

PROJECT NAME	The Practice of Conflict Sensitivity					
GOAL	Indicator	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	
Greater impact of development & humanitarian assistance through improved, & more widespread mainstreaming of, Conflict Sensitive Approaches.	No of donors and NGOs: i) able to give examples / evidence of improved CSA policies and practice since 2008. ii) able to give examples of how the CSA consortium influenced/supported the above.	0 agencies in 0 countries	Goal indicator target finalised	All consortium agencies in 4 countries NGOs/Donors targeted in FY03 outreach/advocacy	X Donors and X NGOs in 4 countries (TBD see milestone 1)	
		Source				
		Proposal	Mid-term evaluation	Reports on consortium agency improved practice	End of project survey across NGOs/Donors targeted through consortium outreach Final evaluation	

PURPOSE	Indicator 1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	Assumptions	
To improve policies and practices that support CSA across a broad network of NGOs, local partners and donor agencies.	DFID adjusts its policies and procedures based on Consortium findings and best practice	No previous consortium engagement with DFID	Consortium/DFID develop joint strategy for improving DFID policies and procedures based on consortium findings	Progress in the joint strategy. DFID and consortium working jointly to influence other donors/NGOs to support conflict sensitivity.	Achievement of goals in joint strategy	CSA increases effectiveness and sustainability of development aid and humanitarian assistance. Consortium members will pass the CSA concept to their partners and CBOs.Both policy and practice levels are willing to address the inevitable challenges to CSA integration as evidenced in resource allocations; specific competency profiles of staff; and funding priorities.	
		Source					
		Proposal	Strategy document Meetings with DFID Mid-term evaluation	Progress report	Final evaluation		
	Indicator 2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
	No. of countries achieve targets set in outreach strategies	No previous consortium outreach	Outreach strategies developed in 4 countries	Progress according to outreach strategies in 4 countries	Achievement of outreach strategies in 4 countries		
		Source					
		Proposal	Outreach strategies Mid-term evaluation	Outreach progress reports	Final evaluation		
	Indicator 3	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
	No of agencies able to demonstrate improvements in CSA capacity	Minimal previous coordinated multi-agency attempts to build CSA across consortium agencies in target countries	Agencies in 4 countries establish CSA capacity baselines	10 in UK 9 in Sri L 7 in Sierra L 8 in Kenya Meeting milestones	10 in UK 9 in Sri L 7 in Sierra L 8 in Kenya Demonstrate improvements		
		Source					
Proposal		Baselines from self-assessments Mid-term Evaluation	Progress reports from 4 countries Baselines from self-assessments	Final evaluation			
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)		
	£2,100,000	N/A	N/A	£2,100,000	100%		
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)						
	N/A						
OUTPUT 1	Indicator 1.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	Assumption	

Output 1: Shared understanding of CSA to development and humanitarian assistance	No. consortium agencies reach shared understanding of CSA.	Minimal multi-agency wide shared understanding in target countries.	10 UK  Shared understanding reached in UK	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 7 Sierra L Shared understanding reached within 4 countries.	Articulation of sharing understanding of CSA across consortium members within and across 4 countries	Consortium members willing to buy into the concept of conflict sensitivity
IMPACT WEIGHTING	20%	Source				RISK RATING
		Proposal. Desk review document	UK benchmarking paper and report on UK workshop	Reports from workshops in 3 countries + feedback on benchmarking paper Mid-term evaluation	Consortium wide report on shared understanding Final evaluation	Low
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)	
	£2,500	N/A	N/A			
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)					
	N/A					
OUTPUT 2	Indicator 2.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	Assumptions
CSA review of institutional blockages and capacity constraints to CSA within agencies and externally and identified steps to address these	No. of agencies having conducted CSA capacity self-assessments and identified blockages/capacity constraints to conflict sensitivity	0 agencies	Methodology developed	10 in UK	10 in UK 9 in Sri L 7 in Sierra Leone 8 in Kenya	Agencies willing and able to implement steps identified
		Source				
		Proposal	Methodology documents	UK self assessment case studies	Kenya, Sri Lanka, Sierra Leone self assessment case studies Final evaluation	
IMPACT WEIGHTING	Indicator 2.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	
20%	No. of agencies having reported on internal/external constraints to CSA and No. of agencies having developed change objectives to address these constraints.	0 agencies	10 agencies in UK having reported on internal/external constraints	8 Kenya 9 Sri L 7 Sierra L having reported on internal/external constraints	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 7 Sierra L having developed change objectives to address constraints.	
		Source				RISK RATING
		Proposal	Report on self-assessment findings from UK	Report on self-assessment findings from 3 other countries Mid-term evaluation	Finalised change objectives from 4 countries	Low
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)	
	£42,764	N/A	N/A	£42,764	100%	
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)					
	N/A					
OUTPUT 3	Indicator 3.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	Assumptions

