**giz** Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

# On Logical framework analysis (logframes in the context of the CSO – GIZ-IS Twining project )

**Change log**

| Who | When (Version Name in Time Stamp) | What | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Version 0/ KR | 08.05.2013 | First Draft | Introduction to the use of logframes in the project and 1. Example of project's logframe 2.Paragraph proposal on project's logframe |
| Version 0.1/ KR | 10.05.2013 | Contents of LF for project : Afghanstat - CSO Twinning Project (2013 - 2016) updated | Descriptions (page 14) added Modified structure of LF applied Contents for Goal, Outcome and Outputs added. Milestones, Indicators and Monitoring indicators for Output A,B,C, D input pending Comment on proposed changes in IR . Proposed Changes marked <mark>yellow</mark> |
| Version 0.2/ / KN and KR | 12.05.2013 | Contents of LF updated | <mark>Yellow</mark> change markers removed, changes applied , comments deleted Simplified structure of LF( Output A,B,C, D) applied Chapter 2.2. enhanced |
| Version 1.0 /KR | 14.05.2013 | completed | Output-Section A corrected. Output-Sections B,C,D completed with detailed indicators; WB results frame with integrated LF added |

## Contents

# 1. From generic to a logframe for CSO – GIZ-IS Twining project

This chapter is to explain the LF approach in general terms and for project purpose only. The different phases are related to the current project, indicating the reference in blue

| Analysis Phase | Planning Phase |
|---|---|
| Stakeholder analysis – identifying and characterising potential major stakeholders; assessing their capacity Ongoing /Results in Inception Report | Developing logical framework matrix – defining project structure, testing its internal logic and risks, formulating measurable indicators of success Ongoing/ Inception Report |
| Problem analysis – identifying key problems, constraints and opportunities; determining cause and effect relationships Ongoing / Results in Inception Report | Activity scheduling – determining the sequence and dependency of activities; estimating their duration, and assigning responsibility Ongoing / Inception Report and Work Plan |
| Objective analysis – developing solutions from the identified problems; identifying means to end relationships Implementation Phase based on Milestones | Resource scheduling – from the activity schedule, developing input schedules and a budget Inception Report/ tb modified during Implementation Phase |
| Strategy analysis – identifying different strategies to achieve solutions; selecting most appropriate strategy Implementation Phase based on Milestones | |

## 1.1. The Logical Framework Approach

## 1.2. An early template

| Narrative causality (mention target groups) | Indicators and means of verification | Assumptions and risks |
|---|---|---|
| 1. GOAL<br><br>The higher-level objective towards which the project is expected to contribute. | 1. GOAL INDICATORS<br><br>Measures (direct or indirect) which verify to what extent the goal is fulfilled. Means of verification should be specified. | 1. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions necessary for sustaining the objectives in the long run. |
| 2. PURPOSE<br><br>The effect which is expected to be achieved as a result of the project. | 2. PURPOSE INDICATORS<br><br>Measures (direct or indirect) which verify to what extent the purpose is fulfilled. Means of verification should be specified. | 2. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions outside the control of the project which must prevail for the development objective to be attained. |
| 3. OUTPUTS<br><br>The results that the project management should be able to guarantee. | 3. OUTPUT INDICATORS<br>(a baseline, a target, milestones)<br>Measures (direct or indirect) which verify to what extent the outputs are produced. Means of verification should be specified. | 3. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions outside the control of the project management, necessary for the achievement of the immediate objective. |
| 4. ACTIVITIES<br><br>The activities that have to be undertaken by the project in order to produce the outputs. | 5. INPUTS<br><br>Goods and services necessary to undertake the activities. | 4. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions outside the control of the project management, necessary for the production of the outputs. |

This template should be read like

IF we undertake the activities AND the assumptions hold true, THEN we will create the outputs

IF we deliver the outputs AND the assumptions hold true, THEN we will achieve the purpose

IF we achieve the purpose AND the assumptions hold true, THEN we will contribute to the goal

## 1.3. WB generic approach includes (as principal difference) : M&E Supervision

| Narrative causality (mention target groups) | Indicators and means of verification | M&E Supervision | Assumptions and risks |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. GOAL<br><br>The higher-level objective towards which the project is expected to contribute. | 1. GOAL INDICATORS<br><br>Measures (direct or indirect) which verify to what extent the goal is fulfilled. Means of verification should be specified. | The program evaluation system | 1. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions necessary for sustaining the objectives in the long run. |
| 2. PURPOSE<br><br>The effect which is expected to be achieved as a result of the project. | 2. PURPOSE INDICATORS<br><br>Measures (direct or indirect) which verify to what extent the purpose is fulfilled. Means of verification should be specified. | People, events, processes, sources of data for organizing the project evaluation system. | 2. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions outside the control of the project which must prevail for the development objective to be attained. |
| 3. OUTPUTS<br><br>The results that the project management should be able to guarantee. | 3. OUTPUT INDICATORS (a baseline, a target, milestones) Measures (direct or indirect) which verify to what extent the outputs are produced. Means of verification should be specified. | People, events, processes, sources of data - supervision and monitoring system for project implementation. | 3. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions outside the control of the project management, necessary for the achievement of the immediate objective. |
| 4. ACTIVITIES<br><br>The activities that have to be undertaken by the project in order to produce the outputs. | 5. INPUTS<br><br>Goods and services necessary to undertake the activities. | People, events, processes, sources of data and monitoring system for project design | 4. ASSUMPTIONS<br><br>Important events, conditions or decisions outside the control of the project management, necessary for the production of the outputs. |

Framework development will be an integral part of the WB-CDF (comprehensive development framework) and the CAS (WB Country Assistance strategy) The wording is slightly different, in WB terminology Purpose has become Project Development Objectives and Goals are often CAS-Goals.

## 1.4. DFID Logframe Template (2009 revised format)

| PROJECT TITLE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GOAL | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| PURPOSE | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| OUTPUT 1 | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | Assumptions |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Impact Weighting | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | RISK RATING |
| | | | | | | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| OUTPUT 2++ | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Impact Weighting | Indicator | Baseline + year | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Target + year | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | RISK RATING |
| | | | | | | |
| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## 1.5. DFID – Example of the REVISED LOGFRAME (December 2011) with high profile involvement of CSO

**In the new terminology, the Goals are now Impacts, Purpose has become Outcome**

| PROJECT TITLE | ENHANCING THE INTERACTION AND INTERFACE BETWEEN CIVIL SOCIETY AND STATE TO IMPROVE POOR PEOPLE'S LIVES (ENCISS) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IMPACT** | **Indicator I1** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | **Assumptions** |
| To deliver sustainable peace, security and democracy through a capable and accountable governance system that responds to the needs of poor women, men, youth and children | Improvements in poor women, men, youth and children access to, use of and satisfaction with basic services | North Region = 3/5[i] <br> South Region = 3/5 <br> West Region = 2/5[ii] <br> East Region = 2/5 <br><br> UN Human Development Index Score 180/187 | | All ENCISS regions score 3/5 <br><br><br><br> UN Human Development Index score 175 mark | • Citizenship continues to build up <br> • GoSL commitment to peaceful and constructive multi-stakeholders engagements and involvements. <br> • Political tolerance and stability <br> • Sierra Leone continues to enjoy peace and stability <br> • GoSL commitment, and openness to engage in consultations on national issues. <br> • GoSL continues to demonstrate its commitment to public accountability and transparency. <br> • Next Poverty Reduction Strategy retains focus on the poorest |
| | **Source** | | | | |
| | ENCISS Baseline 2011 (Review 2013), Sierra Leone MDG Progress Report 2010, UN HDR Sierra Leone 2011, SL PRSP Progress Report 2011, Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (MPI) Country Report 2011 (uses data from 2008 however). | | | | |
| | **Indicator I2** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | |
| | Poor women, men, youth and children perceive a reduction in community tension and disputes | ENCISS Regions = 3/5[iii] <br><br><br> **58.4/100** overall Safety and Rule of Law Score (Ibrahim Index 2011) <br><br> **14/53** Personal Safety Score (Ibrahim Index 2011) <br><br> **17/53** National Security Score (Ibrahim Index 2011) | - <br><br><br> 60/100 Safety and Rule of Law Score <br><br> +5 point increase in personal safety and national security | All ENCISS regions score 4/5[iv] <br><br> 67/100 Safety and Rule of Law Score <br><br> +10 point increase in personal safety and national security | |
| | **Source** | | | | |

