appraisal, Generative themes, PRA methods and so on.

(3) Where there are local groups that are unable to give voice to their opinions, it may be necessary to delay the definition of the project objectives and concentrate on awareness raising and local capacity building.

(4) If local groups have successfully analysed their own problems and designed their own project to solve these problems, it may not be necessary to go through the 'problem tree', 'objective tree' and 'analysis of alternatives' phases of the classic OOIP method. The method should not be slavishly followed, but adapted to local conditions.

(5) Locally relevant indicators should be developed in consultation with local people and used to monitor the progress of the project. Monitoring should be used as a management tool by those running the project, not as a means of control by outsiders.

(6) Finally, periodic workshops are important opportunities for local people to involve themselves in the planning and design of the project, but they should not be relied on as the sole point of contact between programme managers and affected groups. Constant feedback loops are needed to make sure that local people continue to be involved at later stages of the project cycle/spiral.

Note : Overview of suggested changes to the "classic" LFA/OOIP sequence

The table below includes the key suggestions made during the workshop with regard to the classic LFA/OOIP sequence. The latter is depicted in the first column, while the proposed changes are included in the second column. According to their position on the continuum (from "internal management tool" to "tool for people driven development") the suggestions are placed at the left, in the middle or at the right of this column.

Classic OOIP sequence	OOIP/LFA for internal management OOIP/LFA for people driven development <----->
	<p>Whatever their type of involvement, external parties should make their own analysis of the context</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Start with a very open "project-less" phase of analysis</p> <p>Clarify from the very start who owns what (people, local structures, governments, donors)</p> <p>Create a vision of future development (where people wish to get to)</p> <p>Start with "warming up" activities to enable the actors involved to get acquainted with each other and with the environment/context</p> <p>People affected themselves identify potentials, resources and constraints</p>
Definition and clarification of entity (i.e. scope and range of project)	<p>A general policy framework should be set up before the actual planning of project starts</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Process <u>may</u> (or may not) lead to the emergence of a project</p> <p>Group identifies for itself the entity</p> <p>Create trust and transparency between all actors before the actual planning process starts</p>
Participation analysis	<p>Include conflict analysis ; try to identify conflicts (open and potential) that could endanger the project</p>

Problem analysis	<p>Pay close attention to selection of participants</p> <p>Ensure effective participation of target groups (e.g. by organising separate workshops for more homogeneous groups)</p>
Objectives analysis	Analyse whether this step is really necessary
Analysis of alternatives	<p>Let people affected decide which criteria to use for the analysis of alternatives</p> <p>Local potentials and resources should play an important role in the choice among the different alternatives</p>
Definition of project logic	<p>To be undertaken by a multidisciplinary team</p> <p>Affected groups themselves identify solutions, as much as possible on the basis of locally existing knowledge and experience</p> <p>Plan a start up phase with pilot activities so as to analyse how project will interact with the environment/context</p>
Identification and assessment of assumptions	<p>Culture, gender and capacity questions to be raised explicitly in assumptions column</p> <p>Assumptions to be discussed by target group in "mini OOIP"</p> <p>Include sustainability analysis that can be performed by all parties involved; by the donor agency, development agency, by the affected groups themselves)</p>
Definition of objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification	Involve all affected groups in definition of OVI (can be different for different groups)

	<p>Select few but essential indicators that are locally relevant</p> <p>Groups themselves define indicators (not necessarily at the beginning)</p>
Structuring of project (*)	<p>The structuring of the project is an issue that should receive as much attention as the different steps of the classic OOIP sequence, so as to adequately determine who will (and can) be responsible for each activity.</p> <p>All parties should be included in the process of the structuring of a project.</p> <p>Rely as much as possible on local organisations ; if necessary, adapt project design</p> <p>Adequate methods should be identified to correctly analyse the potential of local organisations and institutions</p>
Monitoring of project developments (*)	<p>OOIP to be firmly integrated in project cycle management</p> <p>Monitoring of interests and conflicts to be included during project cycle</p> <p>Monitoring system should be designed in such a way that accountability to affected groups is included</p> <p>Use OOIP for internal project review and mid term evaluations (but try to avoid negativity by too much stress on problems)</p>

(\*) Not part of the OOIP sequence as such

### 3. Future exchange of experiences and follow up of the workshop

At the workshop, it was agreed that there should be a systematic exchange of experiences on people-oriented project management. This exchange would include the following major themes :

- the further development of the OOIP methodology ;
- the inclusion of other participatory approaches within the OOIP approach;
- the development of other participatory methods (alternatives to the OOIP) ;
- capacity building related to OOIP (for example the training of moderators).

