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CIDA: Canadian International Development Agency
AECID: Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (abbreviation in Spanish)
AFD: French Development Agency (abbreviation in French)
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BAC: Basque Autonomous Community
AC: Autonomous Communities
EC: European Commission
BSC: Balanced Scorecard
SWOT: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats
DANIDA: Danish International Development Agency
HR: Human Rights
DFID: Department For International Development
DG: Directorate General for External Aid
PRD: Participative Rural Diagnosis
RRD: Rapid Rural Diagnosis
HRBA: Human Rights-Based Approach
ECODE: Development Cooperation Study (abbreviation in Spanish)
EFQM: European Foundation for Quality Management
RBM: Results-Based Management
PCM: Project Cycle Management
MTR: Management Through Results
MFDR: Management for Development Results
FASID: Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development
VS: Verification Sources
GTZ: German Society for Technical Cooperation (abbreviation in German)
IAP: Research Participative Action
IDRC: International Development Research Centre
INTRAC: International NGO Training and Research Centre
OVI: Objectively Verifiable Indicators
SM: Outcome Mapping
LF: Logical Framework
LFM: Logical Framework Matrix
SF: Social Framework
NORAD: Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
MDG: Millennium Development Goals
NGOD: Development Non-Governmental Organization
SIDA: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
EU: European Union
USAID: United States Agency for International Development
GOPP: Goal Oriented Project Planning
During recent years, the Basque Government has gradually acquired increasingly elaborate and specific (and inevitably, also more complex) methodologies and tools to better manage the Development Cooperation actions it supports and encourages, both directly and through other agents, in particular Development NGOs.

The growing volume of funds destined to Development Cooperation in the BAC has made this necessary, basically due to two reasons: on the one hand, to guarantee the necessary transparency in the concession, use and results of the funds awarded; on the other hand, to promote the greatest impact possible of the actions supported in the South, to be capable of measuring it and communicating the achievements (or failures) to the rest of the relevant agents, including Basque society in general.

The most important of these tools has been, undoubtedly, the so-called Logical Framework Approach, as an instrument for the planning and management of Development Cooperation projects. This method is not, of course, exclusive of Basque Cooperation, but has been commonly used (with its criticisms and detractors) in the world of Development Cooperation at a global level since its creation by the USAID and its introduction in Europe by the German Society for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) in the seventies and eighties.

A lot has been discussed over the years concerning the validity and suitability of this instrument, which has its defenders and critics. However, with variations and/or small differences, today it is still the most widely used method for the planning and management of development projects at a global level, by donors and Development NGOs in the North and South.

On the one hand, the Basque Government’s Strategic Master Plan for Development Cooperation 2008-2011 is clearly committed to research as one of the pillars for the improvement of quality in Basque cooperation and as the latter’s contribution of added value.

What better field, therefore, to investigate than the actual methodological and management tool at the base of the actions that are promoted and supported by Basque Cooperation, the above-mentioned Logical Framework Approach. The Basque Government hopes, in this way, to make known and dynamise the debate and reflection surrounding the doctrine and the development cooperation agents themselves on the benefits and perverse effects of its use.

Additionally, the idea is ultimately to contribute, from a practical perspective, towards the improvement of the quality of Basque Cooperation, by means of guidelines and recommendations relative to the Logical Framework which allow for its improved application (or even a reassessment of its use) by all the agents that use it today.

We hope that this study will be as useful for the readers as it was for those of us who collaborated to draft it.

Marta Ares
Director of Basque Development Cooperation Agency
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Despite there being for some years many scattered voices defending a revision and/or going beyond the LFA, **there are few systematic** studies and there is little research on the weaknesses and strengths of the application of the Logical Framework in cooperation. Evidently there are hardly any systematic and in-depth studies on the subject at a state level in Spain, nor in the BAC\(^1\).

The **final objective sought** is to obtain practical conclusions and recommendations for public agencies, Development NGOs and their partners in the South when approaching their identification, formulation, approval and monitoring processes of the interventions they carry out, adapting to and/or overcoming the limitations of the Logical Framework.

At a geographical level, this paper mainly concentrates on the reality **existing in the BAC**, although the circumstances of the Development NGOs and the rest of the agents analysed possibly do not differ substantially from those we could find in a wider context, at least at a European level.

The study started with a **revision of the state of the art** and the bibliography that existed on the subject, in order to confirm its relevance, avoiding overlapping with previous projects and to offer a global view of the Logical Framework Approach, its weaknesses and strengths in the doctrine at a worldwide level. Later, information was compiled (based, mainly on **standardised questionnaires and semi-structured interviews**) on 101 Development NGOs, 16 of their partner organisations in the South, 3 Universities and 173 public entities from the BAC.

To obtain and process the information and to revise conclusions and recommendations in the report, the research team made contact with the **Basque Government’s Development Cooperation Directorate\(^2\), Euskal Fondoa and the Development NGO Coordination Platform of the Basque Country**. In addition, the opinion and advice of a number of international experts on the subject was collected.

In general the Logical Framework seems to be **in good health** in the BAC. Almost all Development NGOs and their partners in the South we consulted apply it in their daily practice in one way or another, and in addition a majority see it as a useful tool. Use of the Logical Framework by **public entities** in the BAC is varied. A high number (up to 70%) of smaller entities do not apply it in their budget and/or equipment and many of them even declare that they have not even heard of it.

There are **different visions, ways and degrees of understanding the Logical Framework** among the different cooperation agents consulted in the BAC. In general, it is mainly used to summarise and present in an organised and clear manner the diagnoses carried out beforehand, based on other tools, as opposed to those who consider it from a comprehensive and integral perspective to identify, plan and manage an intervention.

Development NGOs, their partners in the South and the public entities analysed in the BAC agree that the main **advantages/strengths** of the Logical Framework are its clarity, simplicity and internal logic. As regards the **most common criticisms**, most agree that the tool is very rigid, the fact that it barely takes into account the external factors that influence the achievements, its “narrowness” when analysing reality as a whole. The partners in the South consulted criticise the difficulty of fitting projects based on the Logical Framework in the wider processes they support.

---

\(^1\) Basque Autonomous Community  
\(^2\) Currently the “Basque Development Cooperation Agency”
In general terms the Logical Framework is not perceived as a tool that is “imposed” by Development NGOs on their partners in the South. As for the perception of “demandability” of the Logical Framework by public entities in the BAC, a high percentage do perceive the use of this tool as a necessary requirement to achieve the approval of projects by public donors, but a large majority stated that they apply the Logical Framework in the same way in interventions financed with own funds.

Most of the forms of the public entities analysed, based on the Logical Framework, suffer from certain rigidity when expressing key information of a project, focusing it excessively on the more quantitative aspects that refer to objectives-results-activities. Certain aspects considered to be essential by the doctrine (analysis of agents, risks and alternatives, regular feedback mechanisms and internal learning, the inclusion and coherence of specific projects in wider development processes and objectives, more qualitative and/or partial indicators to measure progress) hardly have any space.

In most cases, the terms and conditions of the public entities analysed in the BAC do allow space for certain modifications of the original design or the original planning matrix of a project. However, in practice, most Development NGOs surveyed hardly revise and/or adapt them, and there is a certain tendency to “stick” to the initial Matrix. For this reason, among other factors the final assessment of the project is greatly complicated.

Most agents agree that the best field for the application of the Logical Framework, with respect to the different instruments/modalities for cooperation, is limited to a specific type of intervention, such as “traditional” projects. Even in these cases, in actions that are “small”, specific and/or with strong components of infrastructures, many voices point out that strict use of the Logical Framework can be excessive, disproportionate. For the rest of the instruments/modalities, the suitability of the Logical Framework does not seem so clear. In the case of direct Agreements of public entities with other cooperation agents, the Logical Framework is still used. Many public entities in the BAC continue to replicate the “traditional projects” that they finance through Development NGOs, even in cases in which they intervene directly, without the involvement of the latter.

As for geographical areas, most Development NGOs consulted expressed the view that the use of the Logical Framework was particularly difficult for those working in Africa, as it could lead to bias when receiving approval for projects in this region. As for the adaptation of the Logical Framework as a tool for interventions with a strong focus on gender issues and/or aimed at empowering women, most agents state that it is a neutral instrument. However, it is pointed out that the impulse traditionally given to the gender-based approach as a transversal element associated with the Logical Framework has significantly contributed to making visible and/or raising awareness on these aspects among all agents, although the rigidity and “short-termism” in projects based on this tool do not fit in well with flexible, qualitative and more long-term processes usually required by gender-based and/or women’s empowerment issues.

Bar occasional exceptions, among those responsible for public entities, among Development NGOs or their partners in the field, there is no adequate knowledge concerning tools and new/alternative approaches to the Logical Framework (including the planning and management of interventions based on a genuine and operative rights-based approach) although it is seen as interesting by most of them. The few attempts at applying alternative models/approaches have generally been pilot schemes, and in many cases these initiatives have failed or they have ended up returning to the Logical Framework faced with the difficulties found. Many of the alternatives to the Logical Framework mentioned by public entities, Development NGOs and/or partners in the South were not really such, but rather different modalities or adaptations of the tool.
One of the most repeated methods (and tested on some occasions) by Development NGOs and partners in the South does have a greater specificity: **Results-Based Management or Management through Results.** The emphasis is more on the final results (or impacts) than on the products created by the project to achieve them. However, there has not been an adequate distinction between the traditional “Results-based Management” and the new trends of “Management for Development Results” (MfDR) that emerged after the MDG and the last international conferences (Paris and Accra) to tackle the new architecture of development.

Other important alternatives to the Logical Framework tested by the Development NGOs in the BAC and reflected on by the doctrine, have tried to stress not so much the problems to be resolved, but the different agents that must contribute towards it, describing their interrelations, the targets associated to each one and/or the behavioural changes expected in each of them, always treating them as active subjects who play an important role in the intervention itself.

There is hardly any knowledge on the part of most agents of the BAC consulted, on other tools/approaches tested in an international context, with more innovative and flexible approaches to plan and manage increasingly complex interventions for cooperation, with the participation (and reinforcement) of a large number of agents and which respond to the challenges of sustainability and quality required by the Paris and Accra Principles. There are, for example, tools such as the “Systemic concepts” or “Capacity WORKS” implanted and massively used by the GTZ in Germany for its cooperation interventions for over a year.

Once the above scenario has been analysed and taking for granted that the Logical Framework is the common tool universally accepted for the planning and management of projects in the BAC, it does not seem viable, nor advisable, to suggest its radical substitution with another model, at least in the short term. It is thus necessary to take advantage of its positive aspects, but minimising or correcting its inconveniences. There must be guarantees that the planning and management tools and models proposed by the Logical Framework are used in a participative manner and agreed upon with all the local agents. It is necessary to give more weight to the role played by the different agents/groups participating in an intervention and Development NGOs, partners and public entities must place emphasis on an in-depth and detailed description of the external factors and risks faced by a project/programme.

In the case of punctual actions and/or with a limited scope, use of the Logical Framework must be “relaxed.” On the other hand, in the case of programmes with a certain duration and greater scope, a large amount of flexibility is required. In the case of Humanitarian Action interventions, there are methodologies that achieve a balance between the necessary urgency and flexibility of the design, with the incorporation of the desirable quality and systematisation standards. Something similar happens in the case of actions for Awareness-Raising and Education for Development, for which there are procedures and tools that are more focused on long-term processes. Finally, for the modalities of direct cooperation developed by public entities, there are new tools and instruments that offer the possibility of adapting to the increasing complexity of the world of cooperation and advancing in line with the recent Paris and Accra principles (such as Capacity Development, Management for Development Results and/or systemic approaches).

Although it is true that the concept of Human Rights appears repeatedly in the terms and conditions and forms of public entities in the BAC, on most occasions they are poorly operative and definable in practical aspects when identifying, planning and managing interventions. It does not seem, a priori, contradictory to combine aspects of the LF and the Human Rights-Based Approach. It is necessary that public entities of the BAC think deeply about all these issues, establish a dialogue with the Development NGOs that have analysed them in more depth, and progressively incorporate specific aspects of them in their terms and conditions / forms, without this being incompatible with a continued use of the Logical Framework.
Most development NGOs, partners in the South and public entities agree that it would be interesting to learn about/test other alternative methods to the Logical Framework, but almost all of them see the lack of training and/or knowledge as an obstacle. It is therefore necessary to decisively encourage this field in the BAC in order to minimise the risk of “getting stuck” in concepts and tools that could be losing part of their validity.

Training deserves a special mention in the Logical Framework Approach for the heads of “small” public entities with more limited funds and/or technical teams for cooperation. It would be interesting to focus training in the Logical Framework of these groups with a critical perspective from the start, taking advantage of their more “open” view of this tool, not “contaminated” by the prolonged use of it as is the case with others. The role of diffusion, coordination and dynamisation of Euskal Fondoa for this is essential.

In addition, there must be a contribution towards the ongoing training of Development NGOs in the BAC in these issues. It will be necessary to combine more formal courses and training along with workshops to exchange knowledge, in practice, on alternatives that have been already tested by other agents and which have a realistic assessment of them. Along with public entities, the role of the Development NGO Coordinator of the Basque Country to encourage these types of activities among its members seems to be essential.

Finally, the role that the partners in the South can and must play in this field must not be forgotten. On the one hand there must be a commitment to training, minimising the fact that a lack of knowledge on the methodology of the Logical Framework by some of them can lead to bias. On the other hand, new solutions and alternatives arise, on many occasions, from the needs and limitations of the Logical Framework perceived by those who work directly in the field. It is thus necessary to listen to them to intensify the exchange of experiences and innovative models among them and Development NGOs and public entities of the BAC, seeking greater knowledge and the development of common models.

Finally, many of the Development NGOs that perceive serious limitations in the Logical Framework feel, however, “inhibited” when testing alternatives to it in practice, due to different reasons. It is necessary to stop this trend and offer favourable frameworks for the entities that want to explore alternative tools in more depth. However, we must be realistic, so therefore it is preferable to select interventions financed mainly with funds of the Development NGOs themselves. For this reason it is convenient to look for solid local partners, with important management skills. And it is important to carry out tests with interventions that are suitable for this, normally those in which the Logical Framework has greater limitations (i.e. long-term programmes, in complex contexts and/or with multiple agents).

On the other hand, public entities in the BAC have in Direct Cooperation an ideal field to test alternative tools/approaches to the Logical Framework. It is necessary for the public entities to not restrict their direct interventions to replicating the projects they finance through Development NGOs, and to consider not only the intrinsic value of testing new models to improve the quality of these interventions, but also the potential effect that they could have, in the event of being successful, for other agents (Development NGOs in particular).

In any event, it is important to assess the interventions managed with alternatives to the LFA, evaluating their suitability, their acceptance by all the parties involved and their effective contribution towards achieving the goals set. In particular, it is convenient to compare their performance with respect to that achieved in similar interventions with the traditional Logical Framework, in order to learn lessons and thus make adaptations and make progress with them.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PRESENTATION

Since 1999 ECODE\(^1\) has been working on supporting the management of Development Cooperation interventions in the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC) by the multiple agents that are involved in this sector, including public administrations, Development NGOs and organisations in the South. During this time it has had the chance to strengthen the use of the Logical Framework Approach by all these entities, including its effects (positive and on occasions not so positive) on the planning and management of the interventions based on it.

ECODE has also collaborated with the Basque Government’s Head Office of Development Cooperation\(^4\) for the development of its presentation and justification forms for its interventions, Projects, Programmes and Humanitarian Action for Development Cooperation carried out by Development NGOs. In addition, it has worked with a number of Basque entities supporting similar services. As a result, we have been able to see the multiple models there are for planning and formulating interventions, eminently based on the Logical Framework, and the consequences that this has for Development NGOs when applying for and justifying subsidies before various entities for their Development Cooperation interventions.

Finally, thanks to its work, ECODE has been in contact with realities outside the BAC (state, European, global) where steps are being taken, though still uncertain, to revise the Logical Framework and its materialisation in planning tools, presentation and monitoring forms, trying to find valid alternatives to it.

It is in this context where the opportunity of contributing towards this debate on the Logical Framework Approach and its use has been detected in this study, trying to offer it from an eminently practical perspective focused, mainly, on the reality of the BAC. Specifically, this paper has been the work of Nerea Lopetegui and Pedro Surja, both consultants at ECODE.

To this end there has been fundamental support from the Basque Government’s Head Office of Cooperation\(^5\), within the framework of its commitment to research and to the continuous improvement Development Cooperation quality, without which this study would not have been possible.

Euskal Fondo\(^6\) and the Development NGO Coordinator of the Basque Country\(^6\) have also been involved in the study, with both entities contributing ideas concerning the form and content of the study, in addition to facilitating contact with Development NGOs and public entities that participated in it. We are particularly grateful to all the Development NGOs and public entities that have kindly agreed to answer all the questionnaires and which attend the interviews proposed by the research team, dedicating part of their tight agenda to this study.

A copy of this document can be downloaded in PDF format at www.ecode.es. For any queries or comments related to the same, you can write to info@ecode.es

---

\(^1\) In March 2010 the Basque Government approved the setting up of the Basque Agency for Development Cooperation, currently in progress.

