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**Module 4 Questions:**

**Q1**: Explain the differences between a results framework and a logical framework (10mrks)

.

**Results Framework**

This is the next major step involves detailing a program’s course of action; specifically, how will we successfully achieve our goal from a few ‘on the ground’ activities? How can we ensure that various initiatives are working towards that goal? Before determining how exactly to hold various stages of activities, or program inputs accountable, one must create a Results Framework to specify the strategy of reaching a goal, incorporating SMART objectives and intermediate results and finally specific activities.

A Results Framework is constructed from a project LogFrame by converting the LogFrame’s impact and outcomes into final goal and intermediate goals (or objectives) supported by measurable indicators. demonstrates a general results framework, which clearly displays a goal, objective, intermediate results (effects) and activities. At this point, before beginning the project itself, it is essential to attach measurable indicators for each activity component. demonstrate how a results framework is developed for each activity of the results framework without losing your “place” in the big picture (results framework).

Results frameworks are diagrams that identify and illustrate causal relationships linking levels of

**Logical framework**

Once abasic project goal has been established and potential objectives suggested, it is time to start thinking about how exactly to achieve these outcomes. What will the program consist of? Which proposed interventions should be chosen? Taking the time to conduct strategic planning will save a lot of time and money throughout project implementation, ensuring a logical cause-effect path directly towards the intended results, and eventually the final goal al Framework

LogFrame Matrices are the most common frameworks and are seen in almost any solid M&E plan, evaluation report etc. Most donors today expect to see a LogFrame Matrix for a complete picture of project intent; proposed activities, indicators, tools and assumptions. That is because,

the LogFrame brings everything together to neatly forms a matrix demonstrating an integrated program and M&E system. If a project is properly designed and M&E is in place, it should be impossible to separate out the project details from the M&E system itself.

“A LogFrame Matrix summarizes what a project intends to do and how, what the key assumptions are, and how outputs and outcomes will be monitored and evaluated.” This LogFrame Matrix clearly depicts logical flow of how the actual goals and objectives correspond to outputs, activities, indicators, and assumptions. When this information is packaged into a LogFrame Matrix, program managers, donors and other stakeholders can easily ascertain the program’s path towards achieving overall impact.

* what the project should achieve (the goals and objectives)
* the indicators that will be used to monitor progress towards these goals as well as overall achievement;
* how these indicators will be monitored and the source of the data;
* the assumptions behind the design logic of how the activities will contribute to achieving the goal and objectives, and
* risks for the project if the assumptions turn out to be incorrect. from objectives to impacts.

**Q 2**: Use the dummy project that seeks to roll out mass measles immunization campaign by organization XYT in Juba, South Sudan (ref: Module 2, **Q3)**, to develop an M&E logical framework to facilitate both project management and M&E. (20 mrks)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project description | Indicators | Mean of verification | Assumption and risk |
| Goal/impact  Improve health and wellbeing of children under 5 years in juba South Sudan | 95% reduction in child mortality rate | Evaluation survey record | Measles immunization at the household level have increased by 40% |
| Outcome  Reduction in measles infection cases among the children under 5 years in juba South Sudan | probability of household being in a vulnerable state of measles infection in future is reduced by 30% (of headcount)  70% of Women have increased awareness of the impact measles infection has on their children and knowledge of available services (i.e. awareness of community resources/supports) for their children | Household survey |  |
| Output 1  Improve the awareness of the measles immunization campaign to increase significantly with the use of social mobilization materials | a minimum of 250 000 households have maintain a sustainable measles immunization and 30 000 households have adopted seeking the maternal care centers for immunization purposes |  | Security does not deteriorate significantly, and the juba city population maintains its access to maternal care centers.  Funding requirements are met up to enough level to achieve the output |
| Output 2  Improve accessibility of immunization centers | the number of women accessing childcare and support |  | Financial and health crisis does not deepen.  Funding requirements are met up to enough level to achieve the output. |
|  |  |  |  |

**Q 3**: Making references to the elements of a results framework, use the dummy project in Q2 above to construct a results framework. (20mrks)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | LEVEL | STATEMENT OF RESULT | | INDICATORS | DATA SOURCE | TIME FRAME | ASSUMPTION AND RISK | | Goal/impact | The primary purpose of measles immunization is to attain high levels of population immunity by reaching and protecting children unreached by routine immunization services and children who failed to develop immunity after their first dose of measles vaccine. In order to achieve the primary objective of the project  95% of Children under 5 years whose mothers experience reduction in measles infection cases and have access to services that improve their health and wellbeing | -95% reduction in child mortality rate  - 90% decrease in monthly notification rates was seen  0.5% of measles cases were reported all were less than 5years old,  -95% reduction in measles infection cases | | House to house evaluation survey  House to house evaluation survey  Evaluation survey  Dhs record and evaluation record | As registration record become available  Quarterly | Reducing level of measles infection  Against children under 5 years  Availability of resources, including vaccine, budget cycles and vaccine ordering timeliness must be considered | | Outcome | Improve coverage among the children under 5 years |  | | Number of awareness conducted with caregivers |  |  | | Output 1 | Improve health skills and adoption of proper procedures of immunization against measles | Number of children vaccinated per a day in juba South Sudan | |  |  | As long as the commitment and support from the key partners are obtain then there are no more issue | | Output 2 | Improve coverage as a result of mobilization  Improve the capacity of the health workers who are responsible to carry out measles immunization | 90% of eligible children are vaccinated fully | |  |  |  | |

**Q 4:** Briefly explain, with examples, the key components of a logical framework (10

**Key component of the logical framework**

* **DEVELOPMENT/ PROGRAMME GOAL (IMPACT)**

The programme goal (impact) reflects the improvements of a situation in terms of social, economic or any other benefits which respond to identified development needs of the target population under a long-term vision. Usually, several projects will share a common programme goal.