The exchange of experiences can be realised in different ways :

- through the use of existing channels, such as the MDF Journal, INTRAC Research Papers, the IIED RRA-notes, IDS development papers and so on;
- through the realisation of a project on linking up experiences on people-oriented project management (BADC and other donors could be approached for funding). Such a project could include:
  - . surveys, research, and the compilation of experiences both in GOs and NGOs;
  - . the distribution of the results through a newsletter;
  - . the establishment of a permanent network including organisations in the South and in the North;
- through tri-partite contacts to exchange experiences between the ODA, GTZ and BADC (and possibly also the EC).

## 4. Summary of the presentations

### 4.1. The use of LFA and OOIP as open systems : from management tool via participation to capacity building (Dirk Van Esbroeck, South Research)

LFA was initially conceived as a management tool developed in reaction to the doubtful results of development projects and with the main aim to serve donor needs related to the various aspects of the management of development interventions (appropriate design, clear objectives that can be evaluated, standardized presentation of projects, effective control over the course of the intervention and effective accountability mechanisms).

It was however quickly realised that the LFA could be easily adapted to different situations and needs. As Northern development agencies came to realise that the involvement of the affected people and local organisations were important factors for project success, this LFA potential was used by GTZ to develop ZOPP (OOIP) which involved the introduction of a participatory approach for project planning. The GTZ approach was later further adapted by others to allow more effective participation of the affected groups and to pay more attention to the analysis of the context by linking it with other appraisal techniques such as PRA.

Although planning techniques correctly concentrated on the design of the intervention (by defining objectives, indicators and assumptions) and on the participation of all parties concerned, it was realised that the capacity of organisations in the South to implement projects was often insufficiently emphasized. As a consequence, LFA/OOIP approaches were used as a means for organisational strengthening. This was achieved by the inclusion of an analysis of long term sustainability in the OOIP sequence and by coupling OOIP with activities to structure the intervention.

A further step in the development of LFA/OOIP was its use in processes of institutional development. Whereas participation in the original ZOPP/OOIP approach was still induced by an external intervener and embedded in a procedure that he/she determines, the latter approach ideally starts with a very open "project-less" phase of analysis that may (or may not) lead to the emergence of a programme or project. The direction of such a project is therefore to a much larger extent controlled by the local groups and its development will be tailored to local experiences and capacities with LFA/OOIP being used when and where appropriate.

#### 4.2. LFA and OOIP - clarification or camouflage ? (Edith Sizoo, South-North Network Cultures and Development)

Edith Sizoo began her presentation by stressing the importance of taking culture into account when planning and implementing development programmes.

She defined culture as "the complex whole of answers to the challenges of the natural and social environment which groups of people inherit (from their elders), borrow (from other groups) and invent (themselves)." Culture manifests itself on three different, yet interrelated, levels. At a technical level, culture affects how people make things and do things. At the social level, it affects how people relate to one another: patterns of social organisation, politics, economics, kinship and customs. And at the symbolic level, culture shapes our religious beliefs, values, norms and concepts. Culture functions to help people decide between alternatives; help people make sense of the world; and give people security and self esteem.

According to Edith Sizoo, the Logical Framework Approach, is based on a Western definition of logic and rests on Western concepts of time and space. Edith Sizoo emphasised the difference between our linear understanding of time and the cyclical concept of time one finds in many non-Western cultures. How one plans for the future depends on how one believes it is linked to the present, and to the past. Similarly we in the West are taught to analyse a situation by divorcing ourselves from our surroundings, isolating factors, then looking for cause and effect relationships between these various factors. But in other cultures people view the relationship between Man and his environment very differently and find it impossible to analyse situations in this way.