\(^2\) http://www.ecode.es

\(^3\) http://www.gizartelan.ejgv.euskadi.net/r45-coopdesa/es

\(^4\) http://www.euskalfondo.org/

\(^5\) http://www.euskalfondo.org/

\(^6\) http://www.ongdeuskadi.org
1.2 TARGETS AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Despite there being many scattered voices defending a revision and/or going beyond the LFA for some years, there are few systematic studies and there is little research on the weaknesses and strengths of the application of the LFA in cooperation. Evidently there are hardly any systematic and in-depth studies on the subject at a state level in Spain, nor in the BAC.

As for its objective, the existing tests and publications up until now have often taken a more descriptive approach of what the Logical Framework is and how to apply it correctly, than a more analytical-critical approach. As for the sources, in most cases they are based on consultations made at a limited number of Development NGOs and/or they have not directly taken into account the opinion of the partner organisations in the South, nor that of the public donors that finance the interventions. Finally, regarding their usefulness, a large number of these studies have taken a markedly theoretical approach, without a detailed analysis of the practical repercussions the use of the Logical Framework has for the different agents using it. In particular, there has not been a detailed analysis of the Logical Framework’s impact on presentation/justification forms for proposals used by public entities that work with this approach.

Due to this, though still based on the research and analysis carried out until now, this study seeks to also include previous aspects/limitations, complementing the work carried out until now and thus obtaining a more critical vision, comprehensive and with a broader perspective proceeding from all the relevant agents involved.

The final objective sought is to obtain practical conclusions and recommendations for public agencies, Development NGOs and their partners in the South when approaching the identification, formulation, approval and monitoring processes of the interventions they carry out, adapting to and/or overcoming the limitations of the Logical Framework.

At a geographical level, this paper mainly concentrates on the reality of the BAC, although the circumstances of the Development NGOs and the rest of the agents analysed possibly do not differ substantially from those we could find in a wider context, at least at a European level. In addition, an analysis of the state of the art and doctrine in this respect at a worldwide level is included. As a result, the conclusions obtained have, without a doubt, the potential to act as the foundation for further research and to be diffused / replicated at a broader level than just the BAC.

The thematic blocks or issues studied have been the following:

- What are the main conclusions and current trends in relation to the Logical Framework Approach in the doctrine?
- How do the main international and European donors apply the Logical Framework?
- What is the degree of knowledge and effective application of the Logical Framework and its forms among the cooperation agents of the BAC today?
- What common aspects of its use can be highlighted?
- What specificities can be found depending on the nature and size of each entity and the sector they act in?
- What main strengths/advantages of its use do these agents highlight?
- What are their main inconveniences / limitations?
- What other alternatives to the Logical Framework are being proposed/carried out by the different agents for the formulation/monitoring of development cooperation interventions, and what is their real application?
1.3 METHODOLOGY USED

The study started with a revision of the state of the art and the bibliography that existed on the subject, in order to confirm its relevance, avoiding overlapping with previous projects and to offer a global view of the Logical Framework Approach, its weaknesses and strengths in the doctrine at a worldwide level. To do this, basically an analysis of documentary sources was carried out. Specifically, 82 documents were analysed and 51 relevant websites were identified on the Internet, all of which are attached as an Annex to this paper.

From this first stage, and throughout the entire study, telephone interviews and personal contacts were made with renowned experts who are recognised in the doctrine, at the level of the BAC and at a global level, due to their contribution to the subject the study covers, in order to complete the documentary analysis with the more direct and in-depth information they offer.

We also analysed, in general terms, the available information on cooperation models (strategic documents, terms and conditions and forms) of the main donors at a global and European level, in order to detect what treatment and/or use the Logical Framework Approach is given in them. Despite the study being limited to, mainly, the BAC, it seemed appropriate to offer a broader global view to frame and/or contextualise the situation in the Basque Country. In particular the main features of the project planning, management and presentation systems and tools used by Europeaid and the main European donors, the AECID and the AC, were analysed.

Parallel to the above phase, the specific target universe of the study was selected: Development NGOs, local partners in the South, universities and public entities in the BAC. To avoid bias in the conclusions and to be able to appreciate subtle differences between them depending on the different types of entities, a balance was sought in the sample. Specifically, we included those with a large and small volume of resources/staff, with more and less experience in development cooperation, with activity in different sectors and geographical areas, with many and few local partners, with a greater and smaller number of projects in progress. At a geographical level, of course, a balance was sought between entities from the 3 historical territories (Biscay, Alava and Guipuzcoa). Finally, Development NGOs and public entities that are members of the Development NGO Coordinator of the Basque Country and Euskal Fondoa were included, respectively, along with others that are not part of these platforms. Due to operational capability reasons, the local partners in the South included were those that worked with the Basque Development NGOs chosen, meaning that a specific selection was not carried out for them.

In the study a total of 101 Development NGOs, 16 social organisations of the same in the South, 3 Universities and 173 public entities were included. The response rate to the different questionnaires and applications sent to the above was variable: approximately 40% among Development NGOs, partners in the South and universities; less than 20% among public entities, finally obtaining effective information from:

- 42 Development NGOs
- 16 partner organisations in the South
- 3 Universities
- 32 public entities.

In the Annex there is a complete and detailed list of all the participating entities.
To obtain and process the information from the sources mentioned above a number of tools have been used, which were discussed with the Basque Government’s Cooperation Directorate, Euskal Fondoa and the Development NGO Coordination Platform of the Basque Country:

- first of all, to collect information from Development NGOs, partners in the South and public entities, questionnaires were sent via e-mail that could easily systematise the answers while not being excessively restrictive, to leave room for qualitative analyses.

- on the other hand, for the analysis of the documentary sources of public entities (terms and conditions, calls, forms, etc.) standard files with the criteria/aspects that were considered relevant when assessing the degree of incorporation and use of the Logical Framework Approach were designed.

- finally, when the answers to the questionnaires were received and revised, in-depth personal interviews were carried out with the entities that had highlighted more relevant and/or innovative aspects concerning the use of alternatives to the Logical Framework. In total detailed interviews were carried out with 7 entities.

A sample can be found of the tools and models mentioned above, including a list of the entities interviewed, as an Annex.

After the analysis of all the information mentioned until then an initial draft was prepared, in an attempt to contrast different data to reach conclusions with the highest degree possible of internal validity and representativeness. To do this different sources were combined (documentary, questionnaires, in-depth interviews), methods of analysis (quantitative, qualitative) and, above all, opinions of agents on these aspects (Development NGOs, partners, public entities, universities, experts).

The draft was presented and discussed jointly, at an internal level, with the Basque Government’s Cooperation Directorate, Euskal Fondoa and the Development NGO Coordination Platform of the Basque Country. The suggestions, comments and assessments of all of them were taken into account for the drafting of the definitive version of the study, which was presented publicly in March 2011, with the presence of international experts on cooperation project management.

1.4 LIMITATIONS FOUND

The study has not found serious limitations that could have invalidated the conclusions reached in it. After the preliminary analysis phase of the “state of the art” the suitability and relevance of the research has been confirmed. The institutional collaboration of key agents (such as the Basque Government’s Cooperation Directorate, Euskal Fondoa and the Development Coordination NGO Platform of the Basque Country) has been effective. Finally, we have been able to access the expected sources to a greater or lesser extent (opinions of the different agents through questionnaires and interviews; terms and conditions and forms; relevant studies; collaboration of experts on the subject).

The main, minor difficulties or limitations found during the process, along with their consequences in the study, were the following:

- Precisely the novelty of the proposed study has limited the possibility of having previous guidelines, models, methodologies and/or conclusions to base it on to progress with them in more detail. This can have limited the scope and depth of some of the research topics proposed, having to tackle them from a very basic level.
• The actual lack of a complete consensus (and sometimes of knowledge) among the agents consulted regarding what the Logical Framework really is, what it is for and its possible alternatives may have made it difficult to lead a discussion based on common ground and concepts, as well as leading to bias in the terminological approach of the issues proposed and/or some of the answers given and their analysis.

• There has been a low rate of responses to the questionnaires designed and sent for the study, particularly among the public entities consulted (less than 20% of those initially contacted). This has meant that the study has suffered important delays, due to the need for a personalised monitoring to obtain the answers. This could also have decreased the representativeness of the conclusions, due to the reduced size of the sample.

• Although always in their capacity as the heads of each entity consulted, the questionnaires and interviews were responded by individual people. As a result, on some occasions the weight of their opinions and/or experiences has produced bias in the answers, meaning that there could be certain differences with the position of other members of these entities (or even with their "official" position on the matter). On other occasions, the people responsible who were consulted had recently arrived at their job position, meaning they had a limited perspective of the issues dealt with in relation to their new entity.

• Small difficulties when accessing certain up-to-date documents, terms and conditions, calls, etc. of public entities can have limited their analysis at certain times. However in most cases this has been overcome by means of direct contact with the people responsible for said entities, who facilitated these documents.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

This document starts with an introduction in which the background, objectives, scope, methodology and limitations of the study are described, in order to help the reader understand the context and to encourage an informed reading of the report and its conclusions.

In a second section a brief summary of the origin, context, and main features of the Logical Framework Approach as a tool for the planning and management of Development Cooperation projects is presented. It does not attempt to be an exhaustive study (there are already many manuals and studies on the subject) but rather simply a description of the object of the study, given the more analytical-critical approach proposed in this paper. It also offers a global and summarised vision of how the Logical Framework Approach is assessed in the doctrine and what trends there are today in this field. To this end the currents of opinion that are most aligned with its use in a strict sense are presented along with other more critical opinions.

As a way of situating the debate in a global sphere, below is a quick summary of the planning and management systems of projects promoted (in many cases required) by the main European and international public donors, including the AECID. Given the scope of the study, there is also a brief mention of the treatment in the context of decentralised development cooperation in Spain.

Most of the document is dedicated, below, to the analysis of the use and assessment of the Logical Framework Approach by the agents of the BAC, which the study concentrates on. From a subjective perspective, this section covers separately the vision of the public entities, the Development NGOs and their partners in the South. Also included are Universities of the BAC as relevant agents in Development Cooperation.
Finally, and based on all the combined analysis above, a series of conclusions are proposed in reference to the key aspects of the study, along with a list of practical recommendations for the main agents analysed. With this key section of the study, the aim is to make a reality the eminently practical approach mentioned above.

Completing the study are a series of Annexes that expand on, explain in detail and/or go into further depth in relevant aspects to understand the methodology, scope and work process followed, and also to go into the subject in depth by means of an easily accessed, extensive, referenced and commented bibliography.
2. THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK, EVOLUTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 BACKGROUND AND FEATURES OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The Logical Framework Approach or Logical Framework8 (hereinafter, LF) is a management tool that facilitates the planning, execution and assessment of projects. Originally created for the engineering and business management sectors, USAID introduced it in the field Development Cooperation in the late 1960’s9. Soon after, the German Society for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) brought it to Europe and put it into practice. The GTZ was followed by practically all European public agencies and by many others in the rest of the world.

Initially, the LF was designed to try to remedy a number of recurring difficulties when managing and assessing projects:

• The planning was too imprecise, without a clear definition of the objectives that could be used for the monitoring and assessment of the success (or failure) of the project
• The management responsibilities were not clear
• The assessment was a difficult process, as there was no agreement on what the project was really attempting to achieve.

Faced with this, the LF allowed them to:

• Help the projects to establish clear and realistic goals
• Promote logical thought and check the internal logic
• Provide a base for monitoring and tracking and make the planners think in terms of assessment
• Enable the planners to set out the hypotheses that they were developing

The LF involves the structuring of the results of an analysis that allows for a systematic and logical presentation of a project or programme’s objectives. This exercise must reflect the relations of causality between the different levels of achievement planned, indicate how to verify whether they have been reached and define the hypotheses beyond the project / programme’s control and which could affect its success.

7 The aim of this study is not a comprehensive coverage of the description and methodology of the Logical Framework, as there are many manuals on the subject (the proposed Bibliography can be consulted for this purpose). The aim is simply to offer a basic summary that facilitates an understanding of its basic aspects and its evolution.
8 Despite certain subtle differences in the doctrine when using one concept or another, in this study we will always use “Logical Framework” to refer, in a broad sense, to the same.
9 Its creation was commissioned to the consultancy “Practical Concepts Incorporated”, in order to have a systematic method with which to connect the design and assessment of projects
As INTRAC points out in its study of the “Use and abuse of the Logical Framework Approach”\(^\text{10}\) for the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), there are a number of ways of understanding the LF among Development NGOs and other development cooperation agents:

- Those who refer to the LF as a global way of thinking to design, execute and assess a project following an intervention logic based on objectives-results-indicators-activities
- Those who perceive the LF as a mere formal requirement made by donors to obtain funding for the projects of Development NGOs
- Those who understand the LF in a restrictive way, only referring to the Matrix summary of the same (Logical Framework Matrix)

In relation to this last concept, it must be pointed out that the LF uses the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) as the more visible nucleus of the same, to present information on the objectives, results and activities of the project in a summarised, concise, logical and systematic way. The “basic” LFM contains 16 cells organised in 4 columns and 4 rows as indicated in the following table:\(^\text{11}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives (Narrative summary)</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Objectives</th>
<th>verification Sources</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong> (Global objective)</td>
<td>What are the quantitative resources to measure or qualitative resources to judge whether these objectives are being reached? (estimated time)</td>
<td>What information sources are there or could there be offered in a feasible manner?</td>
<td>What external factors are necessary to support the objectives in the long term?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong>: Indicate each one of the results produced by the project to reach the immediate objective.</td>
<td>What quantitative measures or qualitative evidence by which the achievement and distribution of the impacts and benefits can be judged? (estimated time)</td>
<td>What information sources are there or could there be offered in a feasible manner? Is it necessary to carry out the prediction of resources-products for the compilation?</td>
<td>(Purpose for the Target) What external conditions to the project are necessary if the achievement of the project’s immediate objective contributes towards achieving the project’s global objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resultados</strong>: Indicar cada uno de los resultados producidos por el proyecto para alcanzar el objetivo inmediato.</td>
<td>What type and number of results and by when will they be produced? (number, quality, time)</td>
<td>What information sources?</td>
<td>(Result of the Purpose) What are the factors beyond the control of the project which if not present are responsible for hindering the progress of the results to achieve the immediate objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong>: Indicate each one of the activities that must be planned to achieve the result.</td>
<td>The OVIs must be included regarding all the activities. This is essential for reports and for monitoring the project regarding the LF.</td>
<td>What information sources?</td>
<td>(Activity for Result) 1) What external factors must be carried out so that the planned results are obtained according to the calendar? 2) What type of decisions or actions beyond the control of the project are necessary to start the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) See bibliographical references in Annex

\(^{11}\) Translated from “Programming and Project Formulation Workshop”, 2002, ILO-ITC
Since its introduction, the LF has been the object of an evolutionary and/or adaptive process. Initially, the emphasis was placed on the more descriptive aspects, and it was mainly used as a tool to standardise the presentation of projects and to facilitate their assessment by the development agencies/donors, based on shared models.

Later, in the late 1970’s, it became a more analytical tool, to improve the initial design of projects. In the 80’s and 90’s its scope was extended, becoming an integral tool to improve the design, implementation and management of projects. Aspects for the participation and communication among all the parties involved were also added.

In the 90’s some agencies (GTZ, NORAD, DANIDA, FASID, Europeaid) made efforts to make the LF a more flexible tool, paying more attention to aspects such as compromise, transparency, structure, participation and flexibility.

Within this evolutionary process it is worth mentioning two developments of the original LF: the GOPP, of the GTZ and Project Cycle Management, used by the DG VIII of the European Commission

GOAL ORIENTED PROJECT PLANNING (GOPP)

Goal Oriented Project Planning (GOPP) is an instrument developed by the GTZ with the aim of correcting some of the weaknesses observed during the initial application of the LF by this entity:

The LF is focused mainly on completing the LFM in a non-flexible and poorly participative manner

The LF embraces a linear logic associated with things more than with people, in a very controlled and closed system.

The participative assessments of poverty show evidence that the priorities of vulnerable groups differ from those perceived by external agents and local elites.

Those who direct the process are often expatriates and their language may not coincide with the local language.

The analysis of the LF inhibits the process and the participation and it is characterised by its rigidity and obligatory nature.

For this purpose, the GOPP placed emphasis on steps such as participation analysis, problems analysis and goals analysis. The teamwork of interdisciplinary workshops in which the GTZ, its counterparts and the target groups took part became a standard procedure.

The professional profile of the moderator or facilitator of the GOPP was gradually established. Hundreds of moderators were trained in Germany or in the partner countries themselves. The GOPP workshops used work stage and results visualisation techniques with dynamic and visual methods (such as colour cards, etc.).

In short, the GOPP proposes two phases: analysis and planning.
The analysis phase has, in turn, various elements:

- **Analysis of participation**: a general view of people, groups and organisations connected to the project and their interests, motives, attitudes and implications for the planning of the project. This is done as a panel.

- **Analysis of problems**: problem tree grouping the most important problems with cause, effects and the identification of the central problem. The problems are annotated on cards, one per card and organised in smaller groups.

- **Analysis of objectives**: the reaffirmation of the problems in realistically achievable goals; this is often done by transcribing the problems into results, often inverting the cards.

- **Analysis of alternatives**: identification of objectives and an assessment of alternatives depending to the resources, the probability of reaching the objectives, the political viability, the cost-benefit ratio, social risks, time horizon, sustainability and other factors decided by the group.

