



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

REPORT ON LOGICAL FRAMEWORK APPROACH WORKSHOP PART II IN NIUE

25 – 28 May 2015



This report was prepared for the Government of Niue and Secretariat of the Pacific Community with support from the European Union through the Secretariat of the Pacific Community-Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project.

Disclaimer

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union. 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

The Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) project is 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 project budget is €11.4 million. The implementation period for the GCCA: PSIS project is from 2011 to 2015.

The overall objective of the EU funded GCCA: PSIS project is to support the governments of nine Pacific smaller island states, namely Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Nauru, Marshall Islands, Niue, Kiribati, Niue, Tonga and Tuvalu, in their efforts to tackle the adverse effects of climate change. The purpose of the project is to promote long term strategies and approaches to adaptation planning and pave the way for more effective and coordinated aid delivery on climate change at the national and regional level.

The project approach is to assist the nine countries design and implement practical on-the-ground climate change adaptation projects in conjunction with mainstreaming climate change into line ministries and national development plans; thereby helping countries move from an *ad hoc* project-by-project approach towards a programmatic approach underpinning an entire sector. This has the added advantage of helping countries better position themselves to access and benefit from new sources and modalities of climate change funding, e.g. national and sector budget support.

Between March 2013 and May 2014, training in proposal preparation using the logical framework approach was delivered to 9 Pacific Small Island countries, including all four states of the Federated States of Micronesia. The results of a longitudinal survey issued three months after participants attended the training indicated an interest in follow-up training on the LFA in addition to training on monitoring and evaluation. Several countries also made direct requests to SPC for additional capacity building training in project design.

SPC responded to the longitudinal survey feedback and country requests by announcing the delivery of follow-up training on the LFA and project monitoring in five Pacific Small Island States¹.

GCCA: PSIS Capacity development in the Logical Framework Approach and Project Monitoring Part II ('LFA Workshop Part II') in Niue

The second LFA Workshop Part II was held in Alofi, Niue between the 25th and 28th of May 2015. The workshop was delivered by two facilitators from Pacific Research and Evaluation Associates (PREA). The training workshop was delivered over 4 days. A summary agenda documenting the main topics covered during the training is presented in Annex 1.

The objective of the workshop was to:

- Apply the Logical Framework Approach to develop a robust logframe matrix
- Develop an accurate timeline and budget for projects, based on identifying the tasks and costs to implement activities in the logframe matrix.
- Develop a monitoring plan and understand how to monitor projects as they are implemented.

PREA liaised with Mr Haden Talagi, Niue GCCA: PSIS Country Project Officer, to identify the specific training needs and projects to work on during the training in Niue. All relevant training resources were provided to participants in hardcopy with an electronic copy provided on a USB stick.

The workshop was attended by 22 participants from the Government sector, with some participants also having roles in the community sector (see Annex 2 for a list of workshop participants).

¹ Tuvalu, Palau, Niue, Tonga, Kiribati

The LFA training workshop was organised by SPC with support from in-country staff Haden Talagi, SPC-GCCA: PSIS Project Officer for Niue. Mr Sauni Tongatule, Director of the Environment Department welcomed participants and officially opened the workshop. Ms Titilia Rabuatoka, SPC-GCCA: PSIS Project Liaison Assistant also provided welcoming remarks and spoke about the background of the SPC-GCCA: PSIS Project.

After introductions, the two training facilitators from PREA began workshop proceedings.

Workshop Results

“The training was very informative, especially for those not have experience on the work involved with projects”.

Training delivery included a mix of informative presentations, large group activities to demonstrate new knowledge and skills followed by small group activities where participants were challenged to use the knowledge and skills for real-life project ideas that they wanted to develop (see Annex 3 for photo of group work). The whole-of-class activity focussed on a semi-fictional case study to implement a renewable energy project in a small island state.

There were six small project groups that worked through the LFA steps and developed monitoring tools for their projects. Project ideas developed are documented below:

- Reducing illegal dumping of solid waste and setting up a recycling system in Niue
- Improving electricity generation in Niue through policy development and upgrading generators to be compatible renewable energy systems
- Reducing NCDs in Niue
- Documenting caves sites and traditional knowledge of caves in Niue
- Increasing the number of graduates interested in climate science and meteorology
- Improving road access to farmland

The participants were very interactive in their small group projects, and engaged in robust discussion when reviewing and commenting on each other’s projects. Several country specific barriers specific to designing and implementing projects were raised and discussed.

The workshop concluded on day four with Mr Sauni Tongatule, Director of the Environment Department and Ms Titilia Rabuatoka SPC-GCCA: PSIS Project Liaison Assistant, issuing certificates of participation to attendees.

Workshop Evaluation

The detailed results of the workshop evaluation are presented as Annex 4. Thirteen participants who attended the workshop completed a post-workshop evaluation form.