giz Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

| | | Ibrahim Index (2011), SL PRSP Progress Report 2011, Sierra Leone MDG Progress Report 2010, ENCISS Baseline 2011 (and Review 2013) Justice Sector Coordination Office / Office for National Security 2011 Reports (yet to be completed) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| **Outcome** | **Indicator O1** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | **Assumptions** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To improve the quality of the lives of poor women, men, children and youth by *enhancing their engagement* with government so that resources are distributed in an equitable manner | Quality of governance in ENCISS supported CSOs (inclusiveness, responsiveness, transparency and capability). | Score 3/5[v] | 3/5 | 4/5[vi] | • Govt institutions across the board implement national policies and strategies.
• GoSL enforces performance contracts at national and local levels
• GoSL continues to demonstrate its willingness and commitment to principles of responsiveness and accountability to poor and marginalised people's needs and concerns.
• Decentralisation continues to be used and viewed as a strategy for good governance, poverty reduction, peace and stability.
• GoSL commitment, and openness to engage on national issues
• CSOs are willing and have the capacity to engage on national issues
• Decentralised structures have the capacity and willingness to engage, respond and manage community needs, and expectations. |

**Source (Indicator O1):** ENCISS Baseline 2011, ENCISS QPRs, ENCISS Final Evaluation 2013

**Indicator O2** — Grantees and their constituents satisfaction with quality of governance in government (responsiveness, transparency, capability, accountability)[1]

| Baseline 2011 | N | S | E | W | 2012 | N | S | E | W | Target 2013 | N | S | E | W |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Region | | | | | Region | | | | | Region | | | | |
| Responsiveness | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | Resp. | - | - | - | - | Resp. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Transparency | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | Trans. | - | - | - | - | Trans | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Accountability | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Acct. | - | - | - | - | Acct | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Capability | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Cap. | - | - | - | - | Cap | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

**Source (Indicator O2):** ENCISS Baseline, ENCISS QPRs, ENCISS Baseline review (2013), DFID Annual Review (2012) and ENCISS Final Evaluation (2013)

**Indicator O3** — Passage of key legislation and / or policies which enhance the equitable distribution of resources[2]

| Baseline 2011 | 2012 | Target 2013 |
|---|---|---|
| Thematic practices being influenced through ENCISS policy monitoring, forums and grantee advocacy work:

Gender = 15
Youth = 9
Elections = 9 | 50% of grantees policy advocacy / practice work in 2011 has contributed to passage of key legislation or changes in practice to enhance the equitable distribution of resources

2012 totals tbc | 75% of all ENCISS grantee policy advocacy / practice work has contributed to passage of key legislation or changes in practice to enhance the equitable distribution of resources |

---

[1] This includes satisfaction with justice and redress, fair and free elections.
[2] Focus on policy and practice changes

| | | Decentralisation = 13<br>Justice and Security = 5<br>Others (Disability Act = 3,<br>Freedom of Info Bill = 3) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Source** | | | |
| | | ENCISS Grantee Applications 2011, 2012, 2013; ENCISS Policy Forum Reports, ENCISS QPRs, ENCISS Grantee documentation and ENCISS Final Evaluation (2013) | | | |

| **INPUTS (£)** | **DFID (£)** | **Govt (£)** | **Other (£)**<br>**(£1 = Euro 1.19)** | **Total (£)** | **DFID SHARE (%)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 4,500,000 | | 4,453,782 | 8,953,782 | 50% |
| **INPUTS (HR)** | **DFID (FTEs)** | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| **OUTPUT 1** | **Indicator 1.1** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | **Assumptions** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Local levels of government are *demonstrating increased democratic and responsive decision-making*, targeting the needs of the most marginalised | Quality of dialogue sessions between citizens and state in ENCISS geographical areas[3] | Score 3/5[vii] in ENCISS supported districts | 3/5 in ENCISS supported districts | Score of 4/5[viii].<br><br>All grantees highlight good practice examples from across the Programme which illustrate dialogue sessions delivering towards the needs of marginalised in ENCISS geographical areas | • GoSL and district council willingness to open up, and engage in national consultations and dialogues.<br>• GoSL and district councils view and commits to use dialogue as a tool for information sharing and conflict resolutions.<br>• GoSL commitment to coordinate development efforts at local and national levels.<br>• GoSL and district council willingness and commitment to CSOs' involvement in the implementation poverty reduction strategy |
| | | **Source** | | | |
| | | ENCISS Baseline; ENCISS Grantee QPRs, ENCISS regional monitoring reports, Local Governance and Decentralisation Study (early 2012), Grantee Policy Forum Reports on Decentralisation | | | |
| | **Indicator 1.2** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | |
| | ENCISS supported districts have WDCs that are actively engaged in and monitoring | Score 2/4[ix] | Self Assessment Score tbc | Score 3/4[x] | |
| | | **Source** | | | |

---

[3] ENCISS Geographical areas are four: North, South, East and West Region. Specifically - Bonthe District, Kenema District and Bo District

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | development in their communities for poor women, men, youth | ENCISS Baseline 2011, ENCISS Regional Monitoring Reports, Self Assessment Scores of WDCs (early 2012) | | | • Political stability.<br>• The implementation of the PRSP II tops the GoSL' national agenda.<br>• District Budget Oversight Committees are able to get the relevant data from District Councils<br>• GoSL continues to support decentralisation and local councils |
| | **Indicator 1.3** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | |
| | ENCISS district and municipal development plans are implemented in communities | 100% of ENCISS supported district and municipal development plans focus on the needs and concerns of poor and marginalised groups | 30% of ENCISS district and municipal development plans are achieving targets as laid out in their most recent development plan | 50% of ENCISS district and municipal development plans are achieving targets as laid out in their most recent development plan | |
| | | **Source** | | | |
| | | ENCISS Baseline 2011, Grantee QPRs, ENCISS Regional Monitoring Reports of district, municipal implementation activities and progress of plans, Grantee Policy Forum Reports on Decentralisation | | | |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING** | | | | | |
| 25% | | | | | **RISK RATING** |
| | | | | | Medium |

| **INPUTS (£)** | **DFID (£)** | **Govt (£)** | **Other (£)** | **Total (£)** | **DFID SHARE (%)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

| **INPUTS (HR)** | **DFID (FTEs)** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

| **OUTPUT 2** | **Indicator 2.1** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | **Assumptions** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Poor women, men, youth and children are *proactively participating in decision-making processes and monitoring* the implementation of policies that affect their lives in | Grantees influence joint development processes with authorities on *gender equality and women's rights* | No examples of change resulting from ENCISS grantee advocacy work as just beginning activities (Nov 2011) | 60% of grantees focused on this theme demonstrate influential engagements with authorities on the issue of gender equality and women's rights | 70% of the total amount of grantees focused on this theme have tangible evidence of change in gender equality and women's rights | • The Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development (MLGRD) continues to provide technical support to local councils<br>• The MLGRD willing to enforce guidelines for a participatory |
| | | **Source** | | | |