By assuming that local people think as we do, NGOs and donors that use the Logical Framework Approach in a rigid way, without adapting the method to different cultural contexts, leave local people confused. Projects are described as the 'dreams of the whitemen' set up to satisfy the wishes of outsiders rather than the needs of the local people. The so-called beneficiaries just fill in the forms. By ignoring local methods and local value systems, outside 'experts' effectively discount local culture as worthless, damaging people's self-esteem.

At the analysis stage of OOIP, ideas are shared and cards are placed on the problem tree - out in the open. This is an egalitarian form of decision making from our perspective. But we need to understand how local people perceive the process. Are they really showing all their cards. How egalitarian is it? What power relations are operating within the group and between the



group and the moderator? We might see the LFA as a tool for more rational, systematic project planning. Edith Sizoo fears that our belief in the logic of the approach may lead us to overlook local realities, resulting in less clarification and more camouflage.

We need to analyse ourselves and realise that our assumptions may not be valid. The method may not work in all cultures, or at least will need to be adapted. Only by knowing our own value system can we be sensitive to how our methods will work or fail in different cultures.

At the implementation stage of OOIP, manuals describe how frameworks should be agreed, objectives, indicators, time schedules and so on. Once again, Edith Sizoo argues that the method is based on our view of progress, our concepts of 'efficiency', 'effectiveness', 'rationality' and so on.

To summarise, Edith Sizoo left her listeners the following important questions to consider:

- To what extent is the outsider/intervener trained in his own awareness of his own culture?
- To what extent is the outsider/ intervener trained with regard to the culture of the population groups he is OOIPing with?
- On which implicit and explicit values are the LFA and OOIP based?
- Are these compatible with other value systems?
- In reality, whose selection, strategy, sense, self-esteem and security is enhanced most at the end of the day?
- Last of all, how sustainable are the effects of this so-called "logical" method which:
  - a) intervenes for a restricted period of time in a "place" with a long history and long future?
  - b) intervenes in environments that may function on the basis of other - but in their own right just as logical - frames of reference?

#### 4.3. The History of the Use of the LogFrame within the ODA (Vic Heard, Aid Policy Department, ODA)

The ODA (Overseas Development Administration) began using the LogFrame Approach in the late 1970's. In the mid-1980's it became a mandatory requirement for all projects with budgets over £5 million submitted to the ODA Projects and Evaluation Committee for approval. Since then the threshold for its mandatory use has been reduced to £250,000. It is not a formal requirement for NGO projects submitted to the Joint Funding Scheme (JFS), but NGO applicants are also strongly encouraged to use LogFrames.

The fundamental reason for adopting the LFA was to improve the quality of ODA projects by more systematic, rational planning. Unfortunately the benefits of the technique were not realised. Evaluations carried out within the ODA soon revealed that the LogFrame was not being used as a planning tool. Instead it had become a desk exercise, a set of boxes filled in, usually at the last minute, to secure funding.

Vic Heard put forward a number of reasons for this state of affairs: (i) The LFA was introduced by edict. It was not 'sold' to people, so its advantages were not perceived by ODA staff. (ii) The management culture in the ODA was established around the 'production line' approach, with aid administrators and professional advisers in separate departments with separate line management structures. This system did not lend itself to the integration of managers into project teams. Nor did it produce coherent project designs. (iii) Thirdly, although training in the use of the LFA was made available, it was given too low a priority.

The ODA is currently taking steps to set itself back on course: (i) The ODA been restructured, with specialist advisers now attached to aid administration departments. Projects are now prepared by multi-disciplinary teams allowing for greater discussion of alternatives. (ii) New computer software - TeamUp - has been developed and adopted throughout the ODA. This software leads people through the different stages of the LFA and has created new enthusiasm for the method. (iii) Finally, new training has been introduced, combining the comprehensive use of LFA with enhanced interdisciplinary team working skills.

Difficulties remain. The process is still being elaborated. But there are hopes that the ODA will begin to use the Logical Framework Approach in a more satisfactory way in the future.