The most visible product of the planning phase is the Planning Matrix although it would include the following elements:

- **Intervention logic**: define the elements of the project, test its internal logic and formulate objectives in measurable terms.

- **Hypothesis and risks**: identify the supposed conditions that affect the implementation of the project but which are beyond the control of the project management.

- **Identifiers**: identify the resources to measure the progress, formulate indicators and define measurement resources.

- **Schedule of activities**: determine the sequence and dependence of activities, estimated duration, set milestones and assign responsibilities.

- **Expenditure plan**: specify the resources required, develop an expenditure plan, prepare a detailed budget.

**PROJECT CYCLE MANAGEMENT**

The PCM method was developed by the FASID (Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development) based on the GOPP, and started to be used mainly by the DG VIII of the European Commission since 1992.

According to the PCM Manual of the EC the aim of this methodology was, and still is, the improved management of actions (both projects and programmes) of cooperation abroad paying more attention to the essential issues and global conditions of the design and execution of the projects and programmes:

- Clear and realistic objectives for the projects and programmes

- "Quality" factors that guarantee the long-term benefits of the project

- Coherence with and contribution towards the “broader political” objectives of the projects and programmes.

---

See bibliography in Annex
PCM covers the management activities and decision-making processes used during the life cycle of a project (including key tasks, roles and responsibilities, key documents and decision options). The Project Cycle originally included six phases, although later that of “Financing” was eliminated, given that it could be taken at different moments of the cycle, depending on the needs and requirements of the EC\textsuperscript{13}:

At an operational level, PCM tends to improve, through the feasibility/instruction studies, the monitoring and assessment, and through decision-making based on key stages of the preparation and execution of the projects and programmes. It means there is active participation of the parties involved (target groups, beneficiaries, local institutions and decision-makers) throughout the life cycle of the project or programme. PCM should facilitate the management of larger and more complex interventions and allow them to be executed in a more flexible way, geared towards learning.

Despite being an offshoot of it, the LF is still the central tool used in Project Cycle Management:

- It is used during the identification stage of the PCM to facilitate the analysis of the existing situation, to investigate the relevance of the project proposed and to identify potential objectives and strategies.

- During the formulation stage, the LF supports the preparation of an appropriate project plan with clear objectives, tangible results, a risk management strategy and defined levels of management responsibility.

- During the execution of the project/programme, the LF offers a key management tool to support the operative planning and monitoring of the work.

- During the assessment and auditing stages, the LFM offers a summarised report of what was planned (objectives, indicators and key hypotheses), and offers the basis for the assessment of the performance and impact.

\textsuperscript{13} Project Cycle Management Manual, 2001 Version in Spanish, European Commission, EuropeAid Cooperation office
A common problem that has been usually detected when applying the LF in the PCM (particularly in the preparation of the LFM) is that it is carried out separately from the preparation of the other required documents of the project (such as the Identification Sheet or the Financial Proposal). This can sometimes result in certain inconsistencies between the content of the LFM and the description of the project contained in the narrative or financial part of the main documents. Similarly, it has also been stated that, in practice, the LFM is given too much of a dominant role, which leads to excessive rigidity when applying the PCM and prevents taking advantage of some of its benefits.

2.2 VARIATIONS, ALTERNATIVES AND TOOLS THAT COMPLEMENT THE LF

Since the creation and application of the LF in development cooperation it has received criticism by organisations regarding its theoretical foundations and its practical aspects. This criticism has led to alternatives, some consisting of simple adaptations of the LF and others with very different approaches. Below is a description of the alternatives to the LF with the greatest impact on the sector, generated as a response to the weaknesses detected:

OUTCOME MAPPING

The use of the LF and its associated linear-causal logical method, explained above, has been criticised for a number of reasons. Among some of the lines of argument:

- It is debated that with the new modalities of cooperation it is more difficult to attribute development results to individual projects and programmes based on a linear-causal model.
- The LF’s principle of causality is seen as very rigid, not culturally adapted and non-realistic as the base for planning and management.
- The risk of falling into an inflexible planning model. The modification of the objectives or indicators during the execution of the project is avoided in order to follow the “model” of the LF.

This criticism has motivated the IDRC (International Development Research Centre, Canada) to develop a different approach, Outcome Mapping\textsuperscript{14} (hereinafter, OM). The LF is focused on a particular category of results: changes in the behaviour of the people, the groups and the organisations that the programme or projects works with directly. These changes are called “results” or “outcomes”\textsuperscript{15}. Through the LF method, development programmes hope to generate contributions to achieving results more than categorically affirming the attribution of impacts of the development. The results achieved, in turn, improve the possibilities of achieving development impacts, but there is not necessarily a cause-effect relationship. The ultimate responsibility lies with the people affected.

\textsuperscript{14} “Outcome Mapping” en su versión original inglesa
\textsuperscript{15} “Outcomes” en su versión original inglesa
The LF helps to analyse complex changes, particularly those related to behaviour and knowledge. The underlying principles are:

- the changes are complex and do not move linearly
- development is carried out by and for people
- although a programme can influence the achievement of results, they cannot be totally controlled

In the OM, the obligatory interactive and recurrent planning process takes into account existing local structures, institutions and organisations. The pre-planning phase is used to be able to have a "broad initial vision" of the existing relationship, who interacts with whom, and how (e.g., organisational processes of potential agents).

The methodology of the OM is divided in three phases as can be seen in the attached diagram:\textsuperscript{16}:

Some of the key differences between the OM and the LF are the following:

- while both the OM and the LF offer a framework for planning, monitoring and assessment and both have an explicit approach in results and changes, the underlying principles that guide them are based on basically different approaches for development and social change.

- The linearity of the logical framework is seen as its greatest weakness bearing in mind that development is incremental and not linear, and that the OM seeks to recognise, monitor and analyse. In this sense, the LF shares the elements that characterise "traditional assessment" while the OM is inclined towards the elements that characterise the “assessment of development”.

\textsuperscript{16} Outcome Mapping (OM) and Management Through Results (MTR), ACDI, Natalia Ortiz and Javier Pacheco, for ACDI
• The focus of the LF for planning and assessment is the project or programme and what has been achieved; the OM assesses the changes in the key agents and how the programme expects and contributed (or not) towards this change, and why.

• The LF seeks to measure downwards the generalised impact as evidence of the programme’s success, while OM focuses on analysing basic changes in behaviour, and the contributions made to support these changes, in order to have an account of the transformation since the start of the intervention.

Some large agencies (such as the Canadian International Development Agency-CIDA) and international organisations (such as CARE) have analysed a model which is the result of a fusion between the LF and OM, which would make sense in some cases because:

• The combined approach serves different users and different uses: clear area results and ultimate results (concept of the LF, particularly for responsibility) and processes of “how to get there” (concept of OM, particularly for learning and programme direction).

• The existing programme frameworks (planned with the LF or OM) can be improved with simple adaptations.

• The concepts of both approaches can be used, wherever they have greater added value. Long-term processes (i.e. support and incidence work) can be monitored with OM, while the services supplied by the team in a programme can be planned and guided with methods taken from the LF. Certain progress markers for social and behaviour monitoring can be used for the direction of a programme and for learning by the programme’s partners, while quantitative indicators are more relevant for the elaboration of monitoring reports.

THE SOCIAL FRAMEWORK

The Social Framework (hereinafter, SF) is created as an alternative to the LFM, as a result of the need for a higher number of stages within the LFM that includes the different agents involved in the development intervention (process of change), which involves a change in the standard form of the LFM. This new version is thus defined by the types of people, making the LFM a more complex matrix, open to discussions and supposedly representing the change better. (R. Davies, 2002)

The criticised aspects of the LFM that the SF tries to address according to Davies are the following:

• General objectives are defined that are generalities of lesser events more than descriptions of results

• Long, complex, unreadable sentences in the narrative column in an attempt to squeezing in information

• The final product is an account that is impossible to follow

• There is a frequent absence of references to who is involved and too many descriptions of abstract processes of change
• Overly simple indicators used to describe complex interventions

• Excessively focused on horizontal logic.

Continuing with the similarity with the LF, a SF would have the following aspect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the changes expected in</th>
<th>Observable indicators</th>
<th>Who will have this information</th>
<th>Assumptions in relation to other actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each row describes a type of agent. The sequence of rows describes a chain of agents among whom a path of influences is created and/or exists starting from the actor furthest down to the one highest up. The hypothesis column describes how these agents are influenced by a wider network of agents around them.

The SF uses the network diagrams (next figure) as instruments. They are visual tools to map and model complex contexts where many development activities take place.

According to its proponent, Rick Davies, both the SF and the LFM are similar, as both describe a desired process of change, referring to the change produced as a result of a development intervention, as a series of events that take place going through a sequence of rows, starting from the bottom up. However, there are a number of differences between them:

• **Time vs. People:** in the LFM this vertical dimension represents the time flow, starting at the bottom in the present and moving up towards the future at the top. In turn, in the SF the vertical dimension represents a chain of agents connected by their relationships.

• **Length and direction of influence:** unlike the four rows of the LFM, in the SF this chain can be as long or short as the needs require. Unlike the LFM, causality can work in both directions, upwards and downwards along the chain of relationships. The agents influence other agents, who are in turn influenced by these other agents.

• **“Social logic”:** Although there are still the four “adapted” columns of the LFM in the SF, and there is still a certain connection logic, in this case it is a social logic as described below:

---

17 Taken from “The Social Framework as an alternative to the Logical Framework,” 2008, Rick Davies.
If … takes place in the relationship between A and B;
And, if P, Q and R still help B as they have done in the past (Hypothesis);
Then … will take place in B’s relationship with C.

• Shared responsibility: One of the advantages of the Social Framework is that as there are variable objectives for each actor on the route, the responsibility for the proper operation of the whole chain is shared by all the agents on that route. In the project description according to the LF, it often seems that the responsibility of achieving success lies with a single organisation, normally the closest to the beneficiaries.

RAPID RURAL DIAGNOSIS

Rapid Rural Diagnosis (RRD), was created in the late 1970’s. The element it sought to attend to was local technical knowledge, with reference to the agricultural sector. It meant an appreciation of indigenous agricultural knowledge (Brokensha et al., 1980).

"In the RRD it is important to link the extensive scientific practice of data validation using the knowledge of rural people concerning their environment, in an atmosphere of conversation and dialogue. The RRD concludes when a saturation of data is achieved at the moment of compiling and nothing new or contradictory is added. The qualitative validity is more important than the statistical validity of the diagnoses.

The RRD is a progressive, interactive, flexible and fast learning process which leads to a return to a previous phase of the diagnosis when new information surfaces, requiring a reconsideration of what has already been achieved. In turn, an RRD is enriched when it is carried out with a multidisciplinary team. It is normally carried out in a workshop environment, which allows for an intense and continuous debate on the process and the results of the diagnosis. The idea is to reach agreements and to identify the differences among the collective."19

PARTICIPATIVE-RESEARCH-ACTION

It is a methodology that allows for the development of a participative analysis, where the agents involved become the protagonists of the process of building knowledge on the reality of the study’s object, detecting problems and needs and elaborating proposals and solutions.

With the aim of detecting these real demands related with the study’s object and turning them into proposals for action adjusted to the needs perceived, a research process is developed that points towards transformation through work with collectives, associations, neighbourhood groups and other agents in the municipality with shared concerns or interests, facilitating a move towards citizen involvement, encouraging social creativity that benefits the entire local community. Knowledge on the reality is built progressively in a participative process in which the agents involved “have the word”; and in this way the conditions are created that facilitate spaces for reflection, programming and social action related with the problems described by the study’s object.

PRA does not offer a set of answers and solutions to the problems, but encourages conversation and dialogue as mechanisms with which to create processes where the affected subjects contribute, after reflection, solutions to their problems. By building the answers with the different social agents and citizens of the municipality a wide range of possibilities are made available, but the answers, solutions and proposals for action will be more adjusted to the specific reality, to the extent in which they have had the participation of and have been shared by these citizens in the research-action process.

PARTICIPATIVE RURAL DIAGNOSIS

“The Participative Rural Diagnosis (PRD) can be considered a continuation of the RRD, where value is attributed not only to the knowledge of people in rural areas, but also to their diagnosis and analysis capacities. The external agent goes from being “the one who explains the information” to being “the one who catalyses the generation of information”; and the local people go from being “those who are investigated” to “those who investigate”.

The speed of the process is no longer of utmost importance, it all depends on the speed at which an atmosphere of confidence is established between the external agents and the local population, which can be rural or urban. The PRD emphasises what interpretation of reality is made among the different groups, and which is therefore subject to continuous changes.

The RRD and the PRD can be used initially in any phase of a development or research project, from its conception to its assessment, provided the objectives of its application are defined. The more local participation there is in the diagnosis of a situation, more expectations will be generated among the population, and therefore it will be more urgent and important to have an institutional infrastructure to respond and give continuity to the issues that arise.”

Authors such as Chambers (1997) consider that the PRD is the complete opposite of the LF, while others think that the LF does not contradict the approach to people that the PRD has (Mikkelsen 1995). One clear difference is that the LF does take into account who is present and who makes the decisions (NORAD 1995). According to the PRD planning does not have a clear structure and it can be difficult to have a general vision of the project.

The LF is used to structure the general planning process while the PRD is used to identify local problems and to encourage decision-making at a local level. The strength of the LF is that it structures the main elements of the projects while the PRD is an important tool to encourage the participation and empowerment of the local agents.

2.3 TOOLS RELATED TO THE MANAGEMENT OF PROCESSES/ORGANISATIONS

PROSPECTIVE PLANNING

The term “prospective” refers to “the process that involves recurring periods of open reflection, networking, consultation and discussion, leading to a shared and refined vision of the future and common strategies of those involved... this is the discovery of a common space to think about the future and the generation of strategic approaches” (Cassingena Harper, 2003).

“Prospective planning is a research approach that is used for the designing of future scenarios of organisations. It is not a projection of the past into the future, as done by the LF, but the design of the future based on the future itself and its projection towards the present through strategies and research projects for decision-making and the execution of tasks in the present. Meaning that the strategic decisions in prospective planning are located in the ideas that are the driving force or concepts that originate the projects (virtual realities) and in the linking variables or the methods.

Prospective planning work is carried out based on research processes whose aim is to improve and consolidate organisations, in order to offer better quality in their services. Prospective and strategic planning owes its solidness and feasibility to the consistency of its methods. Among those most used we have the Scenarion, Delphi, Morphological, and the Mactor methods, Structural Analysis and Régnier’s Abacus. Each one of the methods mentioned has a specific field of application in which it is the main method and in others, it is complementary.21

BALANCED SCORECARD

The BSC is a management system or administrative system (applied mainly in the world of private business 22) that goes beyond the financial perspective with which directives are used to evaluating the progress of an organisation. It is a method, markedly industrial, to measure the activities of an entity in terms of its vision and strategy, which continually shows how they evolve and when they reach the results defined by the strategic plan. It is also a tool that helps the company to express the objectives and initiatives necessary to comply with the strategy.

The BSC is therefore a strategic management system, which consists of:

- Formulating a consistent and transparent strategy
- Communicating the strategy through the organisation

21 Translated from “El ABCD de la Planificación Prospectiva”, A. Alanis Huerta.
22 Other interesting project management models that have emerged in the field of private enterprise, such as PMBOK, can be consulted in the attached bibliography
• Coordinating the objectives of the diverse organisational units
• Connecting the objectives with the financial and budgetary planning
• Identifying and coordinating the strategic initiatives
• Systematically measuring the fulfilment, proposing appropriate corrective measures

PROCESS MANAGEMENT

The Process-Based Approach consists of the systematic identification and management of the processes developed in the organisation and in particular the interactions between these processes. Process Management is based on the modelling of the systems as a set of interrelated processes through cause-effect links.

The final goal of Process Management is to ensure that all the processes of an organisation are developed in a coordinated manner, improving the effectiveness and satisfaction of all the parties involved (in the case of a private company, clients, shareholders, staff, suppliers, society in general). Process management is at the base of the ISO 9001\(^{23}\) and EFQM\(^{24}\) quality systems, increasingly used by Development NGOs and the tertiary sector in general.

2.4 SPECIFIC TOOLS FOR HUMANITARIAN ACTION

COMPAS

It is the first quality assurance method specifically designed for Humanitarian Action. The Quality Compas is built around a reference, a Windrose, which is at the core of the method. The Windrose\(^{25}\), composed of twelve criteria that determine the quality of a humanitarian project, places the populations affected by the crisis and their environment at the centre of the approach.


\(^{24}\) [http://www.efqm.org/en](http://www.efqm.org/en)

The Windrose

At the four cardinal points: four impact and result criteria that focus on the affected populations and their environment, to reach these four criteria: eight structure and process criteria that concern the project and the organisation. The two functions of the COMPAS Method are:

1. **Project steering**: In each phase of the project, the organisations are faced with a certain number of critical points, moments at which the quality of their action can be affected in one of the twelve criteria of the Windrose. When posing questions (key questions), the COMPAS Method helps to make decisions and allows for the management of the project «with quality». It is the practical application of the principle of Quality Assurance.

2. **Evaluation of the project**: Thanks to the indicators associated with each of the twelve criteria of the Windrose, organisations can measure the quality of their action. They can thus identify eventual risks of dysfunction and take preventive measures. It is the practical application of the principle of continuous Quality improvement.

