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What is LFA and PLF?

The Logical Framework Approach (LFA), as the name suggests, is an approach to logically plan and monitor project interventions and achieve defined goals. This approach, rooted in the international development space, is best used as a participatory tool. LFA defines a systematic path to achieve a goal through project activities via outputs and outcomes.

This process, when used iteratively, has the potential to:

- Continuously enhance the alignment of project interventions with the goals agreed on by the stakeholders.
- Bring awareness on the risks and assumptions in the project intervention.
- Facilitate identification of best-fit indicators to measure project success.

In essence, these process outcomes drive a project towards success and ensure that the evidence of the success is being collected. The final result of this exercise is a 4x4 matrix which compiles all the elements identified through the process i.e. project activities, outputs, outcomes, long term vision, indicators, means of verification, risks and assumptions. The resultant 4x4 matrix for your project is the Project Logical Framework (PLF).

It would be of great help if the workshop is organised in different cities under the CITIIS program for better exchange of ideas and sharing of knowledge.

As part of CITIIS, a programmatic intervention to drive innovation, integration and sustainability in urban projects in India, a period of 6-9 months has been called the ‘Maturation Phase’. This phase is dedicated primarily to refining the project structure, and mainstreaming of the CITIIS values in these projects. This is done through capacity enhancement of the human capital involved in driving the project and active stakeholder engagement with people influencing and benefitting from the project.

Embedding a tool like the Project Logical Framework in this phase brings these objectives together by directly contributing to a vision-driven project structuring while promoting the scope of innovation and participation.
Objective of the Workshop

The workshop was envisioned to help the process of creating the Project Logical Framework for each CITIIS project. Visual aids and tools like a PLF Workbook (https://tinyurl.com/ydx2duhz), flipcharts and post-it’s were used to make thinking, discussions and collaboration as efficient as possible.

The main objective was to rationalise and deepen discussions thereby, gradually improving the results.
Similar workshops with brainstorming sessions and the involvement of domestic experts and mentors should be conducted more frequently.
Design and Format

The workshop was divided into four primary exercises based on four questions:

- Where are we right now?
- Where do we want to go?
- How do we get there?
- How do we know we’re moving in the right direction?

The exercises corresponding with the answers to these questions helped characterise the problem, find the project vision, its stakeholders and the necessary activities to achieve that goal. The exercises were initially done on Flip Charts so that the outcomes and processes could be refined.

The four exercises were:

- The Problem Tree Analysis
- Stakeholder Analysis
- Envisioning
- Results Chain
The PLF workbook

To assist the project SPVs assimilate all the information from the workshop the CITIIS Program Management Unit (PMU) developed a workbook. The workbook (https://tinyurl.com/ydx2duhz) is a compilation of all four exercises, with examples and a step-by-step process to understand each exercise.

The aim of the workbook was to create templates that can be used as a repository for the final elements, physically as well as digitally.

Each tool in the book follows the aspects of:

- **WHY?**: Purpose of the tool
- **WHAT?**: Central question being answered through the tool
- **HOW?**: Step-by-step process
I would certainly like thematic workshops for the more complex topics like the stakeholder engagement plan and M&E as sub themes to emerge from the PLF.

Exercises

Where are we right now?

Problem-Tree Analysis

The workshop began with the question: where are we right now? To answer this question and analyze the current status of their PLF each SPV did two exercises: the problem-tree analysis and the stakeholder analysis.

The problem-tree analysis helps in building a shared context of the project to identify the core problem the team is working to solve. The exercise is structured to identify what is causing the problem and the way it manifests itself as effects.

For this exercise the participants were encouraged to list out all their problems and then work towards the single overarching issue that tied them all together. Once the problem had been identified the teams listed all the causes that result in this problem and the effects this problem has. The exercise was a collaborative effort and each team member interacted with their team to work through the list of causes and effects.

The feedback from the participants showed that 60% of participants found it very useful and engaging while 12% found it reasonably useful.

Please rate the usefulness of the Problem Tree Analysis (Cause & Effect).

25 responses
Problem: CHENNAI
Effects:
- Low
- Low
- Lack of
- Competence
- Required
- Training
- To Him
The second exercise during the workshop was the stakeholder analysis. The exercise works together with the problem tree analysis to answer: where are we right now? The aim of this exercise was to establish who the stakeholders for each project are and who can be leveraged to make a positive impact.

For each of the core problems, causes and effects, the projects identified who the people affected by it are and who are the people driving it. Through the process the SPVs also identified who the people are who can influence it. To make the process more visual and clearer a (+) sign was added if the stakeholder is part of the solution and a (-) sign if they are part of the problem.

The exercise encouraged the projects to think more holistically about the issue at hand and who the people involved are. In clearly identifying the role of the stakeholders they were able to map positive stakeholders who assist in actively finding a solution to the issue and, negative stakeholders who tend to act as roadblocks thereby hindering project progress.

In response to the usefulness of this exercise 44% of the participants rated it 4 out of 5 while, 32% rated it 5.