“Pretty easy to understand”

All respondents indicated that the course was well presented and that they learnt things that would be useful to their work. Respondents also indicated that the learner guide was useful and that the activities gave them the confidence to apply the knowledge in their work.

Most respondents indicated a strong degree of confidence in being able to design a good project. Most respondents indicated that they would be able to complete all the steps of the LFA. The step that some respondents indicated less confidence in was developing the logframe matrix, project monitoring and budgeting.

Respondents indicated that the training could be improved if there was more time. This was due to some participants needing to step out of the training to attend other duties, and some late starts in the morning as some participants arrived late.

The most popular topics for further training and development were:

1. Budgeting and finance (x3)
2. Monitoring and evaluation (x1)
3. Problem tree and solution tree (x1)
4. Logframe matrix (x1)

“Should have more of this kind of training”

The need for further training on budgeting may be related by the complexity of this task and the lack of experience that many younger attendees have with undertaking this task.

“Thank you for the training. It was good to have refresher as there are new things & templates from the initial training. Need a follow-up as well in 2016”

All respondents indicated that they would recommend the course to their colleagues, however there was one attendee that provided a ‘neutral’ response. Eleven respondents indicated the length of the training was about right, and one indicated it was too short and one indicated it was too long.

The medium term outcomes resulting from the training will be assessed through issuing a longitudinal post-training survey (3 – 6 months after the training) combined with telephone interviews.

Conclusion

The training was very successful in continuing to build the capacity of Government staff in Niue. Several participants who attended the initial LFA training benefited from the refresher and extended their knowledge with project monitoring and a more detailed look at project timeline and budget. Participants who were new to LFA also benefited and the feedback indicated they can see the value of the LFA and most have a degree of confidence to use the LFA in their work.

Overall, the Niue training was very successful and demonstrates the benefits of having participants working on real projects that they can work on and develop during the training. The strong level of engagement in group discussion and feedback was beneficial to participants learning from each other.

The impact evaluation in several months’ time will determine whether any of the projects worked on during the training will be developed up into real proposals.

Proposal preparation using the Logical Framework Approach - Part II

Workshop Objective

To build participant capacity in applying the logical framework approach to designing projects, and to build capacity in project monitoring. More specifically at the end of this training programme, participants will be able to:

- apply the Logical Framework Approach to develop a robust logframe matrix;
- develop an accurate timeline and budget for projects, based on identifying the tasks and costs to implement activities in the logframe matrix; and
- develop a monitoring plan and understand how to monitor projects as they are implemented.

Workshop Schedule

Day 1	Day 2
Official opening Introduction to the Logical Framework Approach Step 1. Situation Analysis Step 2. Stakeholder analysis Step 3. Problem analysis Step 4. Solution analysis	Step 5. Strategy analysis Step 6. Logframe matrix
Day 3.	Day 4
Step 6. Logframe matrix Monitoring your project	Step 7. Timeline Step 8. Budget Workshop evaluation Certificate presentation



SPC
 Secretariat
 of the Pacific
 Community

Annex 2. Participants List

No.	Name	Gender	Job title	Organisation	Email	Phone (+683)
1	Susannah Siōnetuato	F	Production Officer	Dept of Education	Susannah.Sionetuato@mail.gov.nu	4145/5700/7666
2	Zarn Kavisi	M	Research Officer	Tāoga Niue	Zarn.Kavisi@mail.gov.nu	4138/5159/7604
3	Luina Vilila	F	Environment Officer	Dept of Environment	Luina.Vilila@mail.gov.nu	4021/4825
4	Judy Nemaia	F	Environment Officer	Dept of Environment	Judy.Nemaia@mail.gov.nu	4021/5945/4660
5	Crispina Konelio	F	Water Specialist	Dept of Utilities	Crispina.Konelio@mail.gov.nu	4223/6635/7432
6	Mellisa Douglas	F	Meteorological Officer	Niue Met. Service	melissa.talagi@mail.gov.nu	4601/5909/4288
7	Charlotte Pihigia	F	Research Officer	Dept of Environment	charlotte.pihigia@mail.gov.nu	4018/5563/4377
8	Jazinta Levi	F	Project Support Officer	PMCU	jazinta.levi@mail.gov.nu	4159/5904/7654
9	Pats Sionetama	F	Technical Adviser	Office of the NAO	Pats.Sionetama@mail.gov.nu	4200/4507
10	EJ Strickland	M	Fire fighter	Niue Rescue Fire Services	ej.strickland@mail.gov.nu	
11	Andre Siohane	M	DG - Infrastructure	Ministry of Infrastructure	andre.siohane@mail.gov.nu	
12	Doreen Siataga	F	Accountant	Treasury	doreen.siataga@mail.gov.nu	6655
13	Kimray Vaha	M	Stastician	Dept of Statistics	kimray.vaha@mail.gov.nu	4219
14	Daniel Makaia	M	Environment Officer	Dept of Environment	daniel.makaia@mail.gov.nu	4021/5387/4827
15	Huggard Tongatule	M	Environment Officer	DAFF	Huggard.Tongatule@mail.gov.nu	4032/5383/7401
16	Chad Siakimotu	M	Building Tradesman	Public Works Dept	chad.siakimotu@mail.gov.nu	4197/5877/7710
17	Haden Talagi	M	Project Coordinator	Dept of Environment	haden.talagi@mail.gov.nu	4021/4377/5277
18	Sauni Tongatule	M	Director	Dept of Environment	sauni.tongatule@mail.gov.nu	4021
19	Poi Okesene	M	Technical Project Manager	DAFF	poi.okesene@mail.gov.nu	4233/5602/4506
20	Natasha Toeono-Tohovaka	F	Senior Project Manager	DAFF	Natasha.Tohovake@mail.gov.nu	4032/7644
21	Angela Tuhipa	F	Establishment Director	PMCU	angela.tuhipa@mail.gov.nu	4159
22	Lucy Viviani	F	Imprest Accountant - EU	Office of the NAO	lucy.viviani@mail.gov.nu	4159/6552/7642