* **PROJECT OBJECTIVE (OUTCOME)**

The project objective reflects what the project intends to accomplish. The project objective will reflect the justification for carrying out the project and will summarize the effects it should have. The project objective should try to define the sustainable benefits to the target group. For instance, the project objective should explain how the initiative will affect the current situation and what difference it will make for the beneficiaries. Ideally the project should only have a single objective. The number of objectives should be limited to maximum three. Too many project objectives will typically imply that the project is too complex to manage or that the team is trying to design a long-term programme while calling it a project.

* **OUTPUTS AND COSTS**

Outputs describe the concrete goods and/or services the project will deliver. These are the products of the activities that will be undertaken. The combination of outputs will achieve the project objective.

* Costs:

Information on **the sum of costs of outputs per outcome** should be indicated in the logframe. They are based on the detailed budget included in the Project Proposal.  
In case of multi-partner projects, the logframe as annex of the Project Proposal includes as far as possible information on the share of SPCP contribution to the total costs (in amount as well as %).

* **ACTIVITIES**

The activities define the way the project team intends to carry out the project. They are composed of a set of actions to deliver concrete results. The activities will form the backbone based on which a detailed plan of operations will be developed. The plan of operations will include individual work plans of the team members, their responsibility regarding each activity and its sub-activities.

The matrix should not include an extensive list of projects activities and focus on **what** the project is to deliver and not on **how**. Key activities show the link between activities and outputs. The complete list of activities belongs in the main text of the project document.

* **INDICATORS:**

Indicators are quantitative or qualitative references that provide a simple and reliable means to measure project progress and achievements.6 Indicators at different levels of the logframe will demonstrate that the project has completed its activities, delivered its intended results and achieved its objective. They provide a signal of progress (or lack thereof), not scientific proof.

The indicators should be SMART

**S**pecific to the project objective, results and activities it is supposed to measure

**M**easurable either quantitatively or qualitatively

**A**vailable at an acceptable cost

**R**ealistic so that the project team is confident they are likely to occur and achievable, and

**T**ime-specific so that the project team knows when or within which period it can be measured.

The number of indicators should be as few as possible, as many as necessary to assess intended changes. Outcome indicators are used for monitoring, project reviews and evaluations. Output indicators are used during monitoring and review.

* **MEANS OF VERIFICATIONS:**

Means of verification indicate what source of information will be used to verify progress towards, or achievement of, indicators. Means of verification should clearly describe where, and in what form, the necessary data will be obtained.

* **INPUTS**

Means are physical and non-physical inputs and finances necessary to carry out the planned activities and manage the project.

Inputs are detailed as part of the project document and its budget.

* **ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS:**

Assumptions and risks are external factors that lie outside the team’s control but are likely to influence the project’s success. An *assumption* is a ***positive*** statement of a condition that must be met for the project's objectives to be achieved.

A *risk* is a ***negative*** statement of a condition that might prevent the project's objectives from being achieved

**Q5:** A logical framework approach (LFA) provides the structure for logical thinking… Explain what this phrase means.

* What LFA seeks to do is provide a structure which will allow project planners and evaluators to specify the components of their activities and identify the logical linkages between a set of means and a set of ends
* Purpose - What the project is expected to achieve in development terms once it is completed within the allocated time. The purpose is the motivation behind the production of the outputs. Outputs - The specific results to be produced by the management of inputs. Inputs - The activities to be undertaken and the resources available to produce the outputs. This terminology is comparable to the inputs/outputs/ effect impact sequence used elsewhere but for the purposes of this paper the original PCI terms will be used. Each objective at each level of the hierarchy is indicated in the Log Frame under the heading Narrative Summary. The first three levels (inputs, outputs, purpose) are specific to the project itself, while the highest level - the goal - relates the project to the programme of which the project is a part, or it relates a programme to other programmes to which it is a contributor. Consider the project which is concerned with. mass measles campaign the inputs required for this project consist of financial and human resource in which to hold it. The output resulting from this provision is to establish maternal care resource centers and procurement of cold chain boxes development of IEC material, and the purpose is to reduce cases of measle infection among the children under5 years. The goal of this project is to maintain a healthy life for the children under 5 years: the achievement of the purpose “to satisfy measle free environment” will clearly contribute to this but, just as clearly, it is not the only component of the goal. The elimination of measle infection is a necessary but not enough component of the goal “to maintain a healthy life for the children under 5 years”. Put another way, we can say that the achievement of the project purpose will not automatically lead to the achievement of the project goal if other complementary projects aimed at the same goal, fail to achieve their purposes. This point will be taken up again at a later stage. The two lower levels of the vertical logic are referred to as the ‘manageable interest’ of the project since it is the job of the project manager to ensure the provision of inputs and their conversion to outputs. Whether these outputs will achieve their purpose will depend upon one or more development hypotheses which remain to be verified for this project. These hypotheses will be considered in greater detail in a subsequent section of this paper. A major feature of the hierarchy in the Log Frame is the sequence in which the results should be considered. It is extremely important that results should be examined sequentially from the bottom upwards through the hierarchy. There is little point in attempting an evaluation of goals unless we can be sure that the purposes which contribute to them have been achieved. Similarly, at a lower level there is little point in examining and critically evaluating outputs unless we can
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