



SPC
Secretariat
of the Pacific
Community



**GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE:
PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND STATES PROJECT**

**IMPACT EVALUATION OF
PROPOSAL PREPARATION USING THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH WORKSHOP IN
THE
MARSHALL ISLANDS**



Contents

Introduction	1
Impact evaluation	1
About the training workshops.....	1
Methodology.....	2
Results	2
Workshop resources	2
Use of LFA steps	3
Proposals prepared since the training	3
Future proposals	3
Additional capacity building	4
Conclusion	4
Recommendations	5

Disclaimer:

Whilst care has been taken in the preparation of the material in this document to ensure its accuracy, Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates and other contributors do not warrant that the information contained in this document is error-free and, to the extent permissible under law, it will not be liable for any claim by any party acting on such information.

Introduction

Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates (PREA) delivered training on 'Proposal Preparation Using the Logical Framework Approach' to government staff of the Marshall Islands on 22-25 July 2013.

The training formed part of the Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) project funded by the European Union (EU) and implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP).

The aim of the training was to strengthen the capacity of national government staff to develop successful and integrated climate change adaptation project proposals. This will allow PSIS and donors to work together to ensure a more effective and coordinated aid delivery to address climate change at the national and regional level.

This report evaluates the impact of the training six months following the workshop.

Impact evaluation

The impact evaluation framework was informed by the anticipated short and medium-term outcomes from the training workshop.

The anticipated short and medium-term outcomes are summarised below:

- Participants submit quality funding proposals informed by the Logical Framework Approach
- Funding proposals submitted would address PSIS climate change adaptation requirements
- Increased number of quality funding proposals are funded by Government and external donors
- Implemented projects assist countries to adapt to climate change impacts
- Components of the LFA would be used in other daily work duties resulting in an increased quality of work produced

About the training workshops

The training workshop was delivered over four consecutive days. This was followed by an optional half-day of mentoring where participants could work on their project proposals.

The objective of the training was to build participant capacity in proposal preparation using the logical framework approach.

At the end of the workshop participants were expected to be able to:

- Describe and perform all the steps of the Logical Framework Approach and to develop a logframe matrix
- Describe and complete the key components of a funding application by pulling relevant data from the logframe matrix
- Be more aware of the donors and grant funding programmes that can be accessed by PSIS to fund climate change adaptation projects.

The key topics covered during the workshop included:

- A background on the project management cycle
- A detailed look at the logical framework approach
- Proposal writing (informed by the LFA) and
- A brief summary of climate change donors active in the Pacific region.

The effectiveness of the training workshop was evaluated through a post-workshop survey that was completed by participants on the last day.

The Marshall Islands workshop was attended by 28 participants consisting primarily of youth council representatives covering all of the islands making up the Marshall Islands. This was not the primary intended audience for the GCCA-funded LFA training, but the decision was made at the country level to focus on equipping youth leaders with the skills and capacity to design projects so that they can have an increased role in climate change adaptation. It is understood that the focus on youth leaders was also made in light of the levels of staff turnaround at the government level, especially senior staff. Focussing on youth leaders would provide more security on retaining the skills in the country. In addition to youth leaders, several members of government attended, along with one NGO representative.

The delivery of the training in the Marshall Islands was constrained by the need to translate material and presentations into Marshallese and most youth leaders were not fluent in English. Though the training delivery was successful based on post-workshop feedback, the ongoing success was going to require support from the Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPCC), the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and Marshall Islands Youth Council support staff on Majuro to:

- Overcome communications difficulties especially in outer islands
- Help identify donors and grants
- Support youth leadership empowerment at the local government level
- Review and proof applications, especially if written in English

Methodology

The impact evaluation took place in February to early April 2014, over six months following the training. The evaluation consisted of:

- An online survey issued to all participants.
- Phone calls to remind participants to complete the survey, or to complete the survey over the phone.

The impact evaluation for the Marshall Islands was constrained by the language barrier (with most participants not being fluent in English), and lack of communications and communications difficulties with the outer islands. The evaluation team obtained assistance from Milañ Loeak from the Youth Services Bureau, Community Development Division at the Ministry of Internal Affairs, to get into contact with youth leaders but this only led to two completed responses from youth leaders.

Results

Only five responses were received from the Marshall Islands, two from youth leaders, and three from government staff and NGO representatives. Though the response rate from youth leaders is very low, three of the four government/NGO participants (the training's original intended audience) responded to the impact evaluation questionnaire.

