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PART I BACKGROUND

Introduction

NLR has initiated an adjustment to the way NLR supported projects are planned. With these adjustments, three objectives are pursued:

- Increased local ownership of the NLR supported projects
- Improved local management capacity
- Increased project efficiency

These objectives will be achieved via:

- Involvement of main stakeholders in the analysis of the functioning of leprosy control and in providing ideas for future improvements
- Introduction of the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) in project planning and management

This manual describes the steps to be taken when planning for a next project phase. It is written for those who will facilitate the planning workshop and for the project managers who are responsible for using the workshop results towards a renewed project document. Using a participatory workshop in the planning process is the preferred approach for NLR.

The manual consists of two parts:

- Background information in order to understand the role and function of the planning workshop
- Guidelines for facilitators and project managers to guide a logical framework planning workshop.

In the annexes, supporting materials are provided.

NLR is aware that improving the local planning and management capacity for leprosy control programmes is a longer term process. In the past, project documents were often conceived and formulated by NLR paid staff, based on an evaluation which was external to the local management. Working towards increased local ownership will take time in which the NLR staff might function as technical and management coach. This coaching role is crucial for the success of Project Cycle Management and Logical Framework Analysis. Depending on the specific country, the coaching role might have more or less emphasis.

At the same time, in order to achieve sustainability in the logframe approach, NLR is committed to adjust the approach to the planning, monitoring and reporting practices in the various countries with which it has agreements. Compatibility between the project document – which is the final result of the workshop process – and the local planning, budgeting and management procedures will increase the chances for a continuous improvement of the
leprosy control programmes.

Striking the right balance between the local procedures and practices on planning and management with the need from NLR to justify its support towards its donors, is a matter of sensitization and negotiation which is to take place before decisions on the logframe workshop are made. NLR and the project management will need to come to an agreement on this issue. Only then a fruitful cooperation can take place.

In some cases – for budgetary or logistical reasons and after consultations between project manager and NLR – it may be decided to opt for a more limited planning process, without organising a workshop. For these cases a more limited process might be followed, see Annex I. This will be the case in countries – or certain areas of a larger country – where the NLR assistance is rather limited.

1. **Project Cycle Management and Logical Framework**

The Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) is a vital part of NLR’s approach to project management. NLR views project management as a cycle of activities and decision making, see Figure 1.

![Figure 1: The NLR Project Cycle](image)

The project cycle usually covers a period of 4-5 years and consists of five main stages:
• Project Evaluation
Assessment of the project’s results. A team of experts provides an overall view on the project’s functioning during the past period. This assessment can be complemented by a separate study on clients’ perspectives. The assessment is an input to the subsequent planning workshop.

• Preparation of the project document
The information to be included in the project document is gathered in the Logical Framework Planning workshop. This workshop provides the basis for the next phase of the project. The workshop consists of three parts:
  o Situational Analysis. A wide variety of stakeholders provides an analysis of the current situation on leprosy control in the project area. The result of this part is an agreed upon list of priority issues to be dealt with in the next phase of the project.
  o Project planning. Those responsible for project implementation continue to formulate a detailed project plan with objectives, indicators for success, activities, main responsibilities and budget requirements.
  o Management arrangements. Project management and advisers finalise the workshop by elaborating on management roles, monitoring arrangements and timing of preparatory activities.

• Approval of the project document
The project manager, as the government’s representative, translates the results of the planning workshop into a project document which is submitted to partner decision makers and NLR for comments. After processing the comments it will be submitted to Government and NLR for approval.

• Progress monitoring
The project manager, if needed assisted by NLR advisers, monitors project progress and provides monitoring reports to NLR. The annual plans are based on the general activity plan outlined in the project document.

• Mid-term review
External assessment of project functioning, usually carried out after two-three years. Aim is to determine needs for adjustments in project strategies, division of responsibilities and budget allocation.

The project management cycle generates five types of documents:
• Project document
• Progress reports
• Annual plans

---

1 Evaluation is often mentioned as the final phase in PCM. In the case of NLR supported projects, evaluation is mentioned as the first activity because the projects in which LFA is introduced, are already running for a number of years.
2 Guidelines for these studies have been published by NLR.
3 Usually a Government Department.
The Logical Framework Analysis is the instrument of Project Cycle Management that assists project management in formulating a practical and feasible project plan. It assists in structuring the thoughts, ideas and concepts of those involved with the project. It creates a common project language. LFA can be seen as *structuring common sense*. The LFA provides tools for:

- Situational analysis
- Project formulation
- Resource allocation
- Project monitoring and evaluation
- Project documentation and reporting

Figure 2 shows the three phases of LFA: analysis, planning and implementation. These phases are the subjects of this manual.

The LFA Planning Workshop elaborates on these phases. Through a participatory process and using a set of tools, the workshop will result in a widely agreed upon project plan, which forms the basis for writing the project document. The main tool in LFA is the Logframe Matrix, see Figure 3.
This matrix is further explained in the second part of these guidelines and in the separate hand-out on the EU approach on logical framework⁴.