| ENCISS thematic areas[4] | | Grantee Applications on Gender Equality and Women's Rights, Grantee QPRs, ENCISS Case Studies, DFID Annual Review (2012), ENCISS Policy Forum Reports on Gender | | | • local development planning and budgeting<br>• Citizens and CSOs willingness to hold their local authorities to account |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Indicator 2.2** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | • Local councils demonstrate capacity and openness to lead and facilitate a community driven development planning processes. |
| | Grantees influence joint development processes with authorities on *youth development* | No examples of change resulting from ENCISS grantee advocacy work as just beginning activities (Nov 2011) | 60% of grantees focused on this theme demonstrate influential engagements with authorities on the issue of youth development | 60% of the total amount of grantees focused on this theme have tangible evidence of change where they have influenced government processes in youth development | • District Councils have the capacity and willingness to transcend the politicization of local government dealings.<br>• Decentralized structures have the capacity and willingness to engage, respond and manage community expectations and needs. |
| | **Source** | | | | • GoSL commitment to coordinate development efforts at local and national levels. |
| | Grantee Applications Youth Development, Grantee QPRs, DFID Annual Review (2012), ENCISS Policy Forum Reports on Youth Development, ENCISS Case Studies | | | | |
| | **Indicator 2.3** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | • GoSL willingness and commitment to CSOs' involvement in the implementation of the PRS-II decentralisation process and the anti-corruption strategy. |
| | Grantees influence joint development processes with authorities on *justice and security* | No examples of change resulting from ENCISS grantee advocacy work as just beginning activities (Nov 2011) | 50% of grantees focused on this theme demonstrate influential engagements with authorities on justice and security | 60% of the total amount of grantees focused on this theme have tangible evidence of change where they have influenced government processes on justice and security | |
| | **Source** | | | | |
| | Garantee Applications Justice and Security, Garantee QPRs, DFID Annual Review (2012), ENCISS Policy Forum Reports on Justice and Security, ENCISS Case Studies | | | | |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING** | **Indicator 2.4** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | • Political stability at district level. |
| 20% | Active participation of grantees in *fair and free election* processes with authorities | No examples of change resulting from ENCISS grantee advocacy work as just beginning activities (Nov 2011) | 100% of grantees working on the election theme have influenced authorities and supported Pre-electoral activities so that the final election process is carried | Grantees continue to support peaceful post election processes for State building. | • Central government budgetary responsiveness to district councils |

[4] 5 themes: Gender, Youth, Justice & Security, Decentralization and Elections. Output 1 captures Decentralization theme, therefore Output 2 has only 4 themes presented.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | out successfully in a peaceful, fair and free way. | | | |
| | **Source** | | | | **RISK RATING** |
| | Grantee Applications on Elections, Grantee QPRs, ENCISS Policy Forum Reports on Elections, Media clippings during elections, Grantee documentation / reports specifically on election work, ENCISS Case Studies | | | | Medium |

| **INPUTS (£)** | **DFID (£)** | **Govt (£)** | **Other (£)** | **Total (£)** | **DFID SHARE (%)** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| **INPUTS (HR)** | **DFID (FTEs)** | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| **OUTPUT 3** | **Indicator 3.1** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | **Assumptions** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Increased capacity of community members, CSOs and government institutions to *communicate information on policy and practices* within the five thematic areas of ENCISS at district and national levels | Policy Forums held at national and district levels demonstrate active engagement between civil society and government to progress identified change | 2 Policy Forums (Nov 2011) | 8 Policy Forums (2 in each ENCISS Region) 1 National Learn & Share Event  2 / 9 of the targeted Policy Forum events have developed sufficient linkages, skills and cooperation to achieve the planned Policy Forum workplans for 2013. | 8 Policy Forums (2 in each ENCISS Region) 1 National Learn & Share Event  4 / 9 of the targeted Policy Forum events above demonstrate tangible results and progress against the planned Policy Forum workplans. | • Less party politics interference in the running and management of district councils' affairs.  • Harmony, cooperation and collaboration between district and chiefdom councils.  • Political stability and tolerance across the country.  • Chieftaincy administration willingness to engage in, and open up for constructive dialogue  • GoSL commitment to a successful implementation of its agenda for change.  • Willingness and commitment of CSOs and state institutions to accountability and transparency  • CSOs willingness and |
| | | **Source** | | | |
| | | ENCISS Policy Forum Reports, ENCISS Learn & Share Report, ENCISS Grantee QPRs, ENCISS Monitoring Reports | | | |
| | **Indicator 3.2** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | |
| | Public access to information from government on resource allocation and | NR = 2/5[xi] SR = 2/5 | 2/5 | All regions = 3/5[xii]  Passage of Freedom of | |

| | service delivery | ER = 2/5<br>WR = 3/5 | | Information Bill | commitment to national growth and development. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Source** | | | |
| | | ENCISS Regional Monitoring Reports, District Council bill boards and reports, MOFED published financial allocations, newspapers publication, Grantee QPR, ENCISS Baseline 2011 (and review 2013) | | | |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING** | **Indicator 3.3** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | |
| 15% | Grantees working in the five thematic areas of ENCISS come together, share information and collaborate on their work | No examples of meetings held amongst grantees | 50% of all ENCISS grantees hold meetings together beyond policy forums on ENCISS thematic areas | 60% of all ENCISS grantees hold meetings together beyond policy forums on ENCISS thematic areas | |
| | | **Source** | | | **RISK RATING** |
| | | | | | Medium |
| | | ENCISS grant applications, ENCISS QPRs, ENCISS Policy Forum Reports, ENCISS Monitoring Reports, DFID Review 2012, 2013 | | | |
| **INPUTS (£)** | **DFID (£)** | **Govt (£)** | **Other (£)** | **Total (£)** | **DFID Share (£)** |
| | | | | | |
| **INPUTS (HR)** | **DFID (FTEs)** | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **OUTPUT 4** | **Indicator 4.1** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | **Assumptions** |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grantees demonstrating organisational and technical capability to fulfil their work plans and mandates | Assessment score of 13 technical areas:<br><br>Score 1[xiii] = 7%<br>Score 2[xiv] = 21%<br>Score 3[xv] = 50%<br>Score 4[xvi] = 22% | 60% of grantees from 2011 score 3 / 4<br><br>Assessment score of 2012 Grantees | 75% of all ENCISS grantees score 3 / 4 | • Suitable and capable NGOs/CSOs with which to partner<br>• Interest and willingness of NGOs/CSOs to work in partnership with ENCISS<br>• Citizens acceptability of ENCISS value addition, role in Sierra Leone<br>• ENCISS grant-making operates efficiently and effectively with proper accountability<br>• Grant giving procedures enable small grants to be easily accessed and a change to grant success being its impact and not only compliance<br>• ENCISS does not overshadow activities but allows NGOs/CSOs to take the lead. |
| Increased *capacity of grantees* to influence and engage with government in ENCISS thematic areas | | | | | |
| | | **Source** | | | |

| | | ENCISS Baseline, Assessment Score Reviews, ENCISS Evaluation, ENCISS Training / Monitoring Reports | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Indicator 4.2** | **Baseline** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | |
| | Grants awarded to CSOs and Government working in citizen – government dialogue | 16 strategic grants (funded till 2013) 14 project grants 15 micro grants (48 grants in total) | 26 project grants 100 micro grants | 16 strategic grants 40 project grants 130 micro grants (186 grants in total) | |
| | | **Source** | | | |
| | | Grant applications awarded 2011, 2012, 2013 | | | |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING** | **Indicator 4.3** | **Baseline 2011** | **2012** | **Target 2013** | |
| 30% | Grantees disseminate effective and well documented evidence on policy issues and practices in the ENCISS thematic areas | No examples as beginning of activities for grantees. | 50% of ENCISS grantees develop evidence on policy engagement practices in citizen – government dialogue | 75% of ENCISS grantees develop evidence on policy engagement practices in citizen – government dialogue | |
| | | **Source** | | | |
| | | Grant applications awarded 2011, ENCISS Thematic Policy Forum reports, DFID Annual Review (2012), Grantee QPRs, Grantee documentation (key publications). | | | **RISK RATING** |
| | | | | | High |
| **INPUTS (£)** | **DFID (£)** | **Govt (£)** | **Other (£)** | **Total (£)** | **DFID Share (£)** |

| INPUTS (HR) | DFID (FTEs) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

---

[i] 3 = Generally satisfied as access to and use of basic services exists but needs improvement, to be built up and meet growing needs