#### 4.4. The Project Cycle Management introduced in the European Commission (Gerard McGovern Evaluation Unit D.G. VIII, Commission of the European Communities)

The logical framework has been employed as part of a more comprehensive method known as Project Cycle Management (PCM). Its introduction within the European Commission has been very recent. The adoption of the new method was in line with the Commission's desire to become more answerable and more effective in its assessment of projects and programmes and to focus project design on the real needs of beneficiaries.

The implementation of PCM is having major repercussions on the management of the projects throughout the project cycle (indicative programmes, project identification and formulation,

implementation, evaluation). All project documents through all stages in the project cycle adhere now to a standardised format containing all relevant issues including the assumptions on which the project is based. An assessment of the various factors which determine the sustainability of the project is included in every project phase.

The introduction of the PCM has been accompanied by an extensive training programme for EC professionals in Brussels and field delegations, as well as for national planning officers in countries where EC assisted projects are being implemented. Training sessions have also been conducted for several European government development organisations.

Although it is too early to assess the impact of the introduction of the PCM method, some changes are already quite evident. The PCM has greatly contributed to uniformity in terminology. It has clearly helped clarify the objectives of projects and programmes. It has helped in formulating more realistic objectives and in eliminating bad projects. It is also clear that it has helped a great deal in measuring the progress of projects. On the other hand, it is also clear that the PCM is not a panacea. It is just one method among many and should be used in conjunction with other management tools.

#### **4.5. The Introduction of OOIP in the BADC (Jos Dewint, Department of Organisation, Training and Evaluation, BADC)**

The main reason for BADC's decision to adopt the OOIP approach in the beginning of the 1990's was the often disappointing results of many of its projects. BADC gave itself five years to introduce the OOIP and adapt project cycle management at all levels of its central administration, in the cooperation sections of recipient countries and with different categories of cooperators (local administrations and external consultants).

To that end, initiation seminars were organised at the level of the central administration and in some developing countries; an OOIP manual was edited and published in 3 languages. So, at the end 1991 a major effort on the level of training had been realised; an evaluation conducted at that moment formulated a number of recommendations so as to assure a proper follow up to this considerable training effort. Efforts have since been undertaken to take these recommendations into account, but unfortunately results have remained limited due to a shortage of resources.

Although the introduction of OOIP hasn't been properly evaluated, according to Jos Dewint, the quality of work has certainly improved. However there remain many problems

constraining an effective OOIP-practice (see problem tree in annex) suggesting that its full potential for improving practice has not yet been reached.

Although no explicit measures were undertaken to use OOIP for evaluation purposes, the Evaluation Bureau of BADC has developed an approach which relies heavily on the use of OOIP. This approach has improved the quality of the agency's evaluation reports.

The fact that the OOIP introduction has not been implemented in a participatory way has caused many problems. Another important constraint is that although a large number of problems are well known, no program or plan exists to address this situation. Jos Dewint hinted that maybe the time has come to consider "The introduction of OOIP in BADC" as an important intervention that should be OOIP-ed so that the necessary measures for improvement can be taken!

#### 4.6. Recent developments in GTZ's use of ZOPP (Volker Steigerwald, GTZ, Section 046 Quality Assurance)

GTZ began using the LFA towards the end of the 1970's and developed its own approach, ZOPP, which from 1983 became mandatory as the planning procedure for all new GTZ contributions to projects of partner countries. ZOPP workshops were applied at specific stages of the project life with different levels of detail.

ZOPP has brought important improvements to GTZ's practice, such as active involvement of stakeholders in project preparation; a clear and unified project structure facilitating decision making, steering and control; and a transparency in all steps in planning and decision making.

In a global way, the introduction of ZOPP passed through three major stages: initial scepticism, followed by enthusiasm and, finally, its adoption as a routine procedure. This third phase led to the emergence of a number of problems: such as an oversimplification of reality with too much attention given to planning; and the reduction of ZOPP to the workshop, which in some case became a ritual with little genuine participation on the part of beneficiaries.

The awareness of these shortcomings, coupled with internal and external criticism of the planning of aid programmes and a new GTZ quality initiative, stimulated GTZ to embark on a process to re-think ZOPP, not in the sense of developing a new methodology, but by emphasizing the strong points and addressing the identified weaknesses of the old approach.