Workshop resources

Three of the five respondents (two government / NGO participants and one youth leader) had access to both the USB and learner guide. Two respondents (one government, one youth leader) no longer had any of the training resources.

Of the respondents that still had the resources, one had referred to them once since the training, one between two and three times, and the final respondent more than three times.

It would be worthwhile placing a copy of the learner guide online, or emailing all participants a copy of the resources so that they can have access to them.

Use of LFA steps

All of the respondents found the LFA steps useful (two of five useful; three of five very useful) to inform future project proposals.

However, only one of the five respondents had used any of the LFA steps for either a project proposal or in performing general work duties (Table 1).

The immediate benefit of the training is not as evident as in the Niue training, but this can be explained by the difference in the background of participants and limited opportunities to apply the new skills.

Table 1. Use of the LFA steps in proposal writing and other work duties - Marshall Islands

LFA Step	Used or performed since training for a project proposal	Used or performed since training for general work duties
Conducted a stakeholder analysis	0	1
Developed a problem tree or solution tree	1	0
Developed a logframe matrix	1	0
Developed a monitoring and evaluation plan	0	1
Created a timeline or Gantt chart (Activity Schedule)	0	1
Created a budget (Resource Schedule)	1	0

Proposals prepared since the training

Only one respondent had prepared a proposal (to the Environment Protection Authority) since the training. The respondent indicated that they had used the LFA (as indicated in Table 1) and had been successful in getting funding.

It is not unexpected for there to be a low rate of proposal preparation from the Marshall Islands training, especially from the youth leader participants. These participants, on the most part, would require considerable support and assistance to prepare proposals.

Future proposals


Three respondents (two government / NGO participants and one youth leader) indicated that they planned to prepare a proposal in the next six months. The remaining two respondents indicated they were not sure. Four respondents noted that they planned to use the LFA for future proposals, and one respondent noted they were not sure.

Though there has been limited proposal preparation following the training, the respondents appear to remain motivated to use the LFA for future proposals. This tends to

demonstrate that the LFA is seen as a valuable process, even if it has not been put into practice extensively to date.

Four of the five respondents indicated some level of confidence in undertaking the steps of the LFA, M&E, and writing a proposal (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Level of confidence in using the LFA, M&E and proposal writing following the training - Marshall Islands



Additional capacity building

Respondents indicated that they wanted additional capacity building in the following areas:

- Developing a monitoring and evaluation plan.
- Creating timelines or Gantt chart (activity schedule)
- Need more in writing process (how to structure, what vocabulary to use, etc.)
- Management and Leadership training
- Erosion/climate change/food security

Conclusion

The Marshall Islands workshop provided contrasting results both in terms of response rate and impact compared to the training workshops held before (Cook Islands) and after (Niue). This can largely be attributed to the level of pre-existing skills and experiences of the participants that attended, and it reinforces the importance of inviting/selecting participants with roles in government and NGOs who are more likely to be prepare funding proposals. The language barrier experienced during the Marshall Islands workshop was also a barrier to passing on skills and establishing a higher degree of confidence in using the new knowledge and skills.

The number of proposals submitted to date was limited, and this again likely relates to the participants that attended the training. Youth leaders are likely to face a number of barriers to develop funding proposals.

The LFA training was designed for government staff, and NGOs, whose role encompassed project design and proposal writing. The content of the training required a level of pre-existing skills and experience obtained through higher education and/or work experience. Though the desire to upskill youth leaders is commendable, the LFA training was rather unsuitable for this group of participants, especially with the language barrier being another impeding factor. The Marshall Islands would likely to have gained more benefit from having more government staff attend the training, even if at a more junior level, and having only one or two youth leaders participate. Other youth leaders could have subsequently been provided an overview by government participants in Marshallese.

Recommendations

Target future LFA workshop(s) to people who have some basic experience in the LFA or project preparation to achieve the greatest impact in terms of building capacity to submit successful proposals. Though the training is presented in a practical manner, the content remains technical and requires a level of pre-existing skills or experience which can generally be found in government staff.

Updated LFA training resources (e.g. e-copy of learner guide) should be made accessible to all participants, either downloadable from an internet/intranet site¹, or emailed directly.

The delivery of monitoring and evaluation training should be considered in the future. M&E is a critical skill required in projects and one that cannot be effectively covered as part of a four day course on proposal writing. This should be targeted at government staff and NGOs.

¹ For example, as Cook Islands have done: <http://www.mfem.gov.ck/58-development/aid-resources/295-logical-framework-approach-training-material-and-resources>