[ii] 2 = Little satisfaction as access to and use of basic services is very limited

[iii] 3 = Notable positive changes in community tension and disputes. A reduction in disputes in community members daily lives but still a great amount of work to do in communities to maintain a peaceful and cooperative environment.

[iv] 4 = Significant reduction in community tension and disputes. Communities are peaceful and few if any disputes occur.

[v] 3 = CSOs are active in representing the marginalized and in empowering citizens but with limited change and results. Isolated cases of key social, economic and political concerns are finding a voice among citizens. CSOs work with their constituency in advocacy work and actively inform citizens

[vi] 4 = CSOs are capable and active in representing the marginalized and empowering children, youth and women, with some success and examples of impact. CSOs are effective in taking up the key concerns of the population and have sustained relations with their constituency, which informs advocacy

[vii] 3 - Some citizens feel their views and opinions are being heard, some can claim their rights and are able to hold government to account, but minimal change is taking place as a result of their efforts

[viii] 4 = majority of citizens feel their views and opinions are being heard, they can claim their rights and that they are able to hold government to account, with some positive examples of change happening as a result.

[ix] 2 = Some progress but still a great amount of work to do overall in engaging with communities and monitoring development of the community to meet the needs of poor women, men and youth

[x] 3 = Achieving progress in community development initiatives with noticeable changes in WDC attitudes in engaging with and monitoring development in their communities

[xi] 2 = CSOs have some access to information but government remains generally closed to sharing and making information accessible unless requested

[xii] 3 - CSOs have some information from government and this is made available to the public by both CSO efforts and Government efforts

[xiii] 1 = Little capacity

[xiv] 2 = Basic level of capacity in place

[xv] 3 = Moderate level of capacity in place

[xvi] 4 = High level of capacity in place

## 2. The logframe proposal for the Afghanstat-CSO Twinning Project

This chapter explains the project logframe and the integration into the results framework of the WB.

We will use the new terminology: Impact, Outcome, and Output. Means of Verification has been renamed to 'Source'.

Inputs could be quantified in terms of funds (expressed in US$ for GIZ and all partners) and have been included for this LF for external sources but use of GIZ staff time (expressed as annual Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) have been included. Assumptions are shown at Outcome and Output level only.

Risks are shown at Activities level only, but also rated at Output level. At the Output level, the Impact Weighting is now shown in the logframe together with a Risk Rating for individual Outputs. **Activities are shown separately (they do not normally appear in the logframe for approval), they are described in the Work plan** and the various reports, Inception report to start with. Although they can be added to the logframe, it is more suitable to keep them in a separate logframe for project purposes. This avoids the blowing up of the logframe with reduced intelligibility and a duplication of the work plan.

The logframe is an additional tool for project management. It does not replace the Work plan but indicates the logical impact chain of various layers of the project in a comprehensive way. Additional indications could be made for monitoring the indicators on various levels. Again this has been discarded to avoid overburdening the logframe. It is recommended to use the logframe at defined intervals (e.g. end of implementation phases) to describe the achievements of the project. The monitoring of the milestones and indicators will be defined by milestones' definition and indicator assessment, which will be integral part of the Quality Assessment Framework.

Some small design changes have been implemented for better readability:

Impact and Risk have been moved to the lower right of each principal output section (A, B, C, D).

FTEs have been replaced by customary unit of GIZ-IS (Man months / MM)

### 2.1. Major difference between the two approaches DFID and WB:

**WB: Top down – Policy oriented**.

The logframe is designed in view of the Country Strategy and its components are adapted to make the project contribution to the Goals visible. It is not as such a control mechanism but a visualisation of the project in the political context.

**DFID: Bottom up – Project oriented**

The DFID logframe is clearly a tool to visualize the monitoring of the project's progress and (as the WB) to see the components of the project in the overall political context. It is more of a living monitoring framework to be extended to the subsequent years of project progress. As such it has more benefit for the project administration and will be used as such in the context. There is no disadvantage to use a DFID style logframe in the WB CAS context, even if different components of the WB country assistance will use another style of logframe.

**A synergy of both**

The present logframe is closely referenced to the Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements of the Catalytic Fund Statistics for Results Facility (SRF-CF)

The result chain should be transparent with the given logframe, Monitoring results are not given in figures but targets are indicated. A separate Monitoring framework in a detailed version of the LF will describe and indicator targets for specific milestones.

| PROJECT TITLE | Afghanstat - CSO Twinning Project (2013 -2016) Improving the quality of the SSA by process management consulting in CSO by GIZ-International Services | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IMPACT** | Indicator | Baseline 2013 | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Target 2016 (Implement. Phase III + Finalisation) | |
| CSO and statistical information impacts used for political decision making | Statistical information is used | | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | WB Country Assistance Strategy | | | | |
| | Indicator | Baseline 2013 | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Target 2016 (Implement. Phase III + Finalisation) | |
| | Visibility and reliability of the SSA for the Afghan and the foreign public | Newspaper, media and press assessment | | | | |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | Afghanistan National Statistical Plan 2010 | | | | |
| **OUTCOME** | Indicator | Baseline 2013 | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Target 2016 (Implement. Phase III + Finalisation) | Assumptions |
| The Statistical System of Afghanistan is working efficiently according to international standards and Statistical | Statistical system aligned with international Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics | Baseline: Inception Report statistical capacity building indicator proposed by project (A | Review of indicator achievement of Statistical system SCBI (+10%) | Review of indicator achievement of Statistical system SCBI t (+30%) | Review of indicator achievement of Statistical system SCBI (+50%) | CSO and Line Ministries cooperate on essential organizational issues Economic stability and |

| Information is used and requested. | | statistical capacity building indicator_<TStamp>.docx ) | | | | progress lead to increased demand for fact based information |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Source** | | | | |
| | | Indicators monitored by external evaluation (see below under outputs) Mechanisms to coordinate statistical activities and to ensure compliance with international recommendations and good practice are in place Information about statistical practices and procedures (metadata) is compiled and published Statistical agencies are entitled and able to comment on erroneous interpretation and misuse of statistics Existence of effective procedures for quality reviews of key statistics Reviews of indicator achievement at milestones | | | | |
| | **Indicator** | **Baseline 2013** | **Milestone 1** | **Milestone 2** | **Target 2016** | |
| | Deliverables of the SSA Request and appearance of SSA and its deliverables | Sales of CSO Statistical Products and Webpage access User satisfaction Baseline (web accesses) | Improvement of Sales / requests of CSO Statistical Products / User satisfaction and Webpage access (+10%) | Improvement of Sales / requests of CSO Statistical Products / Products / User satisfaction and Webpage access (+30%) | Improvement of Sales / requests of CSO Statistical Products / User satisfaction and Webpage access (+50%) | |
| | | **Source** | | | | |