2. **Workshop organisation and facilitation**

The LFA Planning Workshop is a participatory and structured process of analysis and planning in which the participants systematically arrive at an agreed upon project plan. The expected duration of the workshop is five days, see Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Large group of stakeholders (max. 40)</th>
<th>1. Situational analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Project implementation group (max. 20)</td>
<td>2. Identifying strategic options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>Project management and advisers (max. 10)</td>
<td>3. Selecting project strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Activity and resource scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Arrangements for monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁴ Aid Delivery Methods, Volume 1: Project Cycle Management Guidelines, EC March 2004. Available at NLR Head Quarters, Amsterdam
The workshop is facilitated by an external professional. Being an outsider ensures that the participants (management, implementing staff and external stakeholders) can fully focus on the contents of the workshop. Preferably, the facilitator is not a professional in leprosy control, this would distract too much from the facilitation tasks. The facilitator’s task is:

- To guide the group through the logframe planning process
- To ensure proper use of the logframe methodology and tools
- To steer group dynamics (discussions, dilemmas, conflicts)
- Build consensus
- To manage time

The workshop is participatory in the sense that the participants develop the project plan, guided by the facilitator who is neutral and more knowledgeable about the planning methodology. Guidelines for being an effective facilitator of participatory workshops have been formulated in various publications. NLR’s selection of essential facilitation guidelines would be:

- Create an open atmosphere for communication and decision making. This atmosphere can be influenced through the physical environment and the facilitator’s attitude
  - A conducive environment is less formal and is spacious. This can be achieved through: do away with tables (only some tables for materials), use comfortable chairs, have seating arrangements where participants can easily see each other (sitting in rows usually blocks communication), prepare for undisturbed small group discussions, minimise outside noise
  - The facilitator’s attitude is a balance between following the schedule of the logframe workshop and following the participants’ need to discuss their topics; balancing between process and result. This requires flexibility in method use and strictness in following the schedule; there is no clearcut rule but striking the right balance.

- The workshop methodology is the main focus of the facilitator, content knowledge is less needed. The facilitator is an expert on logframe and explains the workshop process through slide presentations on each step. Even though the facilitator is not an expert in leprosy control, he/she will need to be able to guide discussions on the contents. Therefore, the facilitator will need to have minimal knowledge about leprosy control essentials and jargon.

---

5 Two recommended publications are:
- Robert Chambers, Participatory Workshops, a sourcebook of 21 sets of ideas and activities, Earthscan, London, 2002

6 However, during the first two days when a large group of stakeholders will be present, this seating arrangement might not be possible.
• Focus on organisation and management. Planning for the next project phase is a management task. For the workshop participants remaining after the analysis phase it implies that they are not asked to solve practical day-to-day implementation problems; they are planning how to solve implementation issues in the future. It is the facilitator’s task to limit discussions on implementation issues, these only serve as examples to justify planning decisions. The facilitator’s focus is on future directions and how to get there.

• Visualise workshop results. The workshop is designed in such a way that all steps can be formulated on cards or flip-charts. For a list of materials needed for the workshop, see box 1. A workshop secretary will enter all results in the computer, needed for drafting the project document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1: List of materials needed for the workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 20 permanent markers (blue and/or black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ± 50 flip chart papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1-2 flip chart stands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coloured cards (± 20 x 11 cm = 1/3 of A4 size paper). Take colours on which you can write with markers, so not dark blue or dark brown. 5 different colours, ± 100 cards each colour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 pin boards. These are boards to stick the cards on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 boxes of pins, to put the cards on the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The walls of the workshop room are usually suitable for drafting the problem trees. First hang flip-carts on the wall. Use paper tape or Scotch tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities for printing and photocopying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 beamer (LCD projector).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The facilitator is an assistant to project management in establishing increased participation of stakeholders and a more systematic project design. This implies:
  o Preparing the workshop together with project management
  o Referring back to project management in case disagreements persist during the workshop
  o Regularly ask for feedback from project management (e.g. each day after closing) to check if progress is as expected

• Use small groups to enhance communication. Especially during the first two days the group will consist of various hierarchical levels and professional backgrounds. If there is a tendency that there is less open communication between the levels (e.g. between managers and field staff or between doctors and patients) create small groups that are more homogeneous.

• To avoid distractions during the workshop, select a workshop venue away from the normal working atmosphere.

• Use daily reflections (e.g. at start and end) to assess participants’ opinions on process and contents of the workshop so far.
• Take special care of hand-outs for the participants. Two types of hand-outs can be provided:
  o Those to be prepared beforehand, e.g. copies of the slides, summary of project evaluation and explanation of discussion assignments. In Brazil, a separate participant manual was prepared.
  o Those to be produced during the workshop, mostly copies of the discussion results per session

The guidelines for organising and implementing the LFA workshop are detailed in the next part of this manual.

This manual has chosen for the logical framework methodology. It is a result-based approach as opposed to an activity-based approach. Other result-based approaches (e.g. result-based management) work towards the same objective, i.e. creating a consistent link between objectives, indicators, activities and budget. The logframe approach is a means to creating this consistent linkage, not an end in itself. Adjustments to the logical framework methodology, needed to become more in line with local planning and management practices, are possible. NLR promotes the flexible use of the methodology.
PART II GUIDELINES FOR WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

The workshop consists of seven consecutive steps:

1. Situational analysis
2. Identifying strategic options
3. Selecting project strategies
4. Stakeholder analysis
5. Project design
6. Activity and resource scheduling
7. Implementation arrangements

The manual describes these steps and provides the implementation guidelines for the workshop facilitators. It recommends actions to be taken. In preparing the manual, various publications were used, see Annex II. As background reading material NLR provides as a separate document the Project Cycle Management Manual of the European Commission, which details the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA), available at NLR Head Quarters.