The «synoptic chart» of the COMPAS Method makes it possible to synthesise the key characteristics and information to monitor and assess the project based on the twelve criteria. It puts into perspective the results of the action (project logic and monitoring reports) with the process management (key questions and decisions made).

**ANALYSIS OF VULNERABILITY AND CAPACITY**

This consists of compiling, analysing and systematising, in a structured and logical manner, information on the vulnerability of a community to a certain threat. This information is then used to diagnose the main risks and the current capacities of the community and leads, ultimately,
the preparation of activities aimed at reducing the vulnerability of the population in the event of possible disasters and to increase their capacity for survival and recovery.

The AVC is a research method that uses a number of participative tools to understand the degree of exposure of the local population (and its capacity for resistance) to natural phenomena:

- It is an integral part (though not the only one) of preparation for disasters and can contribute towards the creation of preparation programmes in the event of community disasters in rural and urban areas.
- As part of the process, it allows people to identify and understand the risks that they should consider as prioritary, even when they are not natural phenomena.
- It is a tool that allows for the definition of local priorities and proposes actions that contribute towards reducing disasters, in addition to formulating and developing programmes that offer answers to the needs indicated by the population itself.

2.5 THE HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH

The human rights-based approach does not arise as a direct consequence of the criticism of the Logical Framework Approach or as an alternative to it. However it is an approach that is gaining importance within development cooperation.

The proposal of including the human rights-based approach (HRBA) in international development cooperation arises based on the consensus that the international community has reached with respect to the fight against poverty and the promotion of Human Rights. It is about encouraging the application of human rights and improving the capacities of the holders of rights to fulfil their obligations and/or so that the “holders of rights” actually demand their rights. Ultimately, with the HRBA the aim is to tackle the fight against poverty more effectively and sustainably.

The HRBA is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that, from a regulatory point of view, is based on the international rules of human rights and from an operational point of view is geared towards the promotion and protection of human rights.

In the HRBA, development activities can contribute towards applying these rights. Therefore, the national targets and the global development objectives must be aimed towards positive and sustainable changes in the lives of people and which are necessary for the full enjoyment of one or a number of human rights, and articulated in this way. Human rights standards are used for the analysis of the development problems and the design of projects and programmes, assessment mechanisms and the monitoring of their impact (indicators).

The inclusion of this approach in development cooperation projects means a change of orientation not only of the actions but also of the actual analysis of the problem, the identification of projects and their definition. In addition, it implies a very important change in the orientation of international development cooperation policies.

Some of the key aspects from a more methodological-practical point of view are:

- To define the objectives of the development depending on the satisfaction of rights, not so much based on problems (as is the case with the LF).
- The global compromises of the State concerning HR must be assessed in the design of a project/programme, and must guide it.
To break down the specific indicators to measure the fulfilment of rights.

Quantitative and qualitative indicators must be established to follow the achievement of human rights through development programmes. The selection and monitoring of indicators must be participative and must allow the parties directly involved to assess the progress made. The rules and compromises of human rights must guide the selection of indicators, ensuring that the ultimate goals are coherent with them, with the possibility of using three groups of indicators: structural, for processes and for results.

The practice of the human rights approach also implies that every target group benefiting from a contribution or programme must be clearly involved in the activities and must have or gradually acquire the knowledge, awareness, and capacity to demand their human rights individually or collectively.

Some of the main advantages or strengths of the HRBA, according to the doctrine, are:

- It provides a rational and complete framework for development
- It strengthens the responsibility of the State
- It empowers people to take their own development into their own hands and to defend their rights
- It shows the regulatory bases of the development and eliminates the arbitrariness in the formulation of criteria for the development
- It improves the identification of the institutional objectives of the development
- It allows the use of qualitative indicators for monitoring because it focuses the development's impact on the people's situation.

With the traditional management of the LF the expected objectives/results are identified from the beginning. The HRBA also aims to achieve objectives/results, although the participative nature of its programming requires greater flexibility and can lead to changes in the predictions during the programming process. The LF's results management relies on clearly defined accountability and requires the monitoring and self-assessment of the progress made towards the results and the presentation of reports on the actions carried out. In the case of the HRBA, management through results is the programme's management vehicle.

The human rights-based approach is compatible with the LF. The AECID, which uses the methodology of the LF with the Spanish Cooperation Master Plan 2005-2008 has tried to introduce the HRBA. Since the last call for agreements in 2010, aspects that more decisively incorporate the HRBA in the formulation have been included.

On the other hand, the Office of Development Cooperation of the Basque Government has published, in 2009, in collaboration with “GARAPEN BIDEAN, Workshop for Human Rights and Development”, the Methodological guide for the incorporation of human rights in development cooperation. It aims to be a practical guide so that Development NGOs can start to incorporate the HRBA in their projects/programmes. In addition to the definition and references regarding the HRBA it includes guidelines so that Development NGOs can incorporate it to their projects. It does so taking into account that the methodology followed by most Development NGOs of the BAC is the LF, meaning that it is more simple to incorporate it using the guide. The inclusion of fundamental principles such as accountability and the indivisibility of human rights in the different

---

26 See Section 3.2 on the LF in the AECID, in this same study.
phases of the project cycle and in the fields of internal debate and discussion of organisations will facilitate the integration of the HRBA in their operational and organisational strategy. The idea is that progress is made and that the fulfilment of human rights becomes the backbone of the interventions. The guide includes a practical case of Education Rights in Africa that can be very useful as a basic reference for Development NGOs.

Almost all European agencies and Agencies of the United Nations have included, to a greater or lesser extent, mentions of the HRBA in their development cooperation plans, meaning that it is becoming a reference at a global level.

2.6 OTHER INNOVATIVE APPROACHES / TOOLS

MANAGING FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

“Managing for Development Results” (MfDR) is a management modality focused on the achievement of development objectives and on the short, medium and long-term sustainable improvements of a country. It provides a coherent framework to ensure the effectiveness of the development, where the information of the task is used mainly to improve decision making and which includes practical tools for strategic planning, risk management, progress monitoring and impact assessment. This approach is under construction, and still requires a higher degree of practical development with operative and tested instruments.

Although there are certain shared concepts and characteristics, the MfDR is different to other approaches such as “Results-Based Management” (RBM), “Management through Results” (MTR), or “Management through Objectives”, closer to the approach of the traditional LF. While the latter are intended for projects/organisations and with emphasis on accountability and effectiveness/efficiency, in the MfDR emphasis is placed on the development of a country, evaluating in particular the contribution towards the impact, the sustainability and the protagonism of all the partners, from a more global perspective, of continuous and flexible learning and decision making.

In the following chart, the evolution in traditional management paradigms can be seen, until the MfDR is reached:

27 Source: Study on the MfDR elaborated by the CONGDE in 2009, in turn adapted from Juan Toledano (IUDC, 2009)
The MfDR has become the reference of the new shape of international cooperation, since the declaration of the Millennium Development Goals in 2000. The importance of the MfDR for the management of development interventions in increasingly complex contexts has been highlighted in many international conferences and there has been progress in the development of this new approach. Among the most important we can mention:

- International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico (2002)
- Round Table on Better Measurement, Monitoring, and Managing for Results (2002) of the World Bank
- Second International Round table on Managing for Development Results, held in Marrakesh, Morocco (2004)
- High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Paris (2005)
- Third International Round table on Managing for Development Results, in Hanoi (2007)
- Third Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra (2008)

The following graph reflects the basic principles of the MfDR:

The MfDR model does not necessarily exclude the LF. In fact, as pointed out by the DAC of the OECD (2007) “The MfDR is focused on a strong notion of causality. It is presupposed that certain inputs and activities will lead, logically, to certain results. The relevance of these results follows an ascending order: the most basic results (the ‘products’ or outputs) contribute towards the achievement of more

28 “MtR Principles in Action: Sourcebook on Emerging Good Practices” OCDE 2006R
complex results (‘effects’ or outcomes) and, finally, leads to an ‘impact’, which is the furthest reaching result. Therefore attention must be paid to achieving results during all the phases of the management process, from the planning to the monitoring and assessment, as it affects all the levels at which each process develops”.

The following chart synthetically reflects the structure, operation and importance of the MfDR’s revision and learning mechanisms.

In Spain we could highlight the Management Group for Development Results, created in 2009 within the Development NGO Coordination Platform, and which works on this approach. In 2009 the document mentioned above “Management for results within the new framework of international development cooperation” was published (See Annex recommended bibliography “II Encounter of Development NGOs: Transformation and Challenges of the Sector in a Changing Society” in Madrid, 2009.

SYSTEMIC PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The systemic management perspective is an alternative that is not based, like many of the above, on the LF and its supposed “simplification” of reality, but rather the opposite, on ideas of complex systems and realities. It has not emerged as an alternative to the logical framework or to traditional project management, but rather it aims to complement the latter and to adapt it to the new

---

28 Taken from the report on MfDR by the CONGDE (Development NGO coordinator in Spain) (2009), in turn adapted from the CIDA (2003)
30 “Systemic Project Management”
context of cooperation, complex and in which many agents are involved. It is a valid approach to manage changes, understanding all development interventions as a process of change that is still under construction and pending operative developments that are more tangible in the field of development cooperation.

The problems that are usually faced in complex interventions can be summarised as:

- A lack of linear behaviour, which increases the complexity of the projects
- Multiple nature of limiting factors. There are always limits that prevent the progress of the project
- Delays in the feedback of information
- Traditional risk analyses are not enough because they analyse factors separately. The relationship between the system’s elements is not taken into account
- The human factor, as us humans are inherently complex systems

The systemic perspective is based on sets of elements (agents, projects, programmes, etc.), interconnected in such a way that they produce their own behaviour model over time (“Thinking on Systems”, 2008). For this purpose development interventions are conceived as complex systems of interconnected elements.

The following graph\footnote{Taken from Hummelbrunner (“Beyond Logframe: Using System Concepts for Evaluation”; FASID, 2010) in turn adapted from Schwaninger (2001)} expresses this complex system, referring to the context of development interventions:
The doctrine identifies a number of rules for the success of the application of systemic management:

- To implement feedback cycles that act as regulators so that the system adjusts itself when necessary. These feedback cycles are a basic element given the changing context of complex interventions.

- To prepare the rules of the game considering the project as a whole.

- To record what is measurable (objective variables) and what is important (the subjective variables): the latter play a very important role in the project, whether they are taken into account or not, and will directly affect the project’s success.

- To allow self-organisation when referring to subsystems; the project as a system thus acquires the capacity to recover, necessary for the changing context mentioned.

- Direct feedback to those who make the decisions concerning the events that take place during the project; to give them “intrinsic responsibility” within the system.

- To satisfy the principles of: Adaptability, Safety, Existence, Effectiveness, Freedom, Consideration.

- To define the key performance indicators closely linked to the project’s objectives.

For the systemic current, management should be conceived as the direction or advisor of these interconnected processes, which need to take into account the combined logic of all the agents involved. Communication and relations among them are important ingredients of these direction processes, which should try to reconcile the different rationales among them. Although this task of management/direction is essentially carried out by those who are in direct contact with the recipients (the project staff) action is carried out within a framework established by others, which can be referred to as a nested set of systems. This means that the “interfaces” between a system and its subsystems are managed similarly and the flow of information follows the same model at the different organisational levels, as can be seen in the following graph:

---

32 “Systemic Project Management: 7 rules for success”, Gilberto Junqueira. 2010
33 Taken from Hummelbrunner (“Beyond Logframe: Using System Concepts for Evaluation”, FASID, 2010) in turn adapted from Schwaninger (2001)
CAPACITY WORKS

"Capacity WORKS\(^{34}\) is the GTZ’s most recent model of intervention management for sustainable development, after a successful pilot phase of 18 months (since January 2009) applying it to the management of projects and programmes of this development agency in Germany and abroad. It helps to answer key questions such as:

- How does the GTZ effectively contribute to the development of its partner’s capacities?
- How should the management and direction of projects and programmes be structured so that the results of capacity development are as effective and sustainable as possible?

Capacity WORKS is the answer to the changing conditions of the international context of development cooperation. The structures in partner countries and donors have become increasingly complex. Normally a project or programme is no longer designed and carried out with a single partner, but rather involves a multi-organisational and multi-institutional framework.

The key elements of Capacity WORKS are the objectives and results that are agreed upon jointly in relation to an initial agreement/contract. In development cooperation interventions, the procedure can be revised and corrected continually in relation to the five success factors presented in the model (which are explained below). In each success factor, thoughts and actions are guided by key questions. Capacity WORKS opens up a number of structured approaches that the partners can apply flexibly in the management of complex projects and programmes. The model enables users to identify, focus and direct the relevant negotiation processes in these complex contexts of cooperation. The partners are prepared and empowered to develop and maximise their organisational and individual capacities.

The success factors are used as a framework and foundation to decide how a project or programme is designed: the latter is negotiated with the other parties within the framework of the former, which, in turn, is used as the foundation to examine and determine the contributions of the GTZ. It has been proven in practice that the effectiveness and efficiency of interventions increases notably when the management of a project or programme is guided consistently towards the five success factors:

---

\(^{34}\) It is a term created and registered by the GTZ
As for the success factors, Capacity WORKS is based on the EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management) model. EFQM is a general purpose management model, usable in any field or sector. Capacity WORKS adapts this model to the particular characteristics of guiding the GTZ’s complex projects or programmes.

Capacity WORKS is a management model that offers a structured way of proceeding. This process is understood as a circuit that has to be travelled along time and time again. The frequency, on what occasions, in what structures and according to what rules is something that will be decided within each project or programme, individually.

The way Capacity WORKS proceeds is appropriate for all value creation processes in projects or programmes, for both their examination and their execution. Therefore, the description of the process has general validity for a wide range of interventions.

The procedure is described as a series of steps. At the same time, the results and analysis of each step must have a feedback effect on the previous phases. The division of the process in different phases is useful in practice because it facilitates familiarity and day-to-day work with the management model and encourages its institutionalisation.

The linearity of the model - which is divided in stages and partial processes - responds to the intention of simplifying its representation. However, in practice the procedure is open and cyclical in nature.
In the successive steps (A-D), it is possible to use both the key questions and the instruments and advice principles contained in the toolbox for each of the success factors. The key questions define the framework. They offer indications and exercise the function of “devil’s advocate” to structure the reflection process within the projects or programmes. The tools are the support for an efficient job within the framework of the different success factors, and for properly established management decision-making. The advice principles also act as a guide for the selection of interventions.
3. THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND PUBLIC DONORS

3.1 DONORS AND INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

3.1.1 EUROPEAN UNION

Since the 1990’s the European Commission adopted “Project Cycle Management” (PCM) as its primordial element in design and management tools, which is based on the LF. The EC’s first PCM guide was published in 1993, with an update in 2001 that included a new EC development policy from the year 2000 and a later update in 2004, integrating the experience and lessons learned from the new policy.

The EC’s latest development cooperation policy ‘European Consensus on Development’ of December 2005 includes a greater focus on results as one of the guiding principles of the current policy. The promotion and protection of human rights is included as a transversal issue.

The main aid instruments used by the CE are:

- Direct support for projects. Within this, we should distinguish between the “individual project” approach, the subsidising of which is decided after the formulation and the “programme” approach, the subsidising of which is decided after the identification of the programme or “package” of projects.
- Support programmes for sectorial policies
- Macro-economic budgetary aid

The application process for direct support of projects of Development NGOs and Local Authorities by Europeaid includes two phases: the concept note and the detailed proposal (the latter for local organisations/entities that have already gone through the concept note phase). In the concept note a brief summary of the project is requested following an intervention logic based on the LF. In the detailed proposal one of the key documents is, again, the LFM, which is required as an annex. In general, as a result of the above mentioned reflections and lessons learned, it can be said that quite a lot of importance is given to the coherence and framing of the project in wider processes/priorities (of both the applicant entity and the EU itself). In addition, the need to expressly identify (separate from the LFM) the initial hypotheses and main risks faced by the intervention (both internal and external) is notable, including recording the contingency plans and/or measures to be taken to minimise/avoid these risks in the event of occurring.

3.1.2 BRITISH COOPERATION

British cooperation through its Department For International Development, DFID, has different funding modalities for Development NGOs, for projects and programmes in the South:

---

35 See section 3.1 of this study
• GLOBAL ACTION PLAN (GPAF): project with a maximum duration of 3 years

• PROGRAM-PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS (PPA): support for policies, linked to strategic indicators that the beneficiary organisation must produce within 3 to 6 years

• CIVIL SOCIETY CHALLENGE FUND (CSCF): projects lasting up to 5 years

• COMMON GROUND INITIATIVE (CFI): for small organisations working in Africa.

The Logical Framework is a requirement for all interventions financed by the DFID with a budget equal to or greater than 1 million pounds. For smaller projects the project staff must decide whether use of the logical framework could benefit their project. The DFID promotes, however, harmonious and flexible approaches, including the use of methods equivalent to the LF but which must include all the required information. For the DFID, in the Development Cycle, the Logical Framework Matrix is considered from the identification phase, and finishes during the design and diagnosis phases; once approved it must remain active during the execution and monitoring phase. The quality matrix is an essential tool for an ex-post evaluation.