giz Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

| | | Indicators monitored by: | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sales and requests of CSO Statistical Handbook | | | | | |
| | | Demand for CSO Products and Webpage access / User-Producer survey | | | | | |
| | | External evaluation (see below under outputs) | | | | | |
| INPUTS (US$) | GIZ (US$) | Govt (US$) | Other (US$) | Total (US$) | GIZ Share (%) | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| INPUTS (HR) | GIZ (MM) | | | | | | |
| | 187.0 | | | | | | |

| Output A1 /A.2 Dissemination policy in and User-Producer Dialogue in improved | Indicators A.2 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | User satisfaction Media visibility / Publications and Web appearance of CSO: No of requests of statistical | Draft dissemination strategy and User-Produce Dialogue analyzed Baseline information available | Needs assessed, reports on milestones delivered (A1, A7) No of requests of statistical products and media increased by 10% | Revised Statistical Yearbook (A3, A4, A5, A6) No of requests of statistical products (Statistical Yearbook) and | (A2) No of requests of statistical products (Statistical Yearbook) and media increased by 50% | User satisfaction assessed, and improved Media visibility / Publications and Web appearance Review of indicator achievement of Statistical system | Increase of web based publication against print media Gain of importance of civil society with need for statistical |

**OUTPUT A:**
CSO Institution developed as the principal provider of Statistical information in Afghanistan

| | products and media | | | media increased by 30% | | SCBI (+50%) | information Revival of the News, Information and Print Sector |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Source** | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: | | | | | |
| | | (-> information on media clippings , Number of publications, Number of press release to be collected) | | | | | |
| | | Inception Report; | | | | | |
| | | ANSP: Metadata in CSO not apt to international standard. | | | | | |
| | | CPI publications are published t+40 from t = data collection | | | | | |
| | | Afghan Info is not workable | | | | | |
| | | Public perception of the quality of CSO's products: User satisfaction survey. | | | | | |
| | | Scrutiny of media clippings or other media reactions./ Afghan Info is workable / CPI publications are published t+15 | | | | | |
| Output A3 Organisational Structure | Indicators A.3 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | Training assessment and training strategy. Organisation structure of CSO / Institutional Framework | Baseline information provided by Statistical capacity building indicator proposed by project: Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI | Structure reports drafted Framework ( Remuneration / grading system) drafted (A14, A12) C4.5.6. of SCB | Structure reports approved and implementation started (A9, A10, A13) C4.5.6. of SCB improve by 30% | New ANSP released (A8) C4.5.6. of SCB improve by 50% | Structure reports approved and implemented Institutional Framework in place Final assessment: output C4.5.6 of | Update of ANSP is reconciled with reorganisation of Organisation structure Training |

| | New ANSP | | improve by 10%. | | | SCBI | becomes integral part of institution building |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Training effectiveness assed by SCBI. Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI | **Source** | | | | | Training is subject and sector (department) related |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report ANSP: Training assessment and training strategy drafted, approved and published. Organisation structure and Institutional Framework of CSO drafted, approved and published New and improved version of ANSP released Staff performance improvement measured by performance assessments / production of statistics deliverables | | | | | |

| Output A4 Human Resource Structure | **Indicators A.4** | **Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase )** | **Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I)** | **Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II)** | **Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III)** | **Target 2016 /Finalization Phase** | **Assumptions** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HR strategy and HR Handbook. Advanced training offers and facilities Impact measured by output C2. of SCBI | Baseline information available (see below) No HR information system available. | Structure of HR information system approved (A15, A17, A18) Impact measured by output C2. of SCBI improve by 10% | Revision of HR information system. Impact measured by output C2. of SCBI improve by 30% | Revision of HR information system Impact measured by output C2. of SCBI improve by 50% | HR information system tested and implemented Final assessment: output C2. of SCBI | HR Structure is based on participatory ideas Training is believed to be integral part of HR capacity development |
| | | **Source** | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report Statistical Law | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ANSP Impact measured by output C2. of SCBI HR strategy and HR Handbook updated, reviewed, approved and released in a Personnel database. Personnel database in place and accessible to management and staff members / assessment of use of HR database Advanced training offers and facilities updated, reviewed, approved, released and transparent to staff (integrated into Personnel database ) Staff performance improved measured by performance assessments and staff satisfaction survey | | | | | |
| Output A5 Enhance Skills | Indicators A.5 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | Training strategy and Post training assessments HR database Training certificates First orientation course for new staff As A.3 | Baseline information available (see below) As A.3 and Number of CSO staff with educational attainment of bachelor | Structure of HR training system approved (A19, A20, A23) As A.3 and Number of CSO staff with educational attainment of bachelor +10% | As A.3 and Number of CSO staff with educational attainment of bachelor +30% | New orientation trainig course (A22) As A.3 and Number of CSO staff with educational attainment of bachelor +50% | Structure of HR training system approved and implemented Final assessment: output C4.5.6. of SCBI | Skills are enhanced according to capability of staff Skills are enhanced according to necessity of sector (department) |
| | | Source | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report Training Guide, | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No of training, trainees and staff members in external trainings<br>As A.3<br>and<br>Quality of training assessments / Training strategy / Training certificates<br>Number of CSO staff with educational attainment of bachelor | | | | |
| Output A6<br>Statistical<br>Infrastructure | Indicators<br>A.6 | Baseline 2013<br>( Inception<br>Phase ) | Milestone 1<br>(Implement.<br>Phase I) | Milestone 2<br>(Implement.<br>Phase II) | Milestone 3<br>(Implement.<br>Phase III) | Target 2016<br>/Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | Classifications and standards of CSO<br>Business and Enterprise Registry<br>Impact measured by output C3. of SCBI | Baseline information available<br>(see below)<br>No Business and Enterprise Registry / CSO standards declaration available. | Classifications and standards of CSO approved (A24)<br>Impact measured by output C3. of SCBI<br>improve by 10% | Impact measured by output C3. of SCBI<br>improve by 30% | Business and Enterprise Registry approved (A26)<br>and<br>Impact measured by output C3. of SCBI<br>improve by 50% | Classifications and standards of CSO / Business and Enterprise Registry implemented<br>Final assessment: output C3. of SCBI | CSO adheres to international standards<br>Selection of Registries and Data Storage systems are selected for the benefit of CSO and the public |
| | | Source | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by:<br>Inception Report<br>Impact measured by output C3. of SCBI<br>and<br>Classifications and standards of CSO updated and defined, approved and implemented<br>Business and Enterprise Registry defined, approved and implemented | | | | |

| INPUTS (US$) | GIZ (US$) | Govt (US$) | Other (US$) | Total (US$) | GIZ Share (%) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

| INPUTS (HR) | GIZ (Months) | | Impact and Risk | Impact Weighting | Risk Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 80.5 | | | 40% | Medium |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OUTPUT COMPONENT B: Data Collection and Analysis** | | | | | | | |
| Output B1 Data Quality Assurance CSO produces high and reliable quality information | Indicators B1 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | Use of Metadata in SSA Progress of Quality Framework Impact measured by output C 4. 5. of SCBI | Status as in Inception Report and Impact measured by output C 4. 5. of SCBI | Number of data with proper metadata for CSO data Quality Framework (10%) and Impact measured by output C 4. 5.. of SCBI Improved by 10% | Number of data with proper metadata for SSA (+30%) Quality Framework (30%) and Impact measured by output C 4. 5. of SCBI Improved by 30% | Number of data with proper metadata for SSA (+60%) Quality Framework (60%) and Impact measured by output C 4. 5. of SCBI Improved by 60% | Number of data with proper metadata for SSA (100%) Quality Framework in place (100%) Final assessment: output C 4. 5. of SCBI | Data Quality Assurance framework is actively supported by CSO and Line Ministries. Metadata concept reconciled with Methodology of Line Ministries |
| | Source | | | | | | |
| | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report ANSP Number of data with proper metadata,(of data collection and of freedom of political interference) / these indicators will have to be weighed, priority for CSO produced data (1.phase);Other data producers | | | | | | |