The general workshop programme shown in Table 1 on page 9 will be elaborated in this second part of the manual. For a quick overview of the sessions per day, see Annex III. In Annex IV the slides used during the various explanations are presented. These slides – and some photographs from previous workshops – are also provided on the CD inserted in the back cover.7

Preparatory meeting

For proper preparation of the workshop NLR suggests to organise a meeting among project management and NLR staff. If feasible, also invite the workshop facilitator(s). The facilitators should have received a copy of the most recent project evaluation. The meeting should take place well before the workshop, about 2 months before. Participants to this meeting are expected to have read this manual. Before the meeting takes place, the project manager and NLR will have discussed the feasibility of the logframe approach in the local setting. NLR staff and project manager are aware how this approach might fit into, or might be an addition to, the regular functioning of the health services and the leprosy control programme. See also the introduction to part I of these guidelines where the topic of cooperation between NLR and the project manager is elaborated.

7 In case more copies of this manual need to be made, the manual text and annexes are also provided on the CD.
Topics of the meeting would be:

- logframe concept and planning methodology, linkages with regular government planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation
- organisation of project evaluation and study on clients’ perspectives (if already done, discuss results)
- workshop programme and organisation
- stakeholder selection and invitation
- support needed from NLR, national/international
- selection of staff for workshop organisation and documentation (for preparatory tasks and for documentation during the workshop)

Workshop documentation staff, Uttarakhand, India

Workshop introduction

Before the first step of the LFA methodology (situational analysis) can start, the workshop will have an introduction which, according to experience, ranges between 1-2 hours. Necessary elements in this introduction are:

- Opening/welcome (preferably by policy maker)
- Introduction of participants (because of the total number of ±40, a quick round would be sufficient)
- Introduction to the workshop methodology (see slides)
- Introduction to the programme

In some cases the opening/introduction will be longer because of necessary rituals and/or additional introductions by local managers.

1. Situational analysis

The situational analysis in NLR projects consists of two activities:

- External evaluation of past project performance. This concerns an analysis by a team of experts, paying attention to both strong and weak aspects of the project. In some cases this evaluation is extended with a clients’ satisfaction survey.
• Analysis of the current leprosy control situation by a large group of stakeholders who are invited to take part in the first two days of the workshop.

The external evaluation is documented in the evaluation report. A summary of the report serves as an input to the planning workshop where a further analysis by the project's stakeholders takes place.

A typical list of stakeholders would be:
• Leprosy supervisors
• General health staff, various levels
• Leprosy referral hospital
• Patients or patient representatives
• Training Centre
• Local NGOs
• Private sector
• Traditional healers
• National Coordinator
• Medical advisers
• Policy level staff, e.g. Health, Planning, Finance
• In-country NLR staff and NLR Head Quarters staff

The situational analysis provides an overall insight. It examines all relevant factors and actors influencing leprosy control, such as organisational capacities, technical factors and a wide range of external factors. The instruments used in the situational analysis are the SWOT\(^8\) analysis and the Problem Tree. In some NLR projects, a SWOT analysis has already been carried out during the external evaluation, which makes this a suitable tool for elaboration with a larger group of stakeholders. Also the SWOT analysis provides information on those aspects of the projects that are functioning well, not only on problem areas.

The Problem Tree provides more clarity in complex situations; it provides an in-depth problem analysis. The disadvantage of the SWOT is the danger of becoming superficial, the disadvantage of the problem tree is its strong problem focus, with little attention for the positive aspects in the leprosy control programme. The Problem Tree provides clear cause-effect relationships, the SWOT does not. These two tools have a complementary role in the situational analysis; wherever possible, it is best to use both tools.

During the workshop, the following steps are suggested in carrying out the situational analysis\(^9\):

a. Presentation of the findings from the Evaluation Mission.

b. SWOT analysis

c. Problem Trees on 2-3 selected topics\(^10\)

---

\(^8\) Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

\(^9\) It is suggested to use both SWOT and problem tree. If needed, it might be possible to choose for only one of these tools.
d. Formulation of strategic options for the coming project period

These four steps will take the first two days of the workshop when the larger group of stakeholders will be present. Below the checklists for steps b, c and d are presented. Step a, presentation of the evaluation findings, will be done as one the first activity after the introductory session.

Provide copies of the evaluation summary to the participants and put main conclusions on flip-chart and attach these on one of the walls in the workshop room.

1.1 SWOT analysis

The SWOT analysis provides information on positive and negative aspects both within and outside the project.

First, divide the group of stakeholders in smaller groups of 5-7 participants. Main criteria for group composition is homogeneity. Participants will talk more freely when among the same level or kind. Examples of groups: field level staff, managers, patients, NGOs, private practitioners, hospital staff, university/teachers. Using this criterion will generate groups that will provide a detailed picture of the leprosy control situation based on their own particular perspective.