The format of the Logical Framework Matrix was revised in early 2009 to improve certain weaknesses found in recent projects and reports focused on:

- the identification of objectives at the correct level

- a more solid specification of indicators

- increasing information on the coverage of the baselines and goals

- better quantification of results

The main changes introduced in the traditional 4x4 matrix are:

- The indicators have been divided into: indicators, baseline and goal. Annual achievements have been added

- The verification sources are now called “source”

- The resources are now quantified in terms of monetary funds and human resources (time)

- The DFID co-financing checkbox indicates a percentage of the economic value of the resources charged to DFID with respect to the global amount

- The hypotheses are only shown at the specific objective and result level

- The risk factors are shown at the activity level, but they are also evaluated at the result level

- At the result level, the contribution to the impact along with the assessment of risks for each result is shown

- The activities are shown separately and do not appear in the matrix sent for approval, although they can be added to the matrix if the interested party wishes

- A renewed emphasis on the use of broken down data of beneficiaries for indicators, baselines and goals.
3.1.3 DANISH COOPERATION

Danish cooperation, through DANIDA, configures a model clearly based on an approach focused on rights, along with respect for democracy and proper government. Since 1989 DANIDA has applied the LF as a planning tool for the preparation and management of the development activities supported by this agency. The LF also contributes towards the new bilateral cooperation strategy, introducing an approach which offers wider support for sectorial programmes.

Before starting a programme/project or a small project to be financed by DANIDA, a project/programme document based on the LF must be drafted, containing:

- Background (sector, target group, position in the structure, etc.)
- Development objectives, immediate objectives, results (output), activities, resources
- Previous conditions
- Risk assessment
- Organisation and administration of the project
- Organisational and economic sustainability
- Indicators
- Revision, justification and evaluation mechanisms
- Budget specified according to the financial management needs
- Financing
- Accounting and auditing systems
- Execution plan

3.1.4 GERMAN COOPERATION

The German Society for Technical Cooperation (GTZ, until January 2011) has been, possibly, the institution that at a European level has promoted the issues of methodology and improvements in the management of projects in the field of development cooperation, making it a reference for other agencies. In particular, it was the GTZ which introduced the LF in Europe and since this initiative many development aid agencies also made it part of their agendas.

After the initial application of the LF, and as a development of its own methodology, improving the weaknesses observed in it, the GTZ adopted the GOPP (Goal Oriented Project Planning) which incorporated new stages and elements to the methodology of the LF: participative analysis; problems analysis; objectives analysis; interdisciplinary workshops with all the affected groups. This methodology was patented by the GTZ and adopted by many European agencies that used the LF.

36 From this date onwards, German cooperation is unified in the GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) with the fusion of GTZ, DED and Inwent (http://www.giz.de/)
37 See sections 3.1 and 3.5 of this study
38 See a detailed description in the previous section
After using the GOPP for over a decade, like with the LF certain weaknesses were detected in it: schematic oversimplification; artificial situation of workshops; an instrument of power for the staff at GTZ; too focused on problems. For this reason, in the late 90's elements from Project Cycle Management (PCM) were adopted, characterised by the flexibility of the preparation of the project, and with other tools for project planning, such as the Participative Rural Diagnosis (PRD). Subsequently the GTZ has been working with a management model aimed at impacts and introducing certain elements with a more systemic approach.

This is how in 2009 the “Capacity WORKS” model was reached\(^39\), which is the answer to the changed conditions of the international context of development cooperation. The structures in the partner countries and the donors are more complex. Normally a project or programme is not designed and carried out with a single partner, but rather involves a multi-organisational and multi-institutional framework. A programme's results and objectives are the central reference points for Capacity WORKS, GTZ's own management model for sustainable development regarding projects and programmes. Capacity WORKS facilitates efficient and effective coordination and direction of complex projects, integrating the GTZ's capacity development approach.

The GTZ has patented this model and has applied it to all the interventions it supports since 2009, and requires its use by all the consultancies that collaborate with it. GTZ has created an education offer in this respect, with specialised consultants, qualified by the GTZ, whose contacts can be found on its website\(^40\). Although right now Capacity WORKS is a new model only used by the GTZ, given the historical influence this institution has had at an international level, it will have to be taken into account as a possible option in the short term, to be used at a more global level.

On the other hand, the German cooperation strategy “BMZ: Development Policy Action Plan on Human Rights 2008-2010” highlights the importance of the human rights-based approach, and expressly states that “...by making human rights our frame of reference we are underlining the emancipatory potential of a type of development cooperation which regards and promotes people as the subjects and agents of their own development. To that extent, the human rights-based approach marks a paradigm change: target groups become rights holders and our partners become duty bearers. We then no longer refer primarily to the needs and concerns of affected groups, but to statutory entitlements to a decent existence on the one hand and, on the other, to corresponding obligations on the part of state and non-state actors”.

---

\(^39\) See description in the previous section
\(^40\) http://www.gtz.de/en/leistungsangebote/27380.htm
3.1.5 SWEDISH COOPERATION

A substantial part of development cooperation managed by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, SIDA, is carried out in collaboration with civil society organisations at a national, regional and local level. The objective of the **Swedish cooperation policy of support for civil society in developing countries** is a vibrant and pluralist civil society in developing countries that uses a rights-based approach that effectively contributes to reducing poverty in all its dimensions. All programmes must have an orientation that implies that they contribute towards achieving this objective.

The most common form of aid/subsidies of Swedish cooperation with civil society organisations are **projects or programmes**, which are approved for 3-year periods, extendible by one year if requested. This aid helps subsidised organisations to operate independently.

Its cooperation is based on a **programme-based approach**. This means an approach with respect to development cooperation where all the support and dialogue is based on the policy, the organisation, the work cycle and the capacity of the local counterpart. It also implies that the inputs take into account, adapt to and contribute to the wider context, for example, within a thematic and/or geographical area. This concept is thus broader and deeper than the concept of programme in other donors (such as Spanish cooperation, both state and de-centralised).

During its existence, and after having used the LF like other European agencies, it has carried out a number of **reflections on this methodology** and its (possible) improvement. Today, aware that interventions are co-financed by other agents, no specific and strict formats are required from organisations, but rather they **place emphasis on the annual monitoring reports and final technical reports**, whereby reports must be made based on the results initially suggested and agreed upon by all the key agents.

3.1.6 FRENCH COOPERATION

The model for development cooperation of the French Development Agency (AFD) through Development NGOs, includes three tools: **projects**, **agreement-programmes** and **programmes arranged by multiple agents**.

The first two instruments that concern this study follow a management model according to the **Logical Framework**. According to the latest regulations of July 2010, in both modalities of projects and agreement-programmes the intervention logic and the management model according to the Logical Framework is used; the complete Logical Framework Matrix is explicitly required and in the narrative section special emphasis is placed on the evaluation mechanisms and on the external critical hypotheses. In neither of the two instruments is the identification process of the intervention financed.

---

41 Policy for support to civil society in developing countries within Swedish Development Cooperation

42 Programme-Based Approach

43 Destaca el estudio encargado a INTRAC en 2005: “The use and abuse of the Logical Framework Approach” (Oliver Bakewell & Anne Garbutt) ya mencionado
3.1.7 UNITED STATES COOPERATION (USAID)

The development cooperation model of USAID is being progressively focused on interventions where the results can be measured, an approach based on direct effects with tangible results. According to the trends explained in previous sections, we could say that it is similar to the Managing for Development Results model.

USAID includes different cooperation instruments where greater flexibility can be observed in general as regards design methodology and the execution of interventions. Most instruments follow a process similar to that established by Europaid, with a concept note and a detailed proposal (in the case of having passed the selection of the concept note). Goals, objectives and results are asked for in all of them, but there is no specific requirement to follow the methodology of the LF for the intervention logic. In a broader sense, in the technical part of the proposal the methodological approach, the expected impact and the sustainability must be described in detail, in addition to what has been mentioned above. In some isolated cases, the Logical Framework is required in the annexes (APS-OAA-10-000007: Women’s Leadership: Civic Leadership and Journalism).

3.1.8 CANADIAN COOPERATION

After some interesting reflections within its development agency (CIDA) the cooperation intervention management model promoted by it has been based mainly, during recent years, on Results-Based Management, which has already been analysed in previous sections of this study.

However, the CIDA has its own model which includes the logical model, a performance/results measurement framework and risk assessment.

The logical model is divided in 6 levels: supplies, activities, products, immediate results, intermediate results and final results.

3.1.9 AGENCIES OF THE UN

The United Nations agencies increasingly limit the use of the LF in a strict sense in their cooperation interventions, tending towards more flexible, comprehensive and global development models. In particular, given the UN’s work approach, emphasis is placed on tools that lead to an agreement between all the relevant actors, based on common compromises.

The commitment to initiatives such as “Capacity Development” recently set up by the UNDP, which has many similarities and points in common with the systemic approaches adopted by the GTZ for its “Capacity Works” model, is significant in this respect. The UNDP’s approach is understood as “the process through which individuals, organisations and society obtain, strengthen and maintain capacities to establish and reach their own development goals over time”.

Work is also done at the UN to achieve an in-depth inclusion of the Rights-Based Approach in its interventions. Thus, entities such as the UNHCR, the UNDP itself, FAO, etc. have developed models, manuals and other practical materials promoting the incorporation of indicators and elements from a HRBA in the interventions that it supports/develops.

Finally, other agencies such as UNIFEM do not require the LF in their proposal application forms for NGOs and local entities, and instead are committed to simpler frameworks in which development goals are pre-established by the Agency (in which the action applied for must be framed) leaving in turn much freedom to establish results, activities, strategies, etc. provided that they correlate with the mentioned objectives, and can be (at least partially) measurable.

UNDP, Capacity Development Group, 2008a.
3.2 SPANISH STATE COOPERATION (AECID)

Spanish Cooperation has traditionally followed (and required) the LF for the management of the Cooperation interventions it supports, in particular those channelled through Development NGOs. Today it is still the most widely used tool in most intervention modalities and instruments. Among them (except for the modalities of direct bilateral cooperation and contributions to multilateral funds) we can identify the following:

- **Projects with a short duration:** It is the most widely and traditionally used tool with Development NGOs, with a maximum duration of 24 months and for which the LF has been strictly applied, focused on the LFM, although more or less tacitly and progressively incorporating certain elements related to a broader vision of the same (GOPP, PCM, etc.) during the diagnosis and identification (analysis of actors, coherence, problems, alternatives, participation, sustainability measures, etc.).

- **Permanent Open Call (POC):** This more flexible modality with “simplified” procedures, open to all kinds of entities (and even private citizens) which operate in the field of cooperation, and with a duration of up to 18 months, has also been traditionally used by Development NGOs. However, recently, there has been a tendency to restrict this instrument to entities (particularly in the South) that cannot take part in the ordinary call for projects mentioned above. Use of the LF here is more flexible, based less rigidly on the LFM and with less demands with respect to other aspects of the LF.

- **Agreements:** It is a relatively new cooperation instrument (for the last 4-5 years) that aims to solve some of the limitations of traditional projects, in particular as regards their short time frame (the agreements can last up to 4 years, extendible to 6) along with greater flexibility to adapt to the changing circumstances during the lifetime of the intervention (global development objectives are established that are carried out afterwards each year through Annual Operative Plans). Similarly, greater emphasis is placed on the quality of the identification (with the possibility of even financing the contribution of external experts to the Development NGO for this purpose) so that aspects such as the analysis of actor participation, policies, alternatives, etc. are reinforced. Also required is a deeper identification of hypotheses, risk factors and alternatives.

Since 2010, Spanish Cooperation has tried to expand the HRBA, following the premises of the new Master Plan 2009-2012 (which expands and advances on the mentions of HR in the previous Master Plan). For this reason they have included, particularly in the formulation of agreements, aspects that cover said HRBA, integrating them in the traditional model of the LF:

- **Context analysis including actors:** rights-holding target collective; bearers of duties and responsibilities.

- **Formulation of the agreement:** critical analysis of the agreement’s objectives; critical analysis of the planning matrix results. Breakdown according to gender and other rights-holding groups; critical Analysis of the hypotheses or risks outlined in the planning matrix

- **Coordination, monitoring and evaluation:** Critical analysis of indicators in the planning matrix. Baseline; accountability System.
• Completion of the agreement. Sustainability of the intervention and planned expected involvement and transfer procedures: What systems has the agreement set up to empower rights-holders, citizens, civil society or counterparts to promote the survival of its effects and impacts; the degree of participation and availability of the obligation-bearing public institutions.

3.3 DECENTRALISED SPANISH COOPERATION

3.3.1 ANDALUSIA

El The Andalusian Development Cooperation Plan (2008-2011), PACODE, states that “Prioritary line 3: Respect for human rights is, as can be seen throughout the text, a constant feature and an element that determines all the measures carried out during the development of the Plan.” Although it does not directly mention the human rights-based approach, HRBA, it is a constant feature of the plan and is included in the forms of calls for projects/programmes under the section “SYNERGIES: Alignment with public policies” where a request is made for “Coherence of the project with public policies and the demands of civil society within the framework of respect for human rights.”

Within cooperation instruments, there is a call for pluriannual programmes which allows a duration of up to 48 months for the same. As for the part regarding planning and identification, subsidisable expenses are included within the identification and formulation expenses, and an explanation must be attached to the formulation document describing how the identification was carried out. There is no express mention of the rights approach. Also taken into account are the analysis of actors, not only the addressees, and the risk factors and alternatives.

For the formulation the planning matrix is required in the form even if not expressly mentioned in the terms and conditions. The LFM includes the baseline, quantitative indicators and hypotheses; also included is a column for the horizontal priorities (gender equality, protection of the environment, promotion of cultural diversity, strengthening of institutions and civil society organisations) related with the specific objective, the results and activities. The unanticipated impacts are considered.

As for the assessment it must be aimed at learning and on using the results; a final assessment is only obligatory for programmes and projects with a budget > 250,000.

3.3.2 ARAGÓN

The call for aid for development cooperation includes projects and programmes with a maximum duration of 24 months. The HR to be taken into account in the interventions are considered as a “horizontal priority: the defence of human rights” and a “sectorial priority:… the promotion of respect and the protection of human rights”.

45 A brief scenario of the cooperation tools and the treatment of the LF in each of the AC is offered, highlighting the most relevant aspects. We do not go down to the level of Regional Governments and local Councils, as this is beyond the scope of this study. Obviously the BAC is not included as it is already the object of a detailed analysis in subsequent sections of this study.
In the **identification and planning of programmes** the integration of the intervention within a more global framework is required and valued. An analysis of actors or of possible alternatives is not directly required. The subsidisable expenses include the identification expenses but a detailed description of them is not required in the formulation.

The formulation follows the **LF’s intervention logic** but the LFM is not required, at least expressly. Those negatively affected by the action are considered in the formulation. A section of the formulation is dedicated to the risks and suppositions.

Details are required of **monitoring and assessment actions** anticipated although there is no express mention of the type of assessment or whether it is obligatory.

### 3.3.3 ASTURIAS

There is only a **call for projects** with a maximum duration of 1 year. The call includes HR in a transversal manner.

Not explicitly included is **the identification** as a subsidisable expense nor is the explanation of the identification process considered in the formulation although it is partially included in the assessment criteria. In the identification and planning an analysis of the negatively affected addressees by the action is considered, but not an analysis of actors or alternatives.

In the formulation a classic **planning matrix** is required. As for monitoring and assessment, an intermediate monitoring report and a final report is required for the purpose of accountability and to analyse horizontal priorities. A breakdown of the internal and external assessment is required (not obligatory, though fundable) without specifying criteria.

### 3.3.4 CANTABRIA

The call for aid for development cooperation includes the instrument for **projects with a maximum duration of 36 months**. HR are considered a horizontal priority and are valued in the interventions.

As for **identification and planning** in the background and justification, a description of the identification process followed is required; the identification costs are included in the direct costs. An explanation of the alternatives or the incursion of the project in global processes is not required. An analysis of the actors involved in the project is not required either.

In the formulation a **classic planning matrix** is required, including OVI, VS and hypotheses for the general objective. The hypotheses must be detailed, in addition to a specific section for this purpose.

The internal monitoring **and assessment actions** are required in the formulation and are assessed even if the assessment criteria are not described. There must be mention of whether there will be external assessments, which are fundable. In the terms and conditions there is no description of criteria for which an external assessment is necessary.
3.3.5 CASTILE-LEÓN

The call for aid for development cooperation includes the tools of annual and/or biennial projects in phases. According to its 2009-2012 Master Plan there is no express mention of the HRBA; HR appear as prioritary sectors: “Prioritary Sector 2: Support the basic Right to Food, in addition to sustainable, equal economic and rural Development and Growth, respectful of human rights and of the environment” and “Prioritary Sector 4: Protection of Human Rights, Prevention of conflicts and the construction of Peace”.

There is no data on the identification or the framing of the project in a more global process. Consequently the identification expenses in the direct and indirect subsidisable expenses are not considered either. An analysis of the actors involved is not required. However, an analysis of the possible alternatives for the planning and execution of the project to reach the general objective is required. In the formulation the classic planning matrix with OVI, VS and hypotheses for the general objective is required.