| | | (2.phase), reconciled Data (Target) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Output B2 Routine Household Surveys** HHH survey are conducted by CSO | **Indicators B2** | **Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase )** | **Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I)** | **Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II)** | **Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III)** | **Target 2016 /Finalization Phase** | **Assumptions** |
| | 2 HH Surveys (NRVA) are done by CSO | HH Survey (NRVA) is done externally | Progress indicator (1.phase 10%). | Progress indicator (1.phase 30%). | Progress indicator (+60%) Quality Framework (60%) | 2 HH Surveys (NRVA) done by CSO Progress indicator (100%) | Finances for HH survey are allocated for the CSO. Staff capacity building responds to HH survey demands* (*here outputs are dependent from one another) |
| | **Source** | | | | | | |
| | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report ANSP  Measure of advance on household survey / no index possible but progress indicator (1.phase 30%, 2.phase 60%, Target 100%) | | | | | | |
| **Output B3 Establishment Surveys conducted by CSO** | **Indicators B3** | **Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase )** | **Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I)** | **Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II)** | **Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III)** | **Target 2016 /Finalization Phase** | **Assumptions** |
| | Business register is produced by CSO IBES is done by CSO Measured by | No Business register is produced by CSO No IBES is done by CSO | Business register is produced by CSO Measured by delivery | 1.IBES is done by CSO Measured by delivery | 2.IBES is done by CSO Measured by delivery | Business register is produced and IBES is done by CSO Progress indicator (100%) | Finances for Business register and IBES survey are allocated for the CSO. Staff capacity |
| | **Source** | | | | | | |

| | delivery | Baseline / Indicators monitored by:<br>Inception Report<br><br>Assessment of No of surveys / No of users of establishment surveys | | | | | building responds to demands* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Output B4 National Accounts System is produced according s to international standards by CSO | Indicators B4 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase  I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase  II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase  III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | National Accounts System is revised according s to international standards and SNA are produced regularly Measured by delivery and impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI | SNA as in Inception Report and Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI | Progress indicator SNA (1.phase 10%). Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI improved by 10% | Progress indicator SNA (1.phase 30%). Impact measured by output C 5. 6.. of SCBI Improved by 30% | Progress indicator SNA (+60%) Quarterly accounts started Impact measured by output C 5. 6.. of SCBI Improved by 60% | Progress indicator SNA (+100%) Quarterly accounts produced Final assessment: output C 5. 6. of SCBI | Products of SSA for National Accounts are robust and deliver reliable and timely data* |
| | | Source | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by:<br>Inception Report<br><br>Progress indicator (1.phase 30%, 2.phase 60%, Target 100%) National Account that are developed | | | | | |
| Output B5 Price Statistics is | Indicators B5 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase  I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase  II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase  III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |

| produced according s to international standards by CSO timely and based country wide information | Price Statistics is produced by CSO timely and based country wide information and Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI | Status of Price Statistics as in Inception Report and Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI Number of provinces in which price data are collected = 6 | Number of provinces in which price data are collected = 8 Timeliness of CPI production (t+30 of days). Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI improved by 10% | Number of provinces in which price data are collected = 15 Timeliness of CPI production (t+25 of days), Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI improved by 30% | Number of provinces in which price data are collected = 29 Timeliness of CPI production (t+20 of days), Impact measured by output C 5. 6.. of SCBI improved by 60% | Number of provinces in which price data are collected = 34 Timeliness of CPI production (t+15 of days), Final assessment: output C 5. 6. of SCBI | Project component C2 delivers efficient ICT environment for data sharing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Source | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI Number of provinces in which price data are collected and included in the national CPI estimate / Timeliness of CPI production (t+No of days), Target t+15days | | | | | |
| INPUTS (HR) | | Expert months | | | Impact and Risk | Impact Weighting | Risk Rating |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 64.0 | | | | 30% | Medium |
| | | | | | | | |
| OUTPUT COMPONENT C: Administrative Data Systems: | | | | | | | |
| Output C1 | Indicators C1 | Baseline 2013 | Milestone 1 | Milestone 2 | Milestone 3 | Target 2016 | Assumptions |

| Statistical Audits System is in place and assures quality of CSO products | | ( Inception Phase ) | (Implement. Phase I) | (Implement. Phase II) | (Implement. Phase III) | /Finalization Phase | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | National Statistical Audits System revised Progress indicator Quality Assurance reviews are produced regularly and Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI | Status of Quality Assurance System as in Inception Report and Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI | Progress indicator Quality Assurance System (1.phase 10%). Number of audits internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 3/0 Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI has improved by 10% | Progress indicator Quality Assurance System (1.phase 30%). Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI has improved by 30% | Progress indicator Quality Assurance System (+60%) Number of audits internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 6/2 Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI has improved by 60% | Progress indicator Quality Assurance System (+100%) Number of audits internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 10/10 **Final assessment:** output C 5.- **Revision policy and practice- of SCBI** | System of Quality Assurance System is supported actively by CSO management |
| | | Source | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report and Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI  Number of audits (internal CSO / external Line. Ministries) provinces in which price data are collected and included in the national CPI estimate; progress indicator Quality Assurance System (1.phase 30%, 2.phase 60%, Target 100%) | | | | | |
| Output C2 Efficient data sharing within | Indicators C2 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |

| the SSA | Data are shared within the SSA Efficiently and Impact measured by output C 6. of SCBI | Status of Data Sharing as in Inception Report and Impact measured by output C 6. of SCBI | Progress indicator Data Sharing (1.phase 10%). Impact measured by output C 6.of SCBI has improved by 10% | Progress indicator Data Sharing (1.phase 30%) 30% of publications of CSO are based on shared data Impact measured by output C 6.of SCBI has improved by 30% | Progress indicator Data Sharing (2.phase 50%) 50% of publications of CSO are. based on shared data Impact measured by output C 6.of SCBI has improved by 50% | Progress indicator Data Sharing (3.phase 100%) At least 50% of CSO data are shared internationally **Final assessment: output C 6. of SCBI** | Security Situation allows access to major population centres. PSO are connected to CSO to transfer PCI data* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Source | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report  More efficient data sharing within the SSA / Index based on Users / Produces dialogue / satisfaction (to be developed by Key Expert for Users / Produces dialogue) | | | | | |

| INPUTS (US$) | GIZ (US$) | Govt (US$) | | Other (US$) | Total (US$) | | GIZ Share (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

| INPUTS (HR) | GIZ (Months) | | | Impact and Risk | Impact Weighting | | Risk Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 11.0 | | | | 10% | | Medium |