The assignment to the groups in carrying out the SWOT analysis is (provide this assignment as a hand-out):

---

10 These can be topics that were identified by the external evaluation as important to elaborate, topics that the participants feel need more attention or topics that can be clearly separated from the routine project areas.
1. **Describe external opportunities.** These are factors or situations outside the direct control of the project that can affect the project towards improved leprosy control. Think of factors and situations like:
   - Funding opportunities
   - Policy directions
   - National programmes
   - Change in mandate
   - Trends in society
   - Gaps/overlap in service delivery or target group coverage by other providers
   - Weaknesses of organisations outside the project
   - Access to means (finance and technology)
   - External coordination

2. **Describe the external threats.** These are outside factors or situations outside the direct control of the project that can affect the project in a negative way. Think of factors and situations like:
   - Policy directions
   - Decrease in subsidies or other funding
   - Increasing demand for other services
   - Other organisations providing the same services
   - Developments in society that increase the leprosy burden
   - Changes in donor priorities
   - Decrease in resources (staff, inputs)

3. **Describe the internal strengths and weaknesses.** These are the resources and capabilities that help, respectively hinder, the project to carry out leprosy control services. Think of resources and capabilities like:
   - Quality of staff and management
   - Quality of services
   - Range of services and referral system
   - Internal procedures and mechanisms
   - Organisation structure
   - Internal coordination
   - Financial management

The decision to include an item in the SWOT inventory is influenced by:
   - Its relevance for project performance
   - The relative importance of the item on project performance
   - The influence the project may have to address the item\(^{11}\)

Ask each group to list all items of the SWOT analysis on flip-carts. Each group presents its findings.

The discussion after the presentations focuses on:
   - Similarities between the various SWOT results

---

\(^{11}\) These items will be dealt with later when discussing project assumptions, see chapter 5.3
• The aspects of the project that run well
• Major external factors influencing the project
• Major project weaknesses.

This will be the end of the first day. Make a print out of the SWOT results that have been entered into the computer by the workshop secretary and make copies for all participants. They can use this information as reference material during the second day.

1.2 Problem Tree

Select 2-3 SWOT-weaknesses that need more elaboration. Also consider the results from the evaluation mission in selecting these weaknesses. They will be analysed more in-depth using the problem tree.

The problem tree is a tool for clarifying cause-effect relationships between the various problems in leprosy control programmes. An example of a Problem Tree is presented in Annex V. The equipment needed are cardboard cards (± 20 x 11 cm = 1/3 of A4 size paper), markers and space to visualise the cards.

12 To be selected by the review meeting after the first day sessions.
The steps in making the problem tree are:

1. Take one of the selected weaknesses from the SWOT analysis, write it on a card and put it on the wall or pin-board.
2. Begin to identify causes of this problem. These are likely to become the ‘roots’ of the tree. Usually a number of the weaknesses already formulated by the participants during the SWOT can fit as causes. If necessary, create new problems to fit as causes. Link the cards using arrows, first in draft with a pencil.
3. Work towards the effects of the initial problem. These will become the ‘branches’ of the tree. Ensure that all agree with the tree. Heated debates might take place.
4. Review the tree and verify its validity and completeness. Possibly some important problems have not yet been mentioned.
5. Finalise the tree and arrows with a marker.
6. Copy the tree in the computer for reporting purposes.

Repeat this process for the other selected weaknesses in case these weaknesses are not yet covered with the first problem tree. In case the group is large, e.g. more than 30 participants, it is advised to split up the group in two smaller groups, each making a separate problem tree. In this case, two facilitators would be needed. At the end of the session these trees will be presented and discussed in the larger group.
2. Strategic options

In this session the workshop turns from analysis of the past and present into generating ideas for the future. A useful activity to enter into this different mindset is to carry out a short envisioning exercise, taking about 30 minutes:

First explain that the focus of the group is now changing from analysis into action and that for effective actions we will need to have a vision about where we wish to go. Then ask the group to think/ imagine/ dream about the leprosy control programme in 5 years from now. Each participant will describe his/her fantasy on a piece of paper or card. Take about 5 minutes for this. As a final step ask the participants to read their ‘dreams’ to the rest of the group (If time permits, all participants; otherwise make a selection). This exercise intends to create enthusiasm to start planning for the future.

The results from the three parts of the situational analysis – external assessment, SWOT and Problem Tree(s) – provide ample information to start generating ideas for areas that the project should focus on in the coming period. All the analysis information will be on hand-outs, flip-charts and cards.

Ask the participants to read again and review all information and convene in the same small groups as during the SWOT analysis yesterday. Each group will make a list of tentative strategies.
Guidelines for the discussions are:

- The questions formulated in Figure 4 below. These questions combine the topics listed in the SWOT analysis and will guide the discussion towards realistic options for improvements in the leprosy control programme. Successful strategies build upon strengths and takes advantage of opportunities, while it overcomes or minimizes the effects of weaknesses and threats.

- The ‘branches’ and ‘roots’ of the problem tree. These cause-effect relationships might constitute possibilities for the project. Some cause-effect relationships will be more feasible to be tackled by the project than others. Another question is: Should all problems be addressed or only a selection?