As for monitoring and assessment in the formulation no assessment details are required, however “the monitoring and assessment mechanisms” of the project are included in the assessment criteria. Monitoring and final reports for accountability purposes with only quantitative indicators are required. In these reports an explanation of the unanticipated events during the execution and the positive and negative impacts of the action are required. In the final report an analysis of the assessment criteria (pertinence, effectiveness, efficiency, immediate impact, sustainability, participation and satisfaction of the beneficiary population) is requested.

3.3.6 CASTILE-LA MANCHA

The call for aid for development cooperation includes projects and programmes, the latter with a duration of up to 36 months. The planning of programmes is carried out with the rights-based approach, HRBA, both as regards the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948” and the “Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989”. The HRBA is assessed within the technical quality of the programme. In the formulation an analysis of the HRBA is included with a specific budget in the viability section and also in the monitoring reports.

In the identification and planning the incursion of the actions in global processes is assessed. An explanation of the intervention of all the actors involved is required. A description of the identification in annexes to the formulation is required and is covered in direct expenses. An analysis of the possible alternatives is not expressly requested.

For the formulation of programmes there is a double process, with certain similarities to that used by Europeaid. In the first phase a simple format is required (C1) which includes objectives, results and indicators; a timeline is not required. If selected at this stage, the next formulation (C2) must be fulfilled in which the planning matrix is required in the formulation, a classic LFM where the risk factors are also described. In the C2 formulation a detailed timeline of activities is required for the 3 years.

As for monitoring and assessment a final report focused on accountability is required. An external final assessment is required. An explanation of the monitoring and assessment tools is required as an annex to the formulation. Unexpected events are considered in the budget but a detailed breakdown is not required.

---

46 See section 4.1.1 of this study
3.3.7 CATALONIA

The call for aid for development cooperation includes projects lasting 1 year and programmes of minimum 2 years and maximum 3 years duration respectively. The 2007-2010 Master Plan includes HR as a transversal objective: “To promote integral respect and the consolidation of human rights, the governance and strengthening of the social fabric”.

As for identification and planning, the identification in the formulation and the diagnosis with the problem tree and objectives, a description of the different alternatives and an explanation of the diagnosis methodology is considered. It is not obligatory but the annexes regarding identification are valued positively. A description of the action’s incursion in more global processes is requested. Analysis of the actors or their evolution is not expressly requested.

In the formulation an organisation of objectives, results and activities based on the LF is requested; in turn the classic planning matrix is requested in addition to baselines, risk factors and prevention measures. A study of the risks and impacts included in an annex is valued. It focuses on quantitative indicators. As for groups not affected by the action their identification is requested.

For the monitoring and assessment the inclusion in the annex of the “descriptive document of the assessment mechanisms, generation of learning and improvement of the results of the projects used by the applicant entity” is positively valued. Information on the exit strategy is requested. In programmes an external assessment of results is always a requisite while only in projects with a budget over 200.000€. There is an annual monitoring report and a final report: “The assessment report must facilitate learning regarding the development of the project, in addition to accounting for the use of resources and obtaining results”. The monitoring reports are annual and both these and the final report are focused on accountability.

3.3.8 MADRID

The call for aid for development cooperation includes the following tools: projects with a maximum duration of 24 months, micro-projects with a maximum duration of 12 months and development diagnoses with a maximum duration of 12 months. The 2009-2012 General Development Cooperation Plan of the Community of Madrid states in the introduction chapter, in the section “General and specific objectives” that “The Community of Madrid considers development as an expansion process of human freedoms, increasing the opportunities of individuals to improve their situation. For this reason, it development cooperation promotes the autonomy and capacity of people, their freedoms, their potential to improve their own situation and that of the country with their own effort; and includes the Human Rights Approach in Development (HRAD), which situates the human being, in its individual and social dimension, at the centre of society”. In the call the promotion of HR is included as a transversal priority.

There is a specific tool for diagnoses of development that covers actions aimed at needs analysis and alternatives for the subsequent formulation of projects. It includes the analysis of problems, the diagnosis methodology, the incursion in global processes and an analysis of actors. In the case of the project tool also included are the problem trees and objectives, and the alternative chosen must be justified. In projects the identification does not appear as a subsidisable expense.

In the formulation the classic planning matrix is required. OVI, VS or hypotheses are not required for the general objective. There is no express mention of the qualitative indicators. The elaboration of the baseline is subsidised.
In monitoring and assessment, although it is not obligatory, the allocation of an external assessment adjustable to the ToR of cooperation in Madrid is contemplated. A description of the monitoring and assessment procedure in the formulation is requested and valued, although details are not gone into. A final report in all the tools, exclusively focused on accountability, is required.

3.3.9 MURCIA

The call for aid for development cooperation projects includes the project instrument for a maximum duration of 24 months. HR appear as a transversal criterion.

As for identification and planning there is no express mention of identification in the terms and conditions nor in the call. Emphasis is placed on the risks and measures for the success of the project, without an in-depth analysis of the possible global approach nor of the analysis of alternatives.

In the formulation the classic planning matrix is required; including OVI and VS for the general objective. The requested indicators are quantitative.

For the monitoring and assessment there is no express mention of the assessment in the formulation; however, in the final report, within the section "assessment of the execution and deviations" there is a point that refers to assessment: "Reasons that could recommend an ex post assessment of the project". In the monitoring reports in addition to accountability the monitoring of the relevant actors and the risk factors is required; information on deviations and modifications proposed. In the final report a description of the unanticipated results and activities is required.

3.3.10 VALENCIA

The call for aid for development cooperation includes projects with a duration of up to 36 months and programmes with a duration between 18 and 48 months respectively; in addition there is another modality of micro-projects with a duration of up to 12 months. According to its 2008-2011 Master Plan HR appear as "Specific principles of Valencian development cooperation, in accordance with Law 6/2007:…2. The defence and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms"; "Horizontal Priorities:…B) The protection of and respect for human rights"; and "Sectorial priority:…4. Promotion of democratic governability, respect and promotion of human rights".

In the identification and planning the subsidisable expenses cover the formulation. In the description of the project, an account of the problems on which there is a desire to take action and the origin of the initiative is required, in addition to completing it with identification studies in annexes. Also required is a description of the intervention’s integration in more global processes. There is no emphasis placed on the analysis of alternatives or the risk factors, however a partial analysis of the actors involved in addition to the addressees is requested.

The formulation has a section for the classic planning matrix. OVI, VS and hypotheses are required for the general objective.

As for monitoring and assessment, for projects and programmes it is obligatory to carry out an external final assessment of objectives and results; the subsidisable expenses cover this assessment. In addition, the Valencian Community can carry out an impact assessment. Internal monitoring and assessment in the formulation is not required. Modifications during
the intervention are allowed providing it is reported and when necessary with the pertinent authorisation. In the monitoring and final reports in addition to accountability a description of the unexpected activities and those carried out is required.

3.3.11 EXTREMADURA

The call for aid for development cooperation includes **projects with a duration of 12 and 24 months**. There is no express mention of HR or the HRBA in the terms and conditions or in the call.

As for **identification and planning** the identification expenses are not expressly subsidised but the formulation expenses are subsidised. In the formulation a description of the method used for the identification and selection of the project is required. Also required is an analysis of the actors involved in addition to the risk factors, but not an analysis of alternatives.

In the formulation there is no express mention of the LF though **the classic Planning Matrix is required** which also includes the transversal activities. OVI, VS or hypotheses are not required for the general objective. A list of those possibly negatively affected by the project is required.

As for **monitoring and justification** a description of the way the internal assessment is approached is required. An external assessment is not required in any of the cases. The monitoring, monitoring report and final report place emphasis in particular on accountability, but not so much on the lessons learned or the mechanisms used. Modifications are allowed by informing on and describing the changes in the justification report.

3.3.12 GALICIA

The call for aid for development cooperation includes, in addition to **annual and pluriannual projects** (2 years), **programmes with a duration between 25 and 45 months**. HR are considered a transversal factor to be considered in social and cultural viability.

In the **identification and planning** the identification expenses are included as subsidisable costs and descriptive annexes are required in the projects; in the programmes the process and the identification methodology must be explained. The inclusion in global processes and an analysis of the actors involved in the action are required, but not an analysis of the alternatives. However, an analysis of the risk factors and the corrective measures to be taken is required.

In the formulation the **classic planning matrix and the problems and objectives tree** are required; OVI and VS or hypotheses are not required for the general objective. Qualitative indicators are required. In programmes, there is certain flexibility for the planning of activities: details of activities of years 3 and 4 are not required until the payments corresponding to these years are requested.

As for **monitoring and assessment** it is important to note that the terms and conditions expressly mention the LF for the assessment methodology. An **obligatory final assessment and a voluntary intermediate assessment is required in programmes**; in projects a final assessment is only obligatory for those with a budget >120.000. A description of the monitoring and assessment mechanisms and methodologies is required in the formulation. Information on the lessons learned and feedback after the intervention is valued. In the monitoring report a description of the modifications and unanticipated events and activities, an assessment of the risk factors and the evolution of the agents involved are required. In the final report an evaluation of the assessment criteria (pertinence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) is requested.
3.3.13 BALEARIC ISLANDS

The call for aid for development cooperation includes projects with a maximum duration of 18 months. HR are treated as a transversal priority.

In the identification and planning the identification expenses are covered. The inclusion of the intervention in more global processes, the analysis of risk factors and the diagnosis with the problems and objectives tree according to the LF is required. An analysis of the actors involved in the action, those negatively and positively affected and an analysis of the expected impacts is required.

In the formulation the intervention logic according to the LF is followed; the classic Planning Matrix is requested. OVI, VS or hypotheses are not required for the general objective. Indicators in general are required, without specifying whether they must be qualitative or not. Additionally, other assessment criteria not strictly related with the Logical Framework are required.

As for monitoring and assessment the assessment expenses are covered. A monitoring and assessment system is required, with techniques and methodologies, in addition to risk precautions and corrective measures. Assessment is obligatory for projects > 100,000. In the monitoring report in addition to accountability, a description of the difficulties found and the measures to tackle them is required. A final report where the lessons learned and the results and unanticipated activities are considered is required. Information on the impact of the action and details of the end of project final assessment in the final report are required.

3.3.14 CANARY ISLANDS

The call for aid for development cooperation covers two modalities of projects with a duration of 12 and 24 months respectively. HR are considered as a transversal factor in the terms and conditions.

As for identification and planning a description of the incursion of the actions in more global processes is not required. The subsidisable expenses include identification expenses but a detailed description of the identification process is not required. The risk factors or the different alternatives to carry out the project are not expressly taken into account.

In the formulation the intervention logic according to the LF is partially followed and the planning matrix is required, including OVI, VS and hypotheses for the general objective. There is a section expressly for risks and presumptions.

In the section monitoring and assessment a final report for accountability and details of the global impact of the intervention is considered. In the formulation details of the internal and external assessment in the event of being carried out is required, although it is not obligatory.

3.3.15 LA RIOJA

The call for aid for development cooperation includes as instruments, in addition to the projects, the pluriannual projects lasting between 24 and 36 months. HR appear as a transversal activity and/or as the objective of the project, but there is no express mention of the HRBA strictly speaking.

As for the identification and planning the identification process must be explained in addition to the framing of the project in global processes, the analysis of alternatives and the analysis of actors.
In the formulation the planning matrix is not required but the intervention logic of the LF is followed. OVI, VS and hypotheses are required for the general objective. There is express mention of qualitative indicators. A description of the potentially negatively affected population is also included.

In the part regarding monitoring and assessment, monitoring and final reports are requested with an analysis of risk factors and relevant actors in the latter. It is possible to carry out an external assessment, but no requirements are mentioned in the terms and conditions. There is no mention of lessons learned as a result of the intervention and its assessment, nor of unexpected objectives and results that arise during the intervention. In any event, the forms and requirements for the monitoring and assessment are quite complete.

3.3.16 NAVARRE

The call for aid for development cooperation includes annual projects, micro-actions and pluriannual programmes, the latter with a maximum duration of 36 months. HR are presented as a transversal priority.

As for identification and planning a description of the identification followed is requested and the corresponding expenses are covered. The inclusion of the action in global processes is considered and an analysis of the actors involved in it. On the other hand there is no express mention of the analysis of alternatives or of the risk factors faced when carrying out the project.

In the formulation the planning matrix is not required as such but the intervention logic of the LF is followed. OVI, VS and hypotheses are not required for the general and specific objective; there is only mention of quantitative indicators.

As for monitoring and assessment, a partial report and another final monitoring report is included solely for accountability purposes. Authorised modifications are allowed. An external (or mixed) ex-post assessment is requested for pluriannual programmes, particularly for accountability purposes. For the assessment the LF can be complemented with other methodologies.
4. THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK IN THE BAC

4.1 HOW BASQUE PUBLIC ENTITIES USE THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

How it fits in the regulatory framework of decentralised cooperation in the BAC

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Most development cooperation activities of public entities analysed in the BAC take place in the social areas/departments (up to 70%). 17% are managed in areas/departments related more specifically with Equality, Cooperation, HR. Only punctually do they depend directly on a mayoralty/presidency (10%) or they are not inserted in any specific department (3%).

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Despite the above, practically all (90%) the public entities of the BAC analysed have specific terms and conditions and calls for Development Cooperation actions. Very few continue to grant direct aid without more or less defined requisites and criteria, while in all these cases they are entities that have a very limited budget for development cooperation. Obviously the entry into force of the new
state regulations on subsidies\textsuperscript{47} and their subsequent inclusion in the regulations of the BAC has led to a significant systematisation, clarification and regulation of all these procedures.
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\textbf{Source:} ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Expanding slightly more, if we analyse the public entities that have specific forms for presenting cooperation actions, the percentage decreases, although most require it (approximately two thirds of those analysed). Those that do not do it in this way coincide again, in general, with entities that have limited budgets for development cooperation.

The forms of most public entities analysed that had them were rather rigid and not very flexible (up to 60\% of cases) meaning that they hardly allow any margin for an adaptation of substance or form by applicant Development NGOs when collecting the proposals presented.
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\textbf{Source:} ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

According to the questionnaires responded by those responsible for cooperation at the public entities contacted in the study, it can be concluded that a vast majority (72\%) do not require

\textsuperscript{47} Law 38/2003 on Subsidies, and Royal Decree 887/2006 which develops it
the Logical Framework Approach as such in their cooperation terms and conditions/calls. This conclusion is likewise supported by the absence of express mentions of this methodology in the terms and conditions and calls analysed (only 20% of those revised in this study expressly mentioned this approach/tool).

The main reasons pointed out by the people responsible who were surveyed are a lack of knowledge concerning this approach along with few specialised staff that apply it (although, on some occasions it is surprising to find public entities that manage a significant volume of funds for development cooperation, with those responsible claiming that they have not even heard of the Logical Framework).

If we analyse in further detail the profile of entities that do not expressly apply/require the Logical Framework, it generally corresponds with those with a limited budget for cooperation and/or small technical teams for cooperation. In turn, if we exclusively bear in mind the handful of entities that dedicate the most funds for cooperation within the BAC (in particular the Basque Government, the three Provincial Governments and the three province capital City Councils) their use of the Logical Framework carries significantly greater weight. It is necessary to take this into account in order to interpret the conclusions reached regarding the use of the Logical Framework in public entities of the BAC, looking not only at the number of entities that apply it (quite small) but also the volume of funds that are managed based on this tool (quite large).

The above statement must be qualified in practice, given the fact that, as some entities point out “…the Logical Framework is not required, although many of the projects presented observe and consider it…”. On other occasions, though still without expressly naming it as such in terms and conditions and/or forms, it is claimed that they apply “…standard methodologies that describe objectives, results, activities and resources necessary for the execution of the project…” which incorporate, to a certain extent, some aspects of the Logical Framework, although from a limited and less comprehensive perspective of the same.

In some of the cases in which the Logical Framework IS applied, it is not required as strictly obligatory but rather as a benchmark and/or support guide for municipal technicians and Development NGOs (“…it is applied and benchmarked, however although it is recommendable, it is not obligatory for the projects presented to be based on the Logical Framework Approach…”).

Along with the above profile there are a few punctual cases of entities that have expressly decided NOT to use the Logical Framework, despite having in-depth knowledge of it, as they consider it inadequate. Among the most significant cases we have Vitoria City council where, according to those responsible “…in calls with subsidies for small projects or with a reduced subsidy (25,000 euros or less)…we only ask for a simple formulation that includes a schematic description of objectives, results, activities and resources necessary for the execution of the project, but it is not necessary to use the Logical Framework or similar standard methodologies…”. A similar approach is used by the Regional Governments for the so-called “punctual actions”, for which the usual Logical Framework approach is not required, only the objectives to be achieved and the activities to be carried out for this purpose. The justification put forward, in general, for this decision is based on the fact that “there are small Development NGOs, with good projects, but which cannot respond to the technical level required by the Logical Framework Approach” which would be left without the possibility of support with a strict application of this tool.

---

48 According to the Development NGO ALBOAN in 2005 these 7 entities destined over 90% of the funds of the Official Development Aid (ODA) funds in the BAC.
In any event, and to avoid bias in the interpretation, we must bear in mind that most of the following sections are based, mainly, on the answers and opinions expressed by the few entities that do apply the Logical Framework, which represent a small percentage of the total surveyed, as has already been seen.