| OUTPUT COMPONENT:D : ICT Strategy and Operational Plan | |
|---|---|

| Output D1 ICT Strategy and Operational Plan | Indicators D1 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ICT Strategy and Operational Plan | Status of Quality Assurance System as in Inception Report | ICT Progress index (1.phase 10%). Number of meetings internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 3/0 | ICT Progress index (2.phase 30%). Number of meetings internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 6/2 | ICT Progress index (3.phase 60%). Number of meetings internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 6/6 | ICT Progress index (3.phase 100%). Number of meetings internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 10/10 | Management and CSO share the view of an integrated SSA. The technical conditions for the ICT Strategy and Operational Plan go hand with the building of ICT infrastructure* |
| | | **Source** | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report<br><br>Number of Meetings of ICT Task Force (internal CSO / external Line. Ministries )<br>Output of ICT Progress index (1.phase 10%, 2.phase 30% , 3.phase 60% ,Target 100%), Quantitative measure in other sub-output sections (to be developed by Key Expert for ICT) | | | | | Other Output pending |
| Output D2 Implement SDCA | Indicators D2 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | Data Centre is available and shared by users and producers of statistics. | Status of SDCA as in Inception Report | IT infrastructure coverage index (1.phase 10%). | IT infrastructure coverage index (2.phase 30%) Data Centre availability (50%), Number of users (50%) | Progress indicator Data Sharing (3.phase 50%) | Full computer: computer availability for all staffs that require it as per ICT plan Data Centre available (100%), Number of users assessed (100%), | Procurement and Service assurance system for ICT component has been developed and is functional for ICT of CSO |
| | | **Source** | | | | | |

| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report<br><br>IT infrastructure coverage index (4 components: full computer number, generator, UPS, internet access; across 43 entities: 34 PSOs + 7 CSO departments) / All PSOs have functional generators./ Weighed Index of target achievements (to be developed by Key Expert for ICT) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Output D3 ICT Governance and Capacity Building | Indicators D3 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | ICT Training is efficient and ICT knowledge is used for the benefit of SSA Training effectiveness assed by SCBI. Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI | Status of Quality Assurance System as in Inception Report and Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI | Primary quality assessment of ICT Training (+ 10%). Progress indicator increase of staff satisfaction and efficiency (+ 10%). Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI Improved by 10% | Quality assessment of ICT Training (+ 30%). Progress indicator increase of staff satisfaction and efficiency (+ 30%). Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI Improved by 30% | Quality assessment of ICT Training (+ 30%). Progress indicator increase of staff satisfaction and efficiency (+ 30%). Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI Improved by 60% | ICT Training (100%). Increase of staff satisfaction and efficiency (+ 100%). **Final assessment: output C4.5.6.of SCBI** | System of Quality Assurance System is supported actively by CSO management Remuneration system and HR support supports permanence of personnel with ITC knowledge in CSO and Stats services of Line Ministries |
| | | Source | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report<br><br>Primary quality assessment of ICT Training (to be developed by Key Expert for ICT and )Quality Survey (internal CSO / external Line. Ministries) provinces in which increase of staff satisfaction and efficiency is assessed (1.phase 10%, 2.phase 30% , 3.phase 60% ,Target 100%) | | | | | |

Working Paper –
Klaus Röder - Key Expert Data Quality

| Output D4 GIS Capability | Indicators D4 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Performance of GIS Services | Status of Data Sharing as in Inception Report | GIS Services requested and delivered (1.phase +10%). | GIS Services requested and delivered (2.phase +30%). | GIS Services requested and delivered (2.phase +60%). | GIS Services requested and delivers +100% **Final assessment: output C4.5.6.of SCBI** | |
| | | **Source** | | | | | |
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report<br><br> Measuring GIS deliverables (maps, services, CSO survey support measured in MM delivered) | | | | | |
| Output D5 Statistical SW Capability | Indicators D5 | Baseline 2013 ( Inception Phase ) | Milestone 1 (Implement. Phase I) | Milestone 2 (Implement. Phase II) | Milestone 3 (Implement. Phase III) | Target 2016 /Finalization Phase | Assumptions |
| | CSO is largely self sufficient in Statistical SW Capability | Status of Data Sharing as in Inception Report | Number of primary data surveys conducted by CSO with own Statistical SW Capability = 1 / 6 MM. Statistical SW Capability support for Line Ministries (3 MM). | Number of primary data surveys conducted by CSO with own Statistical SW Capability = 1 / 9 MM. Statistical SW Capability support for Line Ministries (6 MM). | Number of primary data surveys conducted by CSO with own Statistical SW Capability = 3 / 12 MM. Statistical SW Capability support for Line Ministries (9 MM). | Data surveys conducted by CSO with own Statistical SW Capability (Al possible). Statistical SW Capability support for Line Ministries established as requested service. **Final assessment: output C4.5.6.of SCBI** | Components D1 and D2 are successfully progressing and measured as indicated |

18/07/2013                                                                                                                      32

| | | Source | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Baseline / Indicators monitored by: Inception Report<br><br>Number of primary data surveys conducted by CSO with own Statistical SW Capability /MM delivered<br>Number of services delivered for Line Ministries supporting Statistical SW Capability (measure in MM) | | | | |
| INPUTS (US$) | GIZ (US$) | Govt (US$) | Other (US$) | Total (US$) | GIZ Share (%) | |
| | | | | | | |
| INPUTS (HR) | GIZ (Months) | | | Impact and Risk | Impact Weighting | Risk Rating |
| | 31.0 | | | | 20% | High |

## 2.2. Use of the Logframe: Afghanstat-CSO Twinning Project

The above described logframe comprises various project information described in more detail:
- The Inputs
- The Milestones
- The Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements
- The Use of Reviews as Quality Assessment Tool
- The Impact chain

The visualization of the Impact chain is the core element of the LF. The elements are connected by the reasoning described before, describing the envisaged project results on various layers

The Goal/Impact is the larger development challenge for which the particular project or programme is part of solution.
- The Goal/Impact should be a high-level aim, shared with other projects and programmes. It is something which the project contributes towards achieving
- The Goal/Impact should be measureable
- The project will have an Impact on the Goal/Impact  :

The Outcome should identify what will change as a result of the project and who will benefit
- • It is the effect which will be achieved if the project is successful
- • The Outcome should be measureable

The Outputs are the specifics which the project will deliver. If the outputs are delivered then the Outcome will be achieved.

Inputs are indicated by US$ and CSO and GIZ-IS MM, other donors could be added. Assumptions are stated in positive (affirmative) form. The risks are (among others) that these assumptions do not hold.


The document on quality reviews and quality assurance systems will be integral part of the projects' documentation. They are not part of the LF but are expected to be applied there.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements will be linked to the elements of the LF, namely the milestones and monitoring of indicator achievements.

Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements:
- Baseline values and targets for indicators are identified in the logical framework are estimated for each country during the application
- The logical framework proposes that usually outcome-level monitoring should be based on user surveys. Sometimes assessment by project coordinators is used if applicable. Existing surveys or user feedback arrangements may be used,  they should adhere to the quality standards of the project and should be conducted to independent assessment of the performance
- The logical framework also includes key output-indicators related to making improvements in statistical capacity. For the related assessments a version of the Data Quality Assessment Framework of the IMF adapted to the ANS will be applied.
- Measuring indicators will be conducted by Implementing agencies(GIZ-IS ad others) according to identified reporting frequencies stated in the LF.
- Progress reporting normally consists of six-monthly assessments of implementation status and results as part of project supervision activities.
- The supervising Administration (SRF Catalytic Fund) Unit will use information provided in project-level monitoring reports to assess progress against indicators listed in the logical framework for the Evaluation

## 2.3. Integration of Logframe: Afghanstat-CSO Twinning Project into the WB-SRF logframe

The following table is a combination of the WB results framework of the SRF-CF, which was responsible for the outcome indicators. The output and activity indicators have been merged from our GIZ-IS Logframe to this template
KR130525: Dates have not been changed because it seems that old dates have not been updated in WB template.