![Figure 4](image)

The discussions will generate a long list of project ideas. Some will be the same and some will overlap. This list is the entry point for deciding on the main project strategies, which will be the first topic for the following day. Ask to write these ‘strategic options’ on cards, the next day these cards can be clustered.

With this list of strategic options the second day ends and a large number of participants will leave. Take some time to explain the remainder of the programme and thank those who are leaving.
3. Strategy selection

This is the start of day 3 of the workshop, participants being a selection of those responsible for project implementation.

Based on the long list of strategic options provided by the large stakeholders group, the project group will select/reformulate the main project strategies. A total of 4-7 strategies is suggested. More strategies will make the project less manageable, less strategies will make the project too small or the strategies too big (should be divided into smaller strategies).

Criteria to use in selecting strategies are:
- Can realistically be addressed by this project. Not too many barriers in staffing, politics, community resistance, etc.
- Expected contribution to key (health) policy objectives, such as improved cure/treatment rates or integration of services
- (Technically) feasible to achieve results in the 5-year time frame
- Will lead to sustainable results; contribution to institutional capacity building
- Will not be too costly
- Has already shown positive results in the previous project phase or elsewhere/ in other projects
- Benefits to target groups – including women and men, young and old, disabled and able, etc
- Complementarity with other ongoing or planned programmes or projects
- What would be the consequences of not addressing this option?

This strategy development stage is challenging, as it involves synthesising a significant amount of information and making a complex judgment about the best implementation strategies to pursue. In practice a number of compromises will have to be made to balance different stakeholder interests, political demands and practical constraints such as resource availability.
### Extensive list of strategic options

1. Operational Plan Dermatological Hospital developed before June 2006 and implementation completed before end Project period
   - Hospital buildings and staff quarters upgraded and repaired
   - Water & electricity supply assured
   - Essential dermatological equipment and drugs available
   - Adequate manpower
   - Increased public awareness on services available in hospital
   - Good feeding for admitted patients
2. Improved referral system in place (from field to the hospital and back)
3. Improved coordination of support by effective communication between stakeholders by the end of the first year.
4. Functional EQA system in the state in all TB labs according to National Guidelines by the end of the second project year
5. A lab supervision system from state to LGA buy the end of the first year
6. Functional handing over of services to GHVC workers (90%) by the end of the 5th year
7. Clear policy on integration by state Govt by the 1st year
8. State Government to make available funds for TB supervision by the end of the 1st year
9. National TB/L Manual in all health facilities by the end of the 1st year
10. Guided transfer of GHC workers by the end of the 1st year
11. NLR to supply one M/cycle to each LGA by the end of the 3rd year
12. Intervention for difficult to reach areas by the end of the 2nd year
13. Clear guidelines for drug stock management at state, district and clinic level
14. Organise referral system with feedback by the end of the 1st year
15. Follow up of on-the-job training by State team by the end of the 1st year
16. To establish a functional management system for drugs and logistics
17. To improve competent and motivated staff
18. To establish collaboration with HIV/AIDS programme
19. To increase involvement of public health practitioners
20. To increase advocacy to State, district and community on TBL
21. To improve control in high endemic areas
22. To strengthen POID activities in the field as part of the Control Programme
23. To ensure the implementation of the National Guideline on TB & Leprosy
24. To increase staff strength in the TB/L Control Team and logistics to enable them transport of needy patients to the Health facilities
25. New patients diagnosed at leprosy hospital should be allowed to start treatment before transfer or referral
26. To ensure the availability of rehabilitation materials for use by disabled patients
27. To intensify POID activities until patients understand its importance
28. To use ex-patients for awareness campaigns, frequent radio jingles and simple drama

### Selected project strategies

- **Improvement of leprosy hospital**
- **Integration of leprosy into General Health**
- **Drug supply management**
- **Referral system**
- **POID and Rehabilitation**
- **Supervision management**
- **TB Lab strategy**
- **Case finding**
- **Project management**
Table 2 provides an example of how a long list of strategic options is reduced to a manageable set of project strategies. These strategic options may include short or long term objectives, activities or important points of attention.

In formulating the strategies, also include those strategies that are already functioning properly during the current project period. There might be routine activities which are forgotten in the selected strategies.

Write the strategies on cards.

4. Stakeholder analysis

The project team will most likely need the cooperation from a wider group of stakeholders in pursuing the identified strategies. Various other organisations are directly or indirectly involved in leprosy control, e.g. WHO, local government, NGOs, interdepartmental committees, local leaders, private sector, medical boards, policy makers, etc.

This session clarifies which stakeholders are important for cooperation with the project and which are important for sharing information/coordination. In a brainstorming session with the group, fill in the matrix below. Cooperation partners are those whose active participation is crucial for working on the selected strategies. Working together in joint activities is the main characteristic of cooperation partners. Coordination partners are those who will take the project’s work into account when implementing their own activities. Coordination is mainly done for limiting overlap and filling service gaps. Coordination is needed when activities need to be attuned to each other, but do not need joint inputs. For an explanatory slide, see the annex.