**Weight of the Logical Framework when assessing proposals made by Public Entities**

![Diagram showing weight of Logical Framework](image)

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

The large number of public entities that are unaware of/do not apply the Logical Framework in their terms and conditions and calls for cooperation obviously conditions the scarce degree of application and importance perceived by them with respect to this tool (almost half of those surveyed do not take it into account). In any event, of the remaining entities consulted it is important to note the scarce number of them that consider it a highly or even a moderately useful instrument (barely 10% and 20%, respectively). Almost half of those responsible of public entities who expressly referred to this issue regarded the weight/usefulness of the Logical Framework as low when assessing the proposals submitted to them.

The above information contrasts greatly with the opinion perceived by the Development NGOs themselves and their partners in the South regarding the high importance of the Logical Framework for public administrations (as will be seen in the following sections).
Among the public entities who declare that they use/apply the Logical Framework, most use it in a generalised manner for projects, in the traditional sense of the term (actions with a specific objective, with a duration no greater than 24 months). However, in the case of projects consisting of punctual actions, with a more limited volume/scope, a number of entities stated that this approach was not entirely suitable. As one of the entities consulted pointed out “…for small and medium-sized projects it is an excessive tool. In the same way that the MS Project is adequate for a large company but not for a workshop or small cooperative, the Logical Framework is not adequate for small projects, as it takes more work than the benefits it produces, and in the end all you do is fill in literature and the same things get repeated in different ways to complete the form…” Along the same lines another entity stated that “…in general we do not think that the Logical Framework is the best technical platform for the presentation of simple projects (post-emergency reconstruction, punctual education actions, etc.) or projects in which the population that participates in them may have problems with the workings of this tool…”.

Also relevant (though less than in the case of projects) is the use of the Logical Framework for direct cooperation/agreement actions carried out by the public entities consulted. However, the fact that these actions are not subject to the logic of competitive concurrence between Development NGOs, as occurs with the case of projects, sometimes allows for greater flexibility of some aspects of the Logical Framework and/or the chance to test an alternative tool/approach to it, as pointed out by some entities. Additionally, these same entities stated that “direct cooperation requires a degree of flexibility and/or continuity (agreements that are extended on an annual basis) that the Logical Framework does not always allow”.

Use of the Logical Framework is significantly lower for Programmes (more complex interventions and/or with a duration greater than 24 months), to a large extent because many of the entities consulted did not use this instrument. If we focus on those that do use it, there are partially opposed opinions on the matter: on the one hand, it is stated that the longer-term programmes based on process approaches require certain flexibility in their planning and management, which
is often incompatible with the rigidity of the Logical Framework; but on the other hand, it is also acknowledged that this type of programme, for which the public entity pledges an important volume of funds with pluriannual compromises, must be treated with even greater rigour, if possible, when they are assessed, selected and justified, for which reason the use of a systematic and universally acknowledged tool such as the Logical Framework provides legitimacy and transparency for public management.

In this sense it must be noted that only a small percentage (14%) of entities finance longer-term programmes (3-5 years) meaning that they can adapt to continuous processes that stretch over longer periods of time. The rest only allow the funding of short-term projects (almost half restrict them to a duration of 1 year, with only 16% of entities allowing them to reach two years).

In the case of Awareness-Raising and Development Education actions, although the Logical Framework is applied by a large number of entities consulted, there are many that question its suitability as a tool for this purpose. In a representative manner, an entity stated that “…in educational sectors (formal, non-formal, informal...) and in educational processes in general it is not adequate. it is a very operative methodology when it comes to “doing things” (building, manufacturing, etc.) but in these other sectors there are very developed methodologies that are adapted, specialised, proven,... for different education processes, ages, spaces, degree of formality, etc. and the Logical Framework does not surpass them or even come close...”. Methodologies such as outcome mapping, segmented assessment or others specific to the context of education, share (and are sometimes preferred over) the space of the Logical Framework as planning and management tools for these types of interventions.

Use of the Logical Framework is much lower for Humanitarian Action interventions, for which a large number of entities consulted (up to 75%) stated that it was neither useful nor practical. The main reasons put forward were based on the speed and agility required to process and manage these actions, incompatible on most occasions with a strict use of the Logical Framework. Others stated that “…we see the application of the Logical Framework in Humanitarian Action as more complex, as the modifications and corrections of the project are usually greater...”.

Finally there is no significant mention of the use of the Logical Framework for co-development interventions, although the main reason seems to be precisely the scarce use of these types of instruments or modalities by most of the entities analysed. In any event there have been no specific opinions on the subject offered by those surveyed.

**Function / utility of the Logical Framework**

- A way of presenting proposals in a summarised and clear manner
- A foundation to measure results and the efficacy of the project
- A participative tool for identifying and planning projects
- A way of comparing and assessing proposals to determine which one to approve

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
Almost all the persons in charge consulted coincide when highlighting, in a more or less proportional manner, the same main uses/functions of the Logical Framework within their public entities, without it being possible to state that any of them are perceived as being above the rest.

The most highlighted aspect consists of considering the Logical Framework as a way of presenting proposals in a clear and summarised manner, an option highlighted mainly by entities of a certain size and which regularly manage an important volume of proposals. Obviously, in these cases, the use of a standard, logical and summarised methodology allows the technician to understand “at a glance” what is requested and/or the action proposed, in addition to carrying out the monitoring, which makes their job much easier. It should be noted that this aspect is also highlighted by the Development NGOs and their local partners, as will be seen later.

Second, and in a certain way related to the previous aspect, it is stated that the Logical Framework is a base to measure the results and achievements of an intervention. The typical structure of this tool, in the shape of objectives-results-activities, with their respective indicators, is adequate for the interests of accountability and transparency concerning the use of public resources which the financing entities must comply with. Although this, as we will see, is highlighted by Development NGOs and their partners, it often does not encourage (or even makes more difficult) the visibility of other aspects such as internal learning, changes in the context and external factors, etc.

Slightly below the previous answers, others point out the importance of the Logical Framework as a participative tool for project identification and planning. Obviously this aspect is valued slightly less than in the case of Development NGOs (who highlight it as we will see later) given that they are the ones, and not public entities, that develop the identification and planning tasks mentioned.

Finally, last of all, the uses of the Logical Framework as a specific assessment instrument to compare and evaluate the proposals submitted by Development NGOs are included, in the most systematic and objective manner possible, for their approval or not with preference over others in the event of having limited resources for it. This, along with the scarce importance of the Logical Framework when assessing the proposals received, expressly perceived by those responsible in public entities (see above sections) is surprising to a certain extent and also contrasts with the impression perceived by Development NGOs and local partners in this respect, who consider that use of the Logical Framework is an essential requirement to access public subsidies and see in this one of the main obstacles to test alternatives to it.

The identification and planning of proposals based on the Logical Framework in the terms and conditions/forms of public entities in the BAC

Less than half of the public entities analysed require in their terms and conditions/forms, in more or less detail, information on the identification process followed for the formulation of the proposal submitted. Even fewer entities allow the financing of all/part of the expenses incurred in this identification process. This aspect has been one of the most common complaints made by Development NGOs to achieve a true and in-depth application of the Logical Framework, not only as a tool for formulation, and it could be allowing/encouraging (involuntarily, of course) technically correct formulations carried out by Development NGOs in the BAC but without the backing of a real and in-depth participative diagnosis. There are some exceptions, as is the case of Vitoria City Council, that has a specific and separate call for the identification of programmes, in which they
require a detailed description of the process and tools used. The Basque Government also allows the financing of identification for the programme instrument: at the beginning only a profile is submitted and if it is approved, the formulation is submitted 6 months after a previously financed identification when the profile is approved.

Only a third of the entities analysed required in their terms and conditions/forms a description of broader global processes that the specific submitted proposal fits into and as a result the rest do not evaluate/apply it when assessing the proposal. Similarly, even those that allow the financing of more long-term interventions barely consider (only 18%) phased planning expressly (although some of them are left out of the time frame). As one of the entities consulted stated, this could lead to “approving the proposals that are technically the best, but not always those that are most needed or with the highest added value (in the sense of pertinence/coherence”).

Again less than half of the terms and conditions/forms analysed (44%) requested information and/or took into account the details of the analysis of the actors in the project. And out of those that did, a large majority (77%) focused exclusively on the destination/beneficiary population, but they hardly paid attention to other relevant groups that play some type of role or have an influence on the project (it is symptomatic that only 3% of entities requested a description of groups that are potentially negatively affected, or with interests opposed to the project). Thus, part of the richness of a true multi-actor approach that takes people into account is lost, in addition to or over and above the products, based on the belief that a project will only bring positive results, an aspect that not always corresponds to reality and which is a source of many failures.

Similarly, very few entities (barely over 10%) require an analysis of risk factors that could affect the project, in more or less detail. And practically none (only 1% of those analysed) also requested an analysis of alternative actions, or contingency plans, in the even of these risks occurring. This excessively “linear” or neutral approach, for which the Logical Framework is often criticised, prevents, on the one hand, including all the knowledge and added value of the context of the partners and other agents on the ground (as one Development NGO stated “…anyone with a bit of technical rigour can elaborate a Logical Framework that is apparently correct, but in-depth knowledge of the context is shown when the aspects that could go wrong are identified and solutions are anticipated…’). On the other hand it leads to ideal or excessively theoretical interventions, in which an unrealistic control over all the external variables is presupposed, assuming that carrying out the activities will inevitably lead to the results and these to the specific objective, something that is usually shown to be untrue in practice.

Finally, a large number of public entities include in their terms and conditions certain references to Human Rights (approximately half of those analysed did so) whether it is as the possible objectives/sectors for the direct intervention of the project, or as transversal issues. There are even some cases (Vitoria City Council) where there is a specific call for Human Rights protection projects. However, in hardly any of the cases analysed was the human rights approach included in depth as an operative tool when identifying, planning and managing an intervention, with the aspects and characteristics that are described in the introductory section of this study which we refer to (and as the AECID has timidly started to test, in the forms of its “Agreements with Development NGOs”).

The formulation of proposals based on the Logical Framework in the terms and conditions/forms of public entities in the BAC

Bearing in mind that one of the main advantages/strengths of the Logical Framework, distinguished by public entities, Development NGOs and partners in the South (see following sections), consists of the clarity and order it provides when visualising a proposal in a summarised
manner, it is surprising that only 6% of the terms and conditions/forms analysed require the incorporation of the so-called “Logical Framework Matrix” (with the 4x4 table structure and the standard terminology) as a separate annex to the submitted proposals. In this way it is possible that this advantage, highlighted by most the agents consulted, is not being fully exercised.

A large majority of the terms and conditions/forms analysed (only 3% do) do not request indicators, verification sources and hypotheses for the project’s general objective. They assume that, unlike the specific objective, that must be completely secured by the project, the general objective is a more or less vague and ideal target that the project only contributes towards. In practice, this categorisation/organisation into a hierarchy of objectives is certainly complex and is not so clear, as a number of local Development NGOs and partners point out. And for this reason, the specific objectives formulated do not usually capture the essence of what is targeted by the project (often limited to repetitions and overlapping with the description of the results) while there is a lack of even tentative information on the progress in the pursuit of wider and more global objectives/impacts that could provide the intervention with a broader approach to processes (enunciating them in a way that is not very clear and measurable, similar to "Improving the living conditions of the population").

A number of Development NGOs and partners in the South have criticised the excessively “quantitative” approach that can derive from the use of the Logical Framework, which is not appropriate to measure certain social transformations, empowerment, gender-related processes, etc. This criticism corresponds with the treatment of the indicators in the terms and conditions/forms analysed, as practically all of them (97%) do not refer to the possibility of incorporating more qualitative indicators (in addition to the strictly quantitative or numerical ones) to measure the targets to be achieved with the project.

As a result, with the limitations indicated in the previous section with respect to the analysis of actors, risks and alternatives, the forms of the entities analysed did not have specific spaces for this either. Thus, none of those analysed contained columns/references to groups/actors in the planning matrix; only 5% did it with respect to the hypotheses or risk factors, which on most occasions are filled in rather mechanically, with the usual excessively generic and external suppositions (“social crisis, climate crisis, etc.”). In no cases was an additional column required in the matrix regarding alternative actions in the event of the risk factors taking place. All this confirms, again, that use of the Logical Framework by most public entities is excessively “closed and rigid”.

The monitoring and assessment of projects based on the Logical Framework in the terms and conditions/forms of public entities in the BAC

In general the use of the Logical Framework as a monitoring tool in the reports required by public entities is almost exclusively focused on the accountability of the direct achievements of an intervention. This aspect is necessary and is justified, but along with this, hardly any attention is paid to internal learning, context evolution, indirect achievements, etc. meaning that many Development NGOs and local partners feel that aspects that have relevant importance for all parties involved, from a more global perspective, are left out or rendered invisible. Again, it seems that the basic hypothesis is that once an intervention has started, it will inevitably lead to the expected results, only needing to monitor the activities that have been planned.

Given the above, it is significant that over 90% of the terms and conditions analysed do not require reports of the lessons learned, a subjective and/or qualitative assessment of the progress of the process, relationships between the parties, mistakes made, etc. in addition to a report of the mere objectives-results-activities. There is hardly a mention either (less than 4% of cases) of the possibility/need of carrying out monitoring reports of the progress of achievements once the formal period of the approved project has expired. Finally a culture of assessment is not yet generalised as a requisite promoted by public entities, with only 11% who request it.
for interventions that they support (in general, the entities that destine the most resources to cooperation, and only for programmes or projects that exceed a certain amount).

Only around a third of the public entities analysed expressly mentioned as a requisite in their terms and conditions/forms that there be proof that all the relevant groups on the ground participate in the monitoring/assessment of the proposals supported. Thus, and despite the fact that a high number of public entities and Development NGOs highlight the importance of the Logical Framework as a monitoring tool, there can be an excessively “unilateral” use of it by Development NGOs, which prevents the inclusion of certain details that are important for the agents on the ground (although maybe they are not for the financial backer) and/or proper transparent feedback of all the results to these groups is not guaranteed.

Barely 5% of the terms and conditions/forms of the public entities analysed required a description of the internal assessment/feedback mechanisms set up to appreciate the progress of a project and were capable of adjusting it to unforeseen circumstances, changes in the context, etc. Similarly, none of the entities analysed demanded an analysis of the evolution of the hypotheses or risk factors analysed initially (as has been seen, many of them do not even require information on these aspects in their proposal submission forms). Finally, less than 14% of the entities requested information on how the expectations, participation, compromises, interests, etc. of the different agents involved had evolved, despite being an essential aspect to measure the achievement and, in particular, the sustainability of an intervention.

Despite all the above, a certain capacity for modification, shown by the terms and conditions/forms of most entities analysed (around 60%) should be positively appreciated. In general this allows for flexible variations, without excessive requirements, of the aspects that are not considered essential in a project (generally location, local partner, objectives, target population). However, it is important to note that there were hardly any cases (only 10% of terms and conditions/forms analysed) in which there was the possibility/need to inform about unanticipated objectives and/or results that could take place during the project. In some cases such as the Basque Government’s programmes they consider informing about unanticipated activities, but in the case of unanticipated objectives/results, it is considered a substantial modification meaning that the corresponding authorisation must be applied for.

**Main advantages / strengths of the Logical Framework perceived by public entities**

The advantage / strength that is most repeated by the public entities consulted consists of the ease it offers to systematise, present and visualise in a tidy and easily understandable manner (for the potential donor) all the key and essential information concerning a proposal.

- It is an instrument that organises and offers the chance to visualise a proposal.
- It helps to systematise the information
- It makes sure that they all fill in the necessary fields (of the form) and the organisation can deliver extra information by means of annexes

Secondly, those responsible at the entities consulted positively valued the ease that the Logical Framework offers for the monitoring and measurement of the specific achievements of a project, thus helping towards the necessary accountability before the administration (and indirectly before the citizens that provide their resources for this purpose).

- It contains a series of criteria for monitoring and offers indicators of clear results
After the above advantages/strengths, and more aimed towards the work of Development NGOs and their partners on the ground, a large number of public entities also stated that the Logical Framework is of help to the former when carrying out an adequate diagnosis and identification, in particular by helping them to focus the approach on a specific problem, thus avoiding dispersing efforts.

- It helps to visualise the specific problem that is sought to be solved within a specific context or situation
- It is a good methodology for planning that clearly outlines the project phases
- It helps to organise the elaboration of a project, pursuing a specific objective, which is to alleviate a situation of injustice and inequality, aimed at a target population that is participative and actively pursues this specific objective
- A tool for identification, planning and design, taking into account the external factors that influence the project
- An instrument to reach a consensus on the general view of the project

Finally, the advantages offered by the Logical Framework when presenting, assessing and comparing proposals submitted by Development NGOs to be supported were highlighted, giving the decision legitimacy as it is based on commonly accepted standards.

- It offers the possibility of comparing different actions
- There are assessment criteria that facilitate this
- It is a consolidated tool, “agreed by consensus” assumed at an international level
- It saves work for applicant entities when most of the funders require, admit or appreciate it

**main weaknesses / inconveniences of the Logical Framework perceived by public entities**

The inconvenience / weakness repeated the most by the public entities consulted refer to the excessive restriction and formalism that the Logical Framework involves (in this case understood, rather, as the way to present proposals in a form) which be excessively mechanical and/or rigid, leaving out relevant information that could help understand the project and/or assess it adequately.