**Responsible for the Annex 3: Results Framework and Monitoring**

**AFGHANISTAN:  AFGHANSTAT: Strengthening the National Statistical System**
**Results Framework**

| Outcome indicators | Baseline | Midterm (March 2012) | Target | Frequency | Responsibility |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| World Bank Statistical Capacity Building Score for Afghanistan Methodology:  40 in 2010 Source data:  20 in 2010 Periodicity and timeliness:  57 in 2010 | 39 in 2010 | 38 | 45 | Yearly | WB |
| Number of NPP's and MDG indicators which are supported by the CSO (and which are clearly sourced as CSO data) Note: Number of indicators in MDG 2008 report clearly sourced as CSO or NRVA. | 17 (MDGs) | 21 (MDGs) | 26 (MDGs) | Yearly | CSO (PICT) |
| Percentage of users* who say they are satisfied or very satisfied with statistical products and services of the CSO and the line-ministries' statistical cells. *(\*) Users include: line-ministries, donors, NGOs, media, academics, private sectors. At list of selected entities* | TBC by Nov 30, 2010 | TBC by Nov 30, 2010 | TBC by Nov 30, 2010 | Yearly | User survey to be conducted or commissioned by the CSO |

| *will be developed during design of the User Survey* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Output indicators** | **Baseline** | **Midterm** | **Target** | **Frequency** | **Responsibility** |
| **A:Improved  Framework for Statistical Production and Capacity Development** | | | | | |
| *Sub -component A2:  User Satisfaction / Media visibility / Publications and Web appearance of CSO / Method: Media visibility by SCBI survey / Sales by score.)* | *Statistical capacity building indicator* | Media visibility / Publications and Web appearance by sales core. Review by Statistical system SCBI (+25%) | Media visibility / Publications and Web appearance by sales core. Review by Statistical system SCBI (+50%) | Sales core and Media Quarterly / SCBI Yearly | CSO (technical committee) |
| *Sub -component A3:  Training and training strategy assessment, Organisation structure of CSO / Method:* Capacity score will be delivered by SCBI | *Training impact measured by output C4.5.6. of SCBI* | *C4.5.6. of SCB improve by 50%* | *Structure reports approved and implemented* Institutional Framework in place *Final assessment: output C4.5.6 of SCBI* | Yearly | |
| *Sub -component A4 and A5:*  Score of capacity delivery of the CSO departments and CSO staff. / Capacity score will be delivered by SCBI | *Impact measured by output C2. of SCBI and score of trainings* | *Impact measured SCB improve by 50% Number of CSO staff with bachelor +50%* | *Structure of HR training system approved and implemented Final assessment: output of SCBI* | Yearly | |
| Sub-component A6:  Classification and Standards of CSO improved and Business Register established | *No Business and Enterprise Registry / CSO standards* | *Impact measured by output C3. of SCBI improve by 30%* | *Classifications and standards of CSO / Business and* | Yearly | CSO (PICT) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *declaration available. Baseline measured by output C3. of SCBI* | | *Enterprise Registry implemented Final assessment: output of SCBI* | |
| **B Improve Data Collection and Analysis Capacity** | | | | |
| Sub-component B1:  Indicator of data quality | Impact measured by output C 4. 5. of SCBI | Impact measured by output C 4. 5. of SCBI improved by 30% | Number of data with proper metadata for SSA (100%) Quality Framework in place (100%) Final assessment: output C 4. 5.  of SCBI | Yearly | CSO (technical committee) |
| Sub-component B2: Indicator of advance on household survey | NRVA done externally | 1 HH Survey (NRVA) done by CSO Progress indicator (50%) | 2 HH Surveys (NRVA) done by CSO Progress indicator (100%) | Yearly | |
| Sub-component B3:Indicator of advance on establishment surveys | No Business register is produced by CSO No IBES is done by CSO | 1.IBES is done by CSO Measured by delivery | Business register is produced and IBES is done by CSO Progress indicator (100%) | Yearly | |
| Sub-component B4:  Improvement of National Account System | Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI | Progress indicator SNA (1.phase 50%). Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI improved by 50% | Progress indicator SNA (+100%) Quarterly accounts produced Final assessment: output C 5. 6. of SCBI | Yearly | CSO (NA department) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sub-component B5: Number of provinces in which price data are collected and included in the national CPI estimate | Status of Price Statistics as in Inception Report and Impact measured by output C 5. 6. of SCBI | 10 Provinces are covered Impact measured by output C 5. 6.. of SCBI improved by 60% | Number of provinces in which price data are collected = 34 Timeliness of CPI production (t+15 of days), Final assessment: output C 5. 6. of SCBI | Yearly | CSO (CPI department) |
| **C Improve Administrative Systems** | | | | | |
| Sub-component C1: Statistical Audits: | Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI | Impact measured by output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI has improved by 60% | Quality Assurance System (+100%) Number of audits internal CSO / external Line. Ministries 10/10 Final assessment: output C 5.- Revision policy and practice- of SCBI | Yearly | CSO (CPI department |
| Sub-component C2: More efficient data sharing within the SSA | Impact measured by output C 6. of SCBI | Impact measured by output C 6.of SCBI has improved by 50% | Progress indicator Data Sharing (3.phase 100%) At least 50% of CSO data are shared internationally Final assessment: output C 6. of SCBI | Yearly | CSO (CPI department |
| Component D: Improve Information and Communication Technology Infrastructure | Impact measured by of SCBI | Impact measured by output of SCBI has improved by 50% | ICT Progress index (3.phase 100%). Data Centre available | Yearly | CSO (IT department) |

| Activity progress indicators* | Baseline | Midterm | Target | Frequency | Responsibility |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (100%), Number of users assessed (100%), | | |
| *Component A – Institutional and Capacity Development Public perception of CSO performance* | | | | | |
| *Deliverables, sales, clicks on web site)* | | | | *Quarterly* | |
| User satisfaction survey and SCBI /see above | | | | Yearly | |
| Use of Afghan Info (clicks) | | | | Quarterly | |
| Performance assessments of staff (SCBI) | | | | Yearly | |
| Number of deliverables | | | | Yearly | *CSO (PICT)* |
| Assessment of use of HR database | | | | Quarterly | |
| Staff satisfaction survey | | | | Yearly | |
| Quality of training assessments | | | | Yearly | |
| Number of CSO staff with educational attainment of bachelor | | | | Yearly | |
| *Component B - Data Collection and Analysis* | | *See above and Project Logframe* | | | |
| User satisfaction survey and SCBI /see above | | | | Yearly | |
| Use of quality tools | | | | Yearly | |
| Use of quality reviews | | | | Yearly | |
| IBES survey conducted (progress indicator cumulative %) | | | | Yearly | *CSO (PICT)* |
| Study on informal sector conducted (progress indicator cumulative %) | | | | Yearly | |
| Scope of price statistics extended (reach of number of milestones, progress) | | | | Yearly | |
| National Accounts data revised | | | | Yearly | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **_Component C - Administrative Data Systems_** | | | |
| Statistical audits at line ministries conducted | | Yearly | _CSO (PICT_ |
| Assessment of use of Administrative Data Systems | | Quarterly | |
| **_Component D - ICT Infrastructure_** | | | |
| Number of PSOs connected to the internet, | | _Yearly_ | |
| Data transfer between the PSOs and CSO operational and in use.(Number) | | Quarterly | |
| ICT is used by staff for primary data statistics | | Yearly | |

\*: Methodology to calculate activity progress indices. Each group will have specific activities to be taken, to be identified in the work plan. Each activity has a life cycle of its own and the progress can be captured through identified milestones of that activity. Once these milestones have been identified, weights will be assigned to the milestones according to their importance. To calculate the indices, the PICT will (i) compile milestones achieved at the reference point of time, (ii) apply appropriate weights, which will yield the index of progress for that activity, and (iii) take a simple average across all activities in the group to obtain the overall index for the group.