Annex 3
Photos of workshop activities



Annex 4

LFA PART 2 - POST TRAINING EVALUATION FORM PALAU

Completed by 13 participants

The training was well structured	7	6	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The training was poorly structured
----------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------------

The activities gave me the confidence that I can apply the knowledge in my work	7	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	The activities did not give me confidence that I can apply the knowledge in my work				
---	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

I found the learner guide useful	7	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	I did not find the learner guide useful				
----------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

I learnt things that will be useful to my work	9	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	I did not learn things that will be useful to my work				
--	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

The course was well presented	9	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	The course was poorly presented				
-------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------

The facilitators made the material enjoyable	10	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	The facilitators did not make the material enjoyable				
--	----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

For each of the following, please rate your level of confidence in being able to undertake the following steps of the logical framework approach when you get back to your job.

	<i>Very confident</i>			<i>Not at all confident</i>			
Problem analysis	10	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Solution analysis	10	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Logframe matrix	1	4	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project monitoring	1	9	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timeline	5	7	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Budget	8	3	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I am confident that I can design a good project	10	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	I am not confident that I can design a good project				
---	----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

I would recommend this course to my colleagues	11	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	I would not recommend this course to my colleagues
--	----	---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Four days for the course was:	About right	11
	Too short	1
	Too long	1

What was the most useful thing you learnt on this course?

<p>Breaking down of project into tasks, timeline, and budget, logframe was also useful</p> <p>How to plan a project properly</p> <p>I can apply the logframe for updating of job descriptions and keeping tabs on jobs to complete</p> <p>In order to produce a good proposal, you need time and good stakeholders.</p> <p>Learning how difficult it is to do a good proposal. It is now very clear and very useful</p> <p>Linkage between each step in a project cycle. The entire course was very useful</p> <p>Logframe matrix. Problem analysis</p> <p>Problem analysis, solution analysis, logframe matrix</p>

Problem tree, solution tree and logframe
Proper way in going about preparing info for projects
The whole of the LFA
The whole project cycle process and the requirement and commitment to ensure a successful implementation of project
where to start a project proposal - from ideas to implementation. Scope / background of a project
LFA. The LFA and overall training

The course would have been more effective if:

Have more 1 to 1 sessions. More time
I had been pre-exposed to project proposal planning before the workshop.
If a project could be designed and submitted for endorsement
More local Niue examples
More time to complete proposal
More time to do activities
More time to properly finish examples that included all participants (examples in the learner guide)
Others can how project proposals from the past in order to see what needs to be improved.
The training was in 10 working days

Which topic(s), if any, do you want follow-up training on?

All
Budget, contingency
Follow-up training in project management, LFA. More project monitoring and budget / timeline
Have refreshers from the Dept of Environment and to work closely with them for these proposals to work
Logframe matrix (specifically indicators & baselines). Project monitoring
Problem and solution analysis
Strategy analysis, budgets

Do you have any further comments or feedback about any aspects of the training?

Good - very effective
Hopefully our proposals will be approved in the future
It would have been great to be present at the 1st workshop last year
Pretty easy to understand
Refresher training every 2 years to promote more team work
Satisfied
Should have more of this kind of training
Thank you for the training. It was good to have refresher as there are new things & templates from the initial training. Need a follow-up as well in 2016
The training was very informative, especially for those not have experience on the work involved with projects
Training was very effective. Training was 1 day too long
Would be good if there is a refresher course ever 2 - 3 years to brush up on project skills