The information in this matrix (see table 3) will be useful later on in the workshop when:
- Formulating the indicators for success in the project design phase (the role certain stakeholders have in achieving results)
- Detailing the project activity schedule (in case of joint activities)
- Preparing for project implementation (ensure cooperation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Cooperation needed</th>
<th>Coordination/information needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Be critical in selecting the cooperation partners. It will become clear that some of the organisations are not crucial for jointly working on the project strategies. In these cases, mere coordinating activities will suffice.

5. Project Design

This part of the workshop will elaborate on the overall outline of the project; the objectives to be achieved, how progress towards these objectives can be measured and what the main implementation risks are. The project design is formulated in the logical framework matrix, see Figure 5. For an example, see Annex VI.

![Figure 5](image-url)

**Contents of the logframe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Objectively verifyable indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions and risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective</td>
<td>What water problems will the project help resolve?</td>
<td>What is the evidence that tells whether the problems have been resolved?</td>
<td>What are the sources of information? What mechanisms should be used for obtaining accessing it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Purpose</td>
<td>What is the intended change for the beneficiaries or large groups? What does the project achieve?</td>
<td>What is the evidence that tells whether the purpose has been achieved?</td>
<td>What are the sources of information? What methods should be used for obtaining accessibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>What are the project's services? What are the main outcomes of the project?</td>
<td>What is the evidence that tells whether the services have been delivered on time?</td>
<td>What are the sources of information? What methods should be used for obtaining accessibility to?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When starting with the matrix in the workshop, first take some time to explain and discuss the various boxes and the matrix logic:

- If adequate inputs/resources are provided, then activities can be undertaken
- If the activities are undertaken - with a number of assumptions - then results can be produced
- If results are produced - with a number of assumptions - then the purpose will be achieved
- If the purpose is achieved - with a number of assumptions - then the project will contribute towards the overall objective
The matrix will be formulated by the participants using cards. For each column, take a different colour.

5.1 Intervention logic

The intervention logic describes the three levels of objectives of the project: results, purpose and overall objective, see box 2 below.

**Box 2: Three levels of objectives**

*Overall objective (also called development objective or goal):*
The overall objective describes the reason why the project is being carried out. It is a higher level objective showing the intentions towards developing a sector or a specific area. The project contributes to the goal. The project is not responsible for achieving the goal.

*Purpose (also called general objective):*
The purpose describes the immediate benefits the project will have for the target group: the patients and the communities. It defines the changes that the project intends to achieve. The project is responsible for achieving its purpose. The project has only one purpose.

*NB: Most NLR supported projects focus on improved services towards a specific target group. In case a supporting organisation (e.g. a national unit) is the focus of a project, then the function this unit has towards other organisations will become the subject of the project purpose.*

*Results (also called outputs or specific objectives):*
The results are the products that the project delivers. They describe the achievements after project implementation. The project will have roughly 4-7 results.

Steps in the workshop:

- Refer back to step 3 (strategy selection) and reformulate the selected strategies into project results. Results are stated in ‘achieved state of affairs’ and not in an activity form. For instance, ‘patient delay to reach skilled health provider reduced’ is a properly formulated result. ‘To reduce patient delay’ would not be a proper formulation. Write all results on cards. For an example, see Table 4.

- Add a final result *Project management ensured*. This result will help in the planning of project management activities, which are not normally part of the other results, but do require inputs (e.g. reporting, supervision, M&E).

- Brainstorm with the group on a formulation for the project purpose, using the question: *if the results have been achieved, what will be the effect on the target group?*[^13]

[^13]: Usually the purpose is formulated in terms of “improved quality of leprosy control (and care) services”
Brainstorm with the group on a formulation for the goal, using the question: if the project has achieved its purpose, what will it contribute to? The formulation of the goal might be too soon at this stage, because participants might not yet oversee the impact this project will have. It can be shifted to a later phase, e.g. until the end of the matrix formulation or even after the activities have been listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration into PHC</td>
<td>GHS are able to suspect/transfer/ diagnose and treat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation and referral</td>
<td>Rehab and referral services established/ upgraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory quality</td>
<td>Quality of laboratory services assured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient management</td>
<td>Adequate patient management established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up supervision</td>
<td>Supervision system functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC/HE participation</td>
<td>Improved community knowledge/awareness, participation and health seeking behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Objectively Verifiable Indicators

Indicators show how achievements of and progress towards the objectives (purpose and results) can be verified. They describe the objectives in operationally measurable terms. Formulating the indicators helps in creating clarity about the project's process and is the first step towards the project's M&E system. Indicators are formulated in response to the question: How can we assess that we are working towards the planned objectives; that what we have planned is actually happening? In this way indicators are both variables - indicating what to look at during project progress - as well as milestones - indicating intermediate targets.

In its ideal form, each Objectively Verifiable Indicator (OVI) should specify:

- Quality (what?)
- Quantity (How much?)
- Time (When, how long?)
- Place (Where?)

Divide the participants in small groups of about 3-5 members. Ask each group to formulate OVIs for one or two results, depending on the total number of results to be elaborated. The indicators will be written on cards.