Please rate the usefulness of Stakeholders Analysis (Positively Influencing Stakeholders/Negatively Influencing Stakeholders).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learnings

- The problem tree analysis enabled the participants to take a step back, look at the macro issue and identify the core problem.
- They deliberated with their teams to finalise the causes and effects of the core problem.
- The stakeholder analysis helped in determining the positive and negative stakeholders.
- It also allowed the teams to see, for the first time, who their stakeholders are.
- Feedback collected after the workshop showed that 8 of 25 respondents; 32% would have liked to spend more time on the problem tree analysis.
- 2 of 25 respondents; 8% would have liked to spend more time on the stakeholder analysis.
Where do we want to go?

Envisioning

This next exercise asked the participants what their project would look like when the problem at hand had been solved. We started by stating the core belief and then worked towards creating a long-term vision through iterations of the core belief. This vision was a picture of the desired future, it is most often the positive alternative of the difficulties and needs that people face in their daily life.

Each SPV highlighted the key words that defined their problem and identified the main problem statement that needed to be solved. Based on that they framed their problem statement as a core belief following the format: WHAT? is affecting WHOM? because of WHY? at WHEN?

Once they had their problem statement it was reframed to a more extreme version of the statement until an inspirational and bold long-term vision was identified.

The exercise encouraged the SPVs to think of what the ideal scenario would be for their projects. They created iterations of their original solution through the exercise while keeping their stakeholders and core problem at the centre of this solution.

52% of the participants found the exercise to be very useful while 28% or 7 participants thought it was fairly useful.

Please rate the usefulness of Envisioning Exercise (“What?” is enabling “Whom?” because of “Why?” at “When?”).

25 responses

Learnings

- The envisioning exercise allowed the participants to imagine what the most ideal solution to their core problem would be.
- It gave them the opportunity to work with their team and develop a long-term vision which can be achieved even when the project is over.
The workshop was structured well and helped to clear doubts and reinforce our approach for PLF.

How do we get there?

Results-Chain Analysis

The Results-Chain Analysis is an exercise that helps a project graphically depict how change should come about by creating a logical sequence of outcomes, outputs and activities. Through this exercise projects also assess their risks and assumptions. Thus, creating a result chain is primarily a matter of formulating a cause-effect hypothesis: if we do this and the assumptions are correct, then we will get that. To develop the result chain, we build upon the exercises that have already been done: problem tree, stakeholder analysis and envisioning.

For this exercise each SPV had to write their long-term vision on a post-it and stick it to the right-most end of their worksheet. Next, they wrote a minimum of two behavioural changes that are necessary to achieve this goal. These were their Outcome 1 and Outcome 2. For each outcome, the SPVs then wrote a minimum of 2 outputs which are tangible results corresponding with the outcomes. With these outputs, the teams then wrote down activities or actual interventions that would lead to the outputs.

Ultimately, each SPV read their results chain, from left to right. For each link in the chain, the teams proceeded to identify risks and assumptions.

64% of the participants found this exercise to be very useful while 4% thought it was moderately useful. With regard to identifying the risks and assumptions, 48% of the participants were happy with the exercise while 20% felt it was only moderately useful.
Learnings

- The Results Chain Analysis laid out clearly the outcomes, outputs and activities that are necessary to achieve the end goal.
- The assumptions help to identify what the projects take for granted while planning.
- The risks on the other hand identify what is necessary to prevent a negative result.
Overall Feedback from the Workshop

Overall the participants requested that more time be spent on identifying risks and assumptions and on the problem tree analysis. Envisioning was another exercise where 28% of participants wished more time had been devoted.

They were pleased with the interactive nature of the workshop which allowed them to exchange ideas with each other and therefore learn from other SPVs. Participants mentioned that the structure of the workshop helped to ‘deconstruct’ the project into seemingly simple steps. These simpler steps improved their understanding in an objective manner. The SPVs were also able to take a step back and revisit the project in a manner which has positively contributed to working on the project’s roadmap.

There were a few participants who felt that the workshop was too rushed and one day was not enough time to understand each exercise in detail.

Understanding of PLF

The PMU asked the participants what their experience with PLF had been prior to the workshop. To this, 40% of the participants said they could understand PLF, 36% said they had never worked on a PLF before and 20% said they had developed PLFs before.

What had been your experience with Project Logical Framework before the workshop?

25 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had never heard of PLF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had never worked on PLF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could understand PLF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had developed PLFs before</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could guide PLF Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, after the workshop 44% of the participants said they have a working knowledge of the PLF and are confident they can draft one as well. 36% said they’d be happy to guide others on formulating a PLF and 32% said they understood the need for a PLF.

**What had been your experience with Project Logical Framework after the workshop?**

**25 responses**

- I understand the need for PLF: 8 (32%)
- I can read and understand PLF: 7 (28%)
- I have working knowledge of PLF: 11 (44%)
- I am self-sufficient in drafting PLF: 11 (44%)
- I am happy to guide others on PLF: 9 (36%)

The SPVs also reported that they were comfortable with drafting their project specific PLFs along with their teams and saw the possibility of applying the tool even beyond CITIIS.

**How comfortable are you in drafting the PLF for your CITIIS project with your team?**

**25 Responses**

- 0.0: 0 (0%)
- 1: 0 (0%)
- 2: 7 (28%)
- 3: 11 (44%)
- 4: 7 (28%)
Facilitators

The workshop was co-facilitated by:

ți Rasikha Venkat an independent M&E facilitator and Education & Policy Manager at the Tata Trust.

ți Anjum Dhamija from the Citiis PMU.