As a result, ZOPP was firmly reintegrated into the concept of Project Cycle Management (PCM), ensuring that development projects are properly identified and implemented through the application of the project management function in an iterative way, involving all important stakeholders at all relevant levels.

This process of evolution from ZOPP to PCM/ZOPP is still under way ; it entails, among other things, efforts:

- to clarify the global framework of German Technical Cooperation ;
- to stress the cyclical character of the project management functions, with ZOPP covering the planning function as an integrated element of the PCM ;
- to stress the importance of responsive steering of project operations through a monitoring and evaluation system ;
- to de-emphasize the ZOPP workshops as the central venue for planning to happen ;
- to de-bureaucratise the approach, away from a ritualistic and standard use of procedure; and,
- to stress again ZOPP as an open system, encouraging the appropriate and flexible use of other methods, instruments and tools (for example PRA techniques).

In his concluding remarks, Dr. Steigerwald stated that ZOPP is currently envisaging a further qualitative leap forward. Enhanced flexibility in applying ZOPP and its integration within a broader Project Cycle Management approach should increase the creative potential for planning and steering people-oriented development processes.

#### 4.7. The Use of OOIP in Coopibo-supported programmes in Zimbabwe (Jan Vannoppen, Coopibo)

Coopibo, a small Belgian NGO, is involved in 4 district level agricultural development programmes (ADPs) in the communal areas of Zimbabwe and in a smaller reforestation programme. The general objective of the programmes is to increase the well being of communal households through a sustainable improvement of agricultural production.

The OOIP method has been gradually introduced in these programmes and has now become a major tool for programme planning, monitoring and evaluation. Before OOIP seminars are organised, "warming-up" activities are implemented, such as demonstration plots, village meetings, look and learn visits, participatory surveys, and so on. They enable the programme

initiators and the local population to get acquainted with each other and constitute a firm basis for the subsequent organisation of an OOIP planning seminar.

The OOIP planning seminars are continuously being adapted in the sense that the participation of farmers in the process has gradually increased in all stages of the OOIP sequence. The majority of the participants attending the seminars are now farmers, which means that the views of officials and outsiders no longer dominate discussions. The high involvement of farmers guarantees the down to earth formulation of problems and solutions, as well as the creation of group solidarity and a strong (local) commitment to the execution of the programme. Farmers have also been included in the discussions on the selection of the criteria to be used to decide between the different alternative strategies. Such discussions allow the creation of a clear vision as to how agricultural development actions should be organised at the district level.

During the latest OOIP planning seminars, farmers actively took part in the analysis of possible solutions (activities) for each of the retained objective fields. They found solutions existing at the local level and linked up with other institutions and resource persons when necessary.

The involvement of the community is crucial at every stage. Before farmer representatives come to the seminar, they discuss existing constraints with their group and bring the results to the seminar. Later on in the process, (i.e. after the problem analysis, the selection among the alternative strategies and the drafting of a preliminary action plan), additional feed back sessions are organised at village level.

After 1 to 2 years, the Agricultural Development Programmes go through an intermediate evaluation which may lead to the adaptation of the results of the planning workshop, taking into account previous experiences. Usually, more attention is provided to the farmers' organisational development. At this point, the log-matrix is worked out in detail (clear formulation of results, activities, indicators, and so on) in conjunction with the farmer representatives. From then onwards, the log-matrix becomes a planning and monitoring instrument.

As a similar approach is used in all ADPs, exchange of experiences between the different programmes has become far more straightforward. In addition, according to Jan Vannoppen, the introduction of the OOIP method has been appreciated by Coopibo's partner organisations and the service institutions it cooperates with. Some of them have also adopted the OOIP method in their work.

#### 4.8. The Use of the Logical Framework by The Save the Children Fund in a Rural Development Project in Pakistan (Louisa Gosling, Save the Children)

SCF have recently produced a manual providing information to field staff on the different planning, monitoring and evaluation methods available. In this document, the Logical Framework Approach is presented as one tool among many, with its own particular strengths and weaknesses.