This discussion will need careful guidance from the facilitator. Make sure the indicators are formulated as much as possible according to the specifications (quality, quantity, time, place). Check whether the cooperation partners

---

14 This purpose - taken from Katsina State, Nigeria - emphasises the demand side (access), the supply side (quality) and the public health (control). The set of results will lead to this purpose.
(identified in step 4) are taken into account. Discussing indicators will lead to a number of feasibility issues: how feasible is it to achieve this result in 4-5 years? Formulating good indicators will make the project plan more realistic.

Developing indicators/milestones is perceived as difficult. It forces the planners to create a clear picture of the project over the years to come. It not only asks for a general insight on what the project is going to do (activities), but also asks how the planner intends to monitor project performance during the project’s life. Usually this will take ample discussions among the planners. When discussing the OVIs in the larger group the facilitator might decide to have a second round of discussions in the small groups if the OVIs are of too low quality. Annex VI provides examples of OVIs.

Formulating OVIs, Minas Gerais, Brazil

5.3 Assumptions

Assumptions are statements about external factors influencing the project positively or negatively, but are outside the project’s control. These project risks are to be formulated during project planning and monitored throughout implementation. Assumptions are stated as positive conditions.

Brainstorm and discuss the project assumptions for results and purpose. Two guidelines:

- Make sure that the assumptions suggested are practically related to achieving the project’s objectives, not too far outside the project’s scope

---

15 Some facilitators prefer to postpone the session on assumptions until after activity and resource scheduling. This would provide a more realistic assessment of which assumptions are important.
• Check whether an assumption is really outside the project’s control. Some assumptions might be included under one of the results, either as activity or OVI.

The diagram below is useful in assessing assumptions that are doubtful to include or that create extensive debate.

5.4 Sources of Verification

Sources of verification (SOV) are the information that verifies the indicators; it provides monitoring information on actual progress towards achievement of the objectives. SOVs describe which information is to be collected in what form.

Ask the participants to formulate the SOVs based on the examples provided in Figure 7. Some information is readily available, other is harder and more expensive to collect. Also discuss the reliability of the (routine) information.
At the end of this session, go through the complete matrix and check for completeness and internal logic. This is the end of step 5 and will need a final check-up of the logframe matrix as it has been drafted. A goal/overall objective might be added/reformulated. The formulation of the purpose might need adjustment or other aspects might need to be changed.

The logframe matrix is being developed on the workshop wall, Jakarta, Indonesia
6. Activity and resource scheduling

The activity schedule is the operationalisation of the project. Each result will be achieved through implementing a series of activities.

Divide the participants in the same groups as when formulating OVI's (see 5.2) and ask them to make activity schedules for the respective results. An activity schedule might look like the one in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Activity schedule format for year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of activity</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Responsible person/unit</th>
<th>Estimated budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLR non-NLR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NLR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since it will not be feasible to formulate detailed activities for the entire 4-5 year period, only make an activity schedule for the first project year. The results are formulated for the entire project period, the activity schedule will outline the first actions towards these longer term results. In order to create an outlook towards the 2nd and 3rd project years, ask the groups to list activities that the project will probably carry out later on. In this way the activity planning will become a rolling plan, with annual adjustments. Arrangements for organising this annual planning will need to be made during the 5th day of the workshop, see par. 7.4.

Besides the project activity schedule, a separate list of activities is needed concerning the actions by project management to ensure cooperation of major stakeholders. These stakeholders were identified earlier in the workshop, see step 4; preparatory actions are to be carried out before year one of the next project phase commences. These actions might be preparatory coordination meetings or finalising regulations/agreements conditional for proper project performance. However, cooperation activities taking place during the course of the project (year 1 onwards) will be included in the various activity schedules linked to the project results.
Allocation of resources (responsible persons/units and estimated budget) needs to be elaborated in greater detail after the workshop by the project manager responsible for writing the project document. For the workshop, it will be sufficient to generate first ideas providing a general overview of the staffing needs for the project. For example, it might become clear that some staff/units will possibly become overburdened. These issues will need to be addressed during the workshop.

7. Management arrangements for project implementation

After four days of logframe planning, the skeleton for the planning document has been made. The workshop has produced:
- A situational analysis, with conclusions on future directions
- A project design, covering objectives, indicators, means of verification and main assumptions
- An activity schedule for the first year and ideas for activities in subsequent years

All these outputs have been entered into the computer and are copied for the participants.

The final day of the workshop covers important management arrangements and concerns only project management (project manager, local adviser(s), evaluator and HQ staff). Main topics for this management group will be: unclarities in the outcome of the workshop so far, roles in the project, the project document and arrangements for M&E. In general, this day will cover all necessary implementation arrangements. The logframe matrix and activity
schedules have provided an overall project plan, now it is time to organise feasible, transparent and effective implementation.

This final session can be seen as a management meeting in which decisions need to be taken on follow-up steps. Therefore, the seating arrangements might be made somewhat more formal, e.g. by using a meeting table.

Before the meeting, draft an agenda. The topics mentioned under 7.1 – 7.4 below will be part of the agenda. For a draft agenda, see Annex VII. During the course of the workshop, other management issues may have emerged that need discussion during this final day as well. Experience has shown that this meeting will take 3-4 hours.