Increased capacity of international consortium members and civil society partners to implement effective CSA	No of agencies having developed capacity building plans for achieving change objectives .	0 agencies	10 UK agencies	8 Kenya 8 Sri L 7 Sierra L	Agencies in all countries	That increased CSA capacity leads to more effective programming	
		Source					Changes valued and approved by agency HQs
		Proposal	Capacity building plans Mid-term evaluation	Capacity building plans Mid-term evaluation	Summary report on capacity building plans Final evaluation		
IMPACT WEIGHTING	Indicator 3.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
20%	No of individual agencies achieving change objectives in line with capacity building plans .	0 agencies	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 7 Sierra L	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 7 Sierra L	10 UK 8 Kenya 9 Sri L 7 Sierra L		
		Source					RISK RATING
		Proposal	Progress reports from 4 countries	Progress reports from 4 countries	Final progress reports from 4 countries Final evaluation	Low	
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)		
	£269,000	N/A	N/A	£269,000	100%		
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)						
	N/A						
OUTPUT 4	Indicator 4.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	Assumptions	
Documentation of effective practice in CSA mainstreaming in a range of countries/context s, across different sectors and multiple organisations	No of countries having posted no. of case studies on external part of consortium website.	0 countries consistently documenting case studies and no consortium website	Website re-launched	Current practice case studies documented in 4 countries + emergency pilot	Consortium case studies documented in 4 countries + emergency pilot	That demonstrating good and bad practice will make a compelling case for changed policies and practices.	
		Source					That agencies are willing to release case studies to consortium website
		Proposal	Website Mid-term evaluation	Website List of available case studies	Consolidated consortium report on case studies Final evaluation		
IMPACT WEIGHTING	Indicator 4.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
10%	No. of countries achieving targets set in Consortium communications and dissemination strategy	0 past consortium communication/dissemination work	Consortium communications and dissemination strategy developed	4 countries achieving first milestones	4 countries achieving targets		
		Source					RISK RATING
		Proposal	Strategy Mid-term evaluation	Progress reports from 4 countries	Consolidated report on communications and dissemination Final evaluation	Low	
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)		
	£33,000	N/A	N/A	£33,000	100%		
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)						
	N/A						

OUTPUT 5	Indicator 5.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	Assumptions	
Innovative approaches to CSA are field tested by consortium members and partners in three countries, and CSA is applied to one emergency response	No. of countries having conducted CSA project implementation pilots	No consortium CSA implementation pilots previously undertaken	3 countries document current practice on CSA in project implementation	3 countries design CSA pilots	CSA pilots implemented in 3 countries	Sufficient security and freedom of movement within identified countries	
		Source					
		Proposal	Reports on CSA in project implementation practice from 3 countries	CSA pilot plans from 3 countries Mid-term evaluation	CSA pilot reports from 3 countries Final evaluation		
	Indicator 5.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
	Effect of conflict sensitivity assessed by appropriate M&E system	No past consortium experience with CSA M&E	Appropriate M&E system designed in 3 countries	Appropriate M&E system being applied in 3 countries	Appropriate M&E system evaluated in 3 countries		
		Source					
		Proposal	Reports on M&E system from 3 countries Mid-term evaluation	Progress report on M&E of CSA implementation pilots	Summary of M&E evaluation findings and recommendations. Final evaluation		
IMPACT WEIGHTING	Indicator 5.3	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
20%	Guidance for applying CSA to emergency response developed	No past consortium experience	First draft of guidance for applying CSA to emergency response developed	CSA guidance applied to 1 emergency response	CSA emergency pilot evaluated and guidance revised		
		Source					RISK RATING
		Proposal	Guidance documentation	Report on emergency response	Post-response evaluation Final Evaluation	Low	
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)		
	£450,000	N/A	N/A	£450,000	100%		
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)						
	N/A						

OUTPUT 6	Indicator 6.1	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)	Assumptions	
Key lessons and policy recommendations delivered through an effective advocacy strategy to influence policy processes in donors/networks/NGOs	No of countries having undertaken policy analysis to inform advocacy agenda	No past consortium analysis	Review of global CSA policy	Policy review conducted in 4 countries	Policies monitored in 4 countries	DFID assists in project visibility	
		Source					Policy makers willing to engage on CSA
		Proposal	UK desk review document	Policy review reports	Policy review reports Final evaluation		
	Indicator 6.2	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
	No. of countries achieving progress as per advocacy strategy	No past consortium advocacy	Advocacy strategy developed in 4 countries	Advocacy strategy progressing in 4 countries	Achievement of advocacy strategy aims in 4 countries		
		Source					
		Proposal	Advocacy strategies	Reports on advocacy progress / reports on advocacy events	Reports on achievement of advocacy targets Final evaluation		

IMPACT WEIGHTING	Indicator 6.3	Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (March 2012)		
10%	No. of countries having consolidated and disseminated key consortium recommendations	No past consortium experience.	Recommendations developed	Dissemination strategy developed	Recommendations shared as per dissemination strategy in 4 countries		
		Source					RISK RATING
		Proposal	List of recommendations	Dissemination strategy	Report on dissemination Final evaluation	Low	
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)	Govt (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)		
	£118,000	N/A	N/A	£118,000	100%		
INPUTS (HR)	DFID (FTEs)						
	N/A						