The LFA can be a good way to check the internal logic of a project plan and ensure that strategies, objectives and aims are linked. It makes planners think about how they will monitor and evaluate a programme by identifying indicators. It also makes planners state the assumptions they are making and identify at the outset the critical factors for success. It can therefore be a useful tool for stimulating discussion about the feasibility of activities.

However, the method also has its weaknesses. The construction of project frameworks is time-consuming and requires considerable training in the concepts and logic of the approach. There is also a danger that project managers can become too rigidly focused on setting and meeting project-centred targets, or on measuring indicators. This may result in a project becoming less flexible and less responsive to changes in situation as the project progresses.

Louisa Gosling admitted that the Logical Framework Approach is not commonly used within Save the Children. Nevertheless she presented a case study showing how in one SCF project in Pakistan the LFA has helped project staff focus their objectives and clarify their long term aims.

The Thar Parkar Rural Development Project (TRDP) started in 1987 as a drought relief operation in the desert region of Pakistan. Five years later, it had expanded into a development programme, with projects covering such areas as health, education, income generation, farming and so on. On the initiative of a new Programme Director, the decision was taken to introduce a clear monitoring and review system to ensure that the programme did not become merely a collection of separate activities, but instead was able to retain its sense of purpose as a single integrated rural development project.

Over a period of twelve months, the TRDP conducted an internal review of its operations. Staff workshops were held and, with a certain amount of guidance from senior managers, project staff have succeeded in devising their own monitoring, review and planning (MRP) system based on LFA.

The programme has been broken down into a number of sectors, each of which is made up of several key components. Specific objectives have then been agreed for each of these sectors and components and indicators have been chosen, against which to measure progress. Each month, monitoring forms are filled in to examine progress against plans and objectives for each specific component. In addition, every six months a wider review is undertaken to monitor progress against broader objectives. These reviews enable staff to discuss the activities of the past six months, examine the assumptions upon which past plans were based and, where necessary, revise objectives and plans for the future. (For a list of the indicators selected and copies of monitoring forms used: see annex).

The MRP system was put in place in 1992. The verdict two years on (in 1994) is generally positive. According to a recent memo to Louisa Gosling from Pakistan, the six monthly review workshops are proving very valuable in providing feedback to both staff and project managers. Some problems have nevertheless been encountered. Making up the list of indicators is a difficult process and it can take a long time before the whole team reaches agreement on the final list of indicators to be used. There is also some confusion as to exactly how some indicators (particularly those that are qualitative) should be measured. A further problem, given the relative complexity of the logical frameworks being used, is high staff turnover. Time needs to be found to train everyone and regular updates are needed for new staff. Finally there is also a need to involve the affected population more in planning and in the definition of objectives.

#### 49. The Use of LFA/OOIP/ZOPP for Evaluation Purposes (Martin Dütting, Misereor)

Evaluation as it is conceived now within Misereor, emphasizes joint and self evaluations and is very much concerned with respecting the autonomy of partner organisations. It further stresses the necessity of adapting methodologies to local needs and uses a mix of methods that might include elements of ZOPP.

ZOPP is essentially considered as a planning method, providing some elements for evaluation through the project planning matrix (the definition of objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification). Some elements of the ZOPP tool box have however been used by Misereor for evaluation purposes, with some positive results. Dr. Dütting presented 3 short cases to illustrate the possible uses of ZOPP for evaluation purposes.

(i) During an evaluation in Uganda, ZOPP was used to carry out a decentralised analysis, the results of which were brought together in a concluding workshop where a rudimentary project



planning matrix was established. In this case, ZOPP was used in combination with more classical evaluation approaches such as programme and performance analysis. The results of the ZOPP analysis were useful in providing the explanations for the outcome of the performance analysis and in assisting the external evaluators in formulating recommendations at the end of the process.

(ii) During an evaluation of an agro-forestry project on the Solomon Islands, ZOPP was used in an improvised way. Since a purely classical joint evaluation approach produced unsatisfactory results, it was decided to shift to a ZOPP-style approach in order to be able to identify the underlying problems. The method, including a problem and objectives analysis, worked well once the initial reluctance of the groups concerned had been overcome. Recommendations were deduced by using the image of climbing over existing obstacles to reach the place where the group wanted to get to in the future.