Management meeting during the final day of the workshop, Minas Gerais, Brazil

7.1 Results of the workshop

The workshop has provided an outline for the next project phase. There might be some issues that need more elaboration before the project document can be finalised. Topics for discussion would be:

- Design check, which concerns two questions
  - Is the list of strategic options (step 2) an adequate answer to the analysis performed (step1)?
  - Are the project results sufficiently covering current and future needs for the programme?
- Review the horizontal and vertical logic of the matrix. This will help clarify the project design for the managers. This includes the questions:
  - Do the combined activities lead to the results; do all results lead to the purpose?
  - Are the indicators and milestones good measurements towards achieving the results and purpose?
  - Are the assumptions important enough?
• Is there anything to be added/adjusted in the activity schedules? Particularly, are routine activities sufficiently included? Possibly this issue can be resolved now or it needs to be shifted to a later date.
• Does the implementing organisation have sufficient capacity to continue the project as outlined in the logframe matrix? If not, how should this be addressed?
• What managerial/political issues need to be addressed and arranged at higher levels before the project can continue? Make an inventory of these activities, also those to ensure cooperation from partners (see previous page).

Ask the participants to decide who will take action, when and to whom will be reported.

7.2 Roles in the project

In the NLR supported projects a number of roles can be identified, see Table 6 below. Since most of these players will be present during this final day, it provides an opportunity to discuss and agree on the various roles. Role clarification during the planning phase will facilitate project implementation.

If the project manager will need to delegate (part of) the responsibilities to others, e.g. to a deputy or a senior staff, this will need to be clarified. Authorities will need to be made clear on what the project manager will do and what the deputy will do. Especially decision making authorities are important to discuss at this moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Roles of main players in NLR supported projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual progress reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial accounting and reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NLR staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical, financial and management coach to the project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial auditing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist in planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (mid-term) evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External advisers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical inputs for programme management (quality control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thematic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take part in final evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 The project document
The project manager will be responsible for writing the project document, usually assisted by a medical adviser. The table of contents for the document would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive summary (including summary sheet of respective contributions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Situation analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem description (brief)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clients’ perspective study (if carried out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis results from workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objectives (purpose/results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Log-frame matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schedules with responsible persons and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Implementation arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M &amp; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management (PM ensured indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Budget breakdown &amp; summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Annexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• References</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main body of the document, chapters 1-6, will consist of 15-20 pages.

Agree on this outline and set a time-schedule for writing/checking/approving:
- Writing of first draft
- Receiving comments
- Producing the final draft
- Signing by NLR and local authorities

Even though the responsibility of writing the document lies with the project manager, he may ask for external support from the NLR adviser or external expert. Creating the first draft of the project document is the process of translating the analysis, logframe matrix and activity/resource schedules into the table of contents listed above. A first draft of the document might become available soon after the workshop, when the workshop results are still ‘fresh’ in the minds of the managers.

The activity schedules provide information on the contributions by NLR and the local government. The document will clarify this issue and provide a summary table, not only for the first year, but estimates for the entire project period.

Ensure that the NLR activity coding is added in the final version of the document.
7.4 Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

Project implementation is working towards the agreed results through the indicators. The logframe matrix and activity/resource schedules provide ample opportunities for M&E. M&E provides answers to the question: are we doing what we have planned to do? This work will demand inputs from the project manager and other senior staff. The last project result (project management ensured) focuses on this project component.

In the ideal situation, the project’s monitoring and evaluation activities coincide with the governments procedures for M&E and reporting. At the same time NLR has an obligation towards its donors to justify its project and programme support. The issue of compatibility between the logframe approach and the local planning and monitoring procedures has been discussed before the workshop. The conclusions from this discussion concerning M&E are to be explained again at this moment in the workshop.

Topics to cover in the discussion on project M&E could be:
- The meeting system (management meetings, quarterly meetings, coordination meetings)
- Coaching/motivation visits by NLR
- Organisational capacities (e.g. job descriptions, project structure, management training)
- Organising the annual updates of the activity schedule (related to the annual monitoring report in which an analysis provides the basis for the activity update)
- Timing of (mid-term) evaluation
- Project monitoring schedule and formats (see below)

When discussing project monitoring, the types of monitoring and the monitoring procedures will need special attention. In general there will be two types of monitoring:
- Internal quarterly monitoring by the project manager. This is a tool for project management to check if progress is as planned. Indicators, activity schedules and budget provide for monitoring guidelines
- Annual progress monitoring and planning. The combined quarterly internal monitoring reports form the basis for annual progress monitoring and planning. This monitoring is linked with the annual budget allocation.

The management group will decide on how monitoring will be done (procedures):
- Who will monitor what (activities, indicators, results)
- Which tools are needed for monitoring (checklists, forms)
- How monitoring information is communicated internally (e.g. meetings, newsletter) and externally, e.g. to coordination and cooperation partners
- Who will write the progress and annual planning reports
Finally, discuss the issue of organisational acceptance of monitoring and evaluation. M&E activities will only be carried out and become effective if supported by all levels. Topics of attention are:

- Project staff are to show commitment to M&E activities, it is not to be seen as an obligation imposed from outside
- Coaching of information collection to ensure quality information
- Take into account the monitoring needs from the cooperation partners
- Dare to be critical to management performance
- Discuss implications of monitoring results for other units/departments in the own organisation and for other organisations