(iii) In Madagascar, ZOPP was used to guide the self-evaluation of the development programme of a diocese. ZOPP proved a useful tool to "reconstruct" the activities and programmes of the past (that have been set up in a rather intuitive, unsystematic way), and to re-plan the second cycle of the programme.

In conclusion, Dr. Dütting stated that some elements of the ZOPP methodology are useful for evaluation purposes: it allows participation; it can provide a solution if discussions are blocked; and it offers a method for planning activities after the evaluation, especially when it is used in a creative way in combination with other methods such as RRA/PRA. Problems experienced when using the method for evaluation purposes include its "snap shot" character (the history of a project not being reflected in the results of the process) and its "negativity" (i.e. its heavy stress on the analysis of problems).

Misereor feels that many of its partners are very creative in using parts of the methodology for their own purposes and needs. The on-going PME (planning, monitoring, evaluation) dialogue, jointly initiated by Misereor, EZE and Bread for the World, will allow it to collect experiences in an open way and develop a broader range of modified and culturally adapted ZOPP variants.

#### 4.10. Local organisations and project implementation : the use of the LF for structuring development interventions (Herman Snelder, MDF)

MDF distinguishes 5 basic steps in the iterative process of designing an intervention (see page 5 of annex 11) ; these steps are in one way or another related to the OOIP steps and precedes the actual implementation of the intervention. Hereafter mainly those steps, that are not explicitly taken up in the classic OOIP sequence, will be described in detail.

##### *1. The description of the context*

This step contains the description of the operational environment and the institutional setting in which the intervention will be embedded. It includes the description of all organisations and their mutual relations and a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats).

##### *2. The analysis of the operational environment*

This step is similar to the first steps of the OOIP sequence : choice of the entity to be analysed, analysis of the parties involved, analysis of problems, analysis of objectives, analysis of criteria and alternatives.

##### *3. Choice and elaboration of objectives, results and activities, and of the logical framework*

This step relates to the second part of the OOIP : the setting up of a planning matrix. However, the results of step 4 below (the analysis of implementing organisations), may lead to subsequent modifications of the logical framework.

##### *4. Analysis of implementing organisations*

This analysis is considered as an essential complement to the OOIP and LFA approaches that focus only on the question : *what* has to be done ? It is important to assess to what extent (local) organisations are able to implement the activities as defined through the OOIP/LFA process (i.e. *who* will do the job?).

Several methods can be applied to determine whether organisations are able to carry out certain project activities. An *external* analysis can examine a number of aspects of an organisation: its mission; output; input; relations with the context. These may be described and judged from the perspective of the results of the logframe. The external analysis can be

complemented by an *internal* analysis that also takes into consideration the internal aspects of an organisation: its primary process, its structure, systems, staff and style of leadership. This analysis takes only place after the final decision has been taken regarding the responsibility of the organisation for a specific cluster of project activities.

It should be noted that analyses of organisations are very sensitive exercises and should be carried out carefully, with the involvement of all layers of the organisations involved, for in the end it is they who finally have to accept the changes proposed and who are responsible for carrying them out.

The results of these analyses indicate the strong and weak points of an organisation in relation to the project activities and serve as a basis for the formulation of strengthening activities that complete the already prepared logical framework.

If no organisations are identified that are suited to carry out certain activities, this may imply that the logical framework has to be adapted so as to become more compatible with the local institutional environment.

#### *5. Structuring and organising development interventions (with more partners involved)*

This step aims at structuring the intervention in such a way that all implementing parties know for which activities they are responsible. Selected implementing organisations are made responsible for clusters of operational and strengthening activities. In addition, coordinating and control activities are identified and assigned to existing organisations or temporary coordination bodies.

The following sub-steps can be distinguished in this regard: the (re)grouping of operational activities (on the basis of the logical framework); the assigning of these activities to implementing organisations; the identification and assigning of strengthening activities; the identification and assigning of coordination and control activities; and the determination of coordination activities. Representatives of all organisations concerned are to be involved in this process.