- An instrument that has already been assumed by all parties with a certain mechanical nature
- It does not contextualise the intervention to be carried out (it does not offer space to talk about background, justification of the intervention, relationship of Development NGOs in the North with Development NGOs in the South, etc.
- A project can be very well-structured but can lack real foundations
- Important aspects of the project are lost in the methodology
In a way related to the previous point, there is also reference to the “perverse use” or abuse that can be (and is, according to those surveyed) made of the Logical Framework by some Development NGOs that have an excellent command of the methodology, but this does not guarantee projects that are more participative, better identified, viable, coherent, sustainable, etc. In this respect, also highlighted is the fact that the use of this tool can lead to bias against smaller entities that, despite having interesting proposals, do not know how/are unable to express them so well according to the Logical Framework approach, being finally excluded from eventual funding.

- It is not very flexible and does not guarantee the participation of the community
- It is presented as intrinsically participative but in a vast majority of cases there was no real participative process. Participation in the identification, formulation, etc. of the project is not offered by the Logical Framework method “per se”
- It does not reflect the specific features of the associations, particularly the smaller ones
- It is too strict and does not offer the option of adapting the tool to the specific needs of the community or the project that will be carried out
- Due to the complexity of a number of the concepts (cause-effect relationship, general and specific objective, hypothesis, etc.), it is not an appropriate tool for communities where a majority of people are illiterate or with a minimum level of education
- The applicant organisation has clues as to what the institution wants, even if they are not totally informed on the subject; for example: gender issues, environment…

Further minor criticism / weaknesses of the Logical Framework are related with the inadequacy of this tool for projects different to the usual “standard” projects, due to their approach or dimensions.

- It is hard to carry out in more abstract proposals
- Not all actions are adequate for this tool, as some of them are very basic

Finally, some negative aspects highlighted by some public entities (normally small) are its excessive complexity, requirements and workload for those that have limited staff and/or resources for cooperation.

- It requires a greater investment of time and if the municipality is small this dedication is hard to sustain
- It duplicates the documentation in some cases / Too much literature in some cases
- It multiplies the objectives and complicates the intervention in its effort to be precise
The Logical Framework and the quality of the proposals approved

In particular, it is important to note the high percentage of entities consulted (almost two thirds) who state that they do not have a clear idea in this respect, have not dedicated enough thought, or have different views on the subject. As a conclusion it can be stated that most public entities do not directly, clearly and unmistakeably perceive that the use of the Logical Framework, as such, is directly and unequivocally linked to a higher quality of the approved proposals (although they do not categorically deny it either). Some of the answers and clarifications provided point mainly to the neutral nature of the tool, making the quality of a proposal depend more on its proper or improper use than just on the use of it in itself:

• Using a standard methodology (whichever, whether it is the Logical Framework or not) does mean that the entity is “forced” to use a procedure that guarantees that the significant aspects for the project are taken into account and that none have been overlooked (at least not intentionally). In this respect it could be said that it does. But the mere application of the Logical Framework Approach without other requirements and conditions is not enough to achieve the objective of quality

• The projects submitted to our institution must follow a form that is required from them to process the application, a form in which the aspects to be developed are described. All of them (bar a few exceptions) follow the Logical Framework Approach, meaning that what is really evaluated is not this, as this aspect is not what distinguishes them. Another matter is the degree of development of each of the points of this approach and its fulfilment, explanation, etc.

Along a different line, particularly interesting is the input offered by one of the public entities surveyed (which manages an important volume of resources for cooperation) in relation to the limitations of the Logical Framework to include and reflect more global aspects of coherence, pertinence, etc. that transcend the mere quality of the project’s internal design:

• Usually, with the available data, the projects that are higher in quality ARE approved, but they may NOT be those that are needed the most

Among the entities that saw a direct link between the use of the Logical Framework and a greater quality of the projects approved (around 20%, but including a large number of entities in the BAC that destine the most funds to cooperation) the reason was again attributed to the clarity and detail of the objectives pursued with the project that the Logical Framework encourages. Also

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
highlighted was the fact that adequate use of this tool shows the better technical preparation of the supporting Development NGOs and their actions are thus expected to be of higher quality:

- It helps the project to be clearer and makes it easier to monitor it and carry out a subsequent assessment.
- There is a need to specify and this involves an analysis and a reflection on the project presented
- The objectives sought are seen much clearer and in greater detail
- Normally, if the entity uses the Logical Framework Approach in the project it is because it has specific training or preparation in the field of cooperation and as a result enough knowledge to produce a quality project and achieve a good score in the assessment

Finally, a small group of entities (around 10%, most of them with limited resources for cooperation) considered, in a more critical manner, that the Logical Framework did NOT facilitate / promote the approval of higher quality projects, mainly due to the weaknesses/disadvantages already mentioned in the previous section:

- It did not, precisely because the awarding of aid is very linked to the knowledge of the Development NGOs and the people
- What is valued is the clarity, viability and the direct responsibility of the project
- There are many other methods of analysis, planning and monitoring, with the same potential to prove the quality of the proposals submitted. In fact, the Logical Framework Approach would be “impaired” regarding the definition of the background and the local context or the assessment of the proposal’s sustainability

The Logical Framework and the gender-based approach

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Again it is worth noting the high percentage of entities consulted (60%) that did not choose one answer or another to the question of whether the Logical Framework is suitable/facilitates interventions with a gender-based approach. And this is due to a lack of reflection / experience in
this respect, or because they consider the Logical Framework as a neutral tool, where the gender approach can be included just as well as any other, depending on how it is used and on the work and internal approach the Development NGO and its local partner incorporate.

- Provided that the proposal and the Development NGOs include the gender perspective and feminist issues in their formulation and daily work. We do not think, however, that the Logical Framework favours the incorporation of this perspective; if the perspective is assumed, then the Logical Framework’s support will accompany the planning of proposals with a gender-based approach, but if not, this support will not encourage the incorporation of the gender-based approach.

Among the entities that considered that the Logical Framework could be particularly suitable for gender-related interventions (almost 30%), it is important to note, on the one hand, the idea that the identification process, problem analysis and setting of objectives encouraged by this tool can offer a means to bring attention to gender inequalities and establish specific measures to fight against them; on the other hand, it has been pointed out that the incorporation of the gender approach as a transversal issue in many public entities’ forms contributes towards raising awareness and motivating Development NGOs and their partners to pay particular attention to them in their interventions.

- The Logical Framework demands clarity and organisation among the objectives, results, indicators and actions that requires, if carried out with a gender perspective, an adequate inclusion of this approach in all activities

- Participation, objectives and monitoring are highly specified

- Yes because the gender perspective must imply a prior identification of the situation of discrimination and inequality that is sought to be mitigated, there must be an adequate formulation, monitoring and a subsequent assessment to observe the level of fulfilment of the objective set beforehand. To see whether the power relationships between women and men are transformed in any way with the inclusion of the gender perspective in the project

- The gender approach must be transversal. In fact, part of the Logical Framework should be focused on gender-related issues, so that all projects take it into account

However, it must be noted that only a third of the presentation forms of the projects analysed allowed the inclusion of transversal aspects (most of them related to gender aspects). The remaining two thirds did not include any specific sections to cover these transversal aspects, in particular gender-related aspects.

Finally, a smaller group of entities (11%) were more critical of the Logical Framework’s suitability to work on gender-related aspects in interventions. Their justifications were mainly to do with certain incompatibilities between the rigidity and limited scope of the Logical Framework, on the one hand, and the flexibility and long-term approach required by the processes that work on gender-related issues, unfair role-swapping, empowerment of women, etc.

- There is a widespread difficulty (even among specialists) to define and specify certain operative gender indicators, measurable within the completion period of the project, etc., in particular for certain processes and in empowerment issues. And indicators are crucial for the Logical Framework; if there are weaknesses at that level, there are weaknesses in the entire approach
Alternatives to the Logical Framework in public entities of the BAC

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Only a minority of public entities consulted (1 out of 10) stated that they were aware of an alternative tool to the Logical Framework. The rest either expressly stated that they were unaware of any (a third of those surveyed), or it was simply not specified (over half of them), mainly, in this last case, because they were not even aware of/did not work with the Logical Framework.

The profile of most of the few that stated they were aware of these alternative tools corresponded to public entities with an important volume of resources for cooperation and/or stable teams managing these types of activities.

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Among the few entities that stated they were aware of alternative instruments/tools to the Logical Framework, almost half had been made aware through theoretical training, both external and internal (through documentation, publications, etc.). A slightly lower percentage (38%) made contact with other alternatives through the specific experiences of other entities, etc.
If we go into greater depth, analysing effective attempts to apply alternatives to the Logical Framework by the entities consulted, we see that a minority (10%) have done so, among which we have, prominent due to their size, the 3 Regional Governments and Vitoria City Council, which do not strictly require the Logical Framework in some of their calls (in particular for small projects). In both cases, more than alternatives to the Logical Framework, systematised and developed, what these entities allow is a flexible approach to it, offering space for more free and open lines of argument, or placing particular emphasis on aspects that are of special relevance for the entity, regardless of the form used. Thus the strict vertical logic in “objectives-results-activities”; is relaxed to a degree, in addition to the dependence of the entire project on this axis.

- In general terms, the application form is simplified with the aim of permitting a more free line of argument, less attached to the standard concepts of the Logical Framework. Specifically, the first part is also improved, that of the analysis, including topics for reflection such as background and local context, and in the planning part issues such as the sustainability of the proposal or the methodology applied are assessed.

- In small projects... apply logic (common sense) to the assessment of these projects rather than a methodology that is not an appropriate methodology for them.

- In “standard” development cooperation projects we combine the Logical Framework with the self-imposed requirement of clearly defining in the calls the typology of the projects sought and their categories, the requirements, the priorities of the call... accompanying it with a detailed and precise form and an assessment table that obliges to define the aspects that are basic for an adequate design, viability, etc. of the projects, including the identification, monitoring, etc. phases

Along with the previous two initiatives, there are some punctual radical ones (by an entity with limited resources for cooperation), which proposed the approval of aid “without submitting proposals, due to the mere fact of knowing the agents who are working on a certain project”. It should be noted that this proposal did not prosper.

As has been commented, regarding other instruments/modalities of intervention other than projects (Humanitarian Action, Development Education, Direct Cooperation) there are more cases in which public entities use other specific methodologies, analysed in sections 2.3 and 2.4 of this study.

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
In development education projects and other areas that have already developed their own methodologies, criteria, conditions, etc. (human rights, emergencies,…) we prefer to require these specific and proven methodologies and not the Logical Framework, which is not suitable for them either.

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Most public entities consulted thought it was interesting to test alternative tools to the Logical Framework (only a third consider that it would not be necessary as this tool has worked adequately until now). The main reasons cited by the entities that had not tested alternatives to the Logical Framework up until now were a lack of knowledge/training concerning them, and practical difficulties when applying them in day to day management. However, it is worth mentioning that among these difficulties, the most important is not perceived to be the need to assess/evaluate proposals, with the result that only 16% of those surveyed see it as one of the main obstacles preventing them from not using the Logical Framework.
In fact, as has been analysed in more detail in the introductory section of this study, these tools are not incompatible, in a strict sense, with the Logical Framework but rather they attempt to address some of its deficiencies or limitations, as mentioned by the actual entities consulted. Specifically, we refer to its excessive rigidity and academic complexity, in addition to its eventual imposition by Development NGOs in the North as the only valid instrument to identify and design an intervention. However, there are evident interconnections between different models, as the PRD, RRD, etc. can contribute to provide valid information to advance through the identification phases necessary to design, plan, formulate and present a project based on the Logical Framework and vice versa. Many of the tools and phases used in the Logical Framework Approach could also be applied as part of a PRD exercise, provided they guarantee the use of resources, channels, strategies, etc. that are easily assumed, understood and led by the communities themselves.

Along with the above, also important are specific methods and tools for the planning and management of Humanitarian Action, as is the case of the COMPAS method, the Analysis of Capacities and Vulnerabilities (ACV), real-time assessment, etc. (all of them analysed in more detail in section 2.4 of this study). As for the first (the COMPAS method), the most well-known and widely applied, it is rather a quality assurance method (by means of self-checking questions to be carried out in each phase of the project) meaning that in theory it could be applicable in addition to any identification, planning and management tool, offering the possibility of assessing whether it is adequately applied or not and to reach the quality standards expected. It is interesting to note that among these standards, it includes quality aspects from the actual organisation that implements it as a quality factor of the project implemented, an aspect that in turn is more vague in the Logical Framework Approach.

Similarly, also important are specific methodologies for Development Education and/or Awareness-raising interventions (such as segmented assessment, educational programmes, etc.) although their operability and/or scope is not described in detail.

Other alternative tools mentioned are not really that different to the Logical Framework Approach, the latter understood as a complete and participative tool for the identification and planning of proposals, and not so much for their formulation and/or presentation (this is the case of the GOPP, which develops and completes the excessively limited initial approach of the Logical Framework, until the one applied today is reached), or there are instruments that complete it, particularly during the identification and diagnosis (as is the case of the SWOT).

Finally, some of the methodologies pointed out by some (few) entities correspond to project management models that are more from the business world (the “Project Management Institute” -PMI model), they focus more on the management of organisations than on specific projects (Balanced Scorecard-BSC, Business Process Management, etc.) or they refer more to the design of public policies or global programmes (such as the “Integrated Approach”).
4.2 HOW BASQUE DEVELOPMENT NGOS SEE THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Degree of knowledge and application of the Logical Framework

Use of the Logical Framework Approach among the Development NGOs that participated in the study, in one way or another, is complete. Without excluding that some of them may be considering and/or experimenting with other alternative models and/or tools to it (as will be described later in the study), the truth is that none of those consulted categorically stated that they do not use it. We can conclude, without a doubt, that despite the existing criticism, doubts, limitations, etc. the Logical Framework is still the management/planning instrument that is used almost universally among Development NGOs of the BAC.

Even smaller, more recent Development NGOs and/or those with a smaller number of projects and partners, which could, a priori, have more difficulties to apply the Logical Framework, unanimously state that they use it. From the qualitative analysis and the in-depth interviews carried out with these Development NGOs, one of the main reasons/motivations behind this seems to be a lack of knowledge and/or reflection on other models, as the available training and documentation on the Logical Framework is the most accessible for the “newly arrived”. In a way it seems that these Development NGOs choose to reproduce the models followed by other more consolidated Development NGOs.

Meanwhile, some of the main reasons/motivations of the Development NGOs with longer experience, greater volume of resources, number of projects and/or partners to almost universally follow the Logical Framework seem to vary. These entities do have access to and have more in-depth knowledge of other alternative models and tools to the Logical Framework, at least at a theoretical level. However, they are entities that manage important volumes of funds (in most cases proceeding from public entities). This conditions and limits them enormously when “experimenting with other models” that could compromise the management and yield of results to the donors.
If we have a closer look at how the Development NGOs surveyed use the Logical Framework, we find that most of them (almost half) do not consider it as a mere “make-up” or format to present to donors, but rather they use it decidedly, using it as a common work tool with their local partners, and in addition using it throughout all the phases of the project cycle (including identification/planning). There does not seem to be a specific profile among the Development NGOs that gave this answer, including in this group Development NGOs of different sizes, experience, sectors and field of work, etc.

Along with the above, there is also an important number of Development NGOs (approximately one third of those surveyed) which state that they use the Logical Framework together with their local partners, although rather as an instrument to summarise, structure and formulate the interventions previously identified through other means. Among these identification instruments, the most mentioned in the interviews were the Participative Rural Diagnosis, SWOTs, analysis of agents, problem trees..., although in reality most of them are not incompatible (or even different) with the Logical Framework Approach, but rather mere tools to obtain the information required by it. In many of these cases, the profile was of Development NGOs that mainly worked with solid local partners with much experience and training, which were mainly responsible for the identification of the proposals, which they do with these other tools. However, the Logical Framework is accepted by both as an instrument of “common ground” in order to plan, formulate and present the definitive projects.

Finally, only a small percentage of Development NGOs surveyed (around 6%) made a merely formal and restrictive use of the Logical Framework, using it unilaterally without involving their local partners and only to draft and/or formulate the proposals they submit to donors in the format that they require. In these few cases, the profile corresponded to entities that do not work with local partners, in addition to religious congregations whose local counterparts were associations linked to the actual congregation.

### Degree of usefulness of the Logical Framework as perceived by Development NGOs

Regardless of the requirements of the donors regarding the presentation of proposals based on formats that follow the Logical Framework, and of the many criticisms and weaknesses of this approach within the doctrine and the Development NGOs themselves, the truth is that most of those surveyed (over half) stated that, in addition to mainly using the Logical Framework, it was...
particularly useful as a Development Cooperation intervention planning and management tool. Furthermore, practically all the rest of those surveyed (almost 40%) acknowledged that the Logical Framework is useful, although they did not rate this usefulness as high, but average.

The profile of all these Development NGOs that stated that the usefulness (high or average) of the Logical Framework is extensive and diverse, including large and small entities, with different approaches and sensitivities, sectors/areas of action, etc. It is important to note that there are not any significant differences between Development NGOs that mainly depend on public financial backers and those that have an important percentage of private funds. Thus, it seems to be confirmed that the real usefulness of the Logical Framework is spontaneously perceived even by entities that would not strictly require its use in order to receive funds from public administrations (which usually require this approach).

Only a small number of Development NGOs pointed out that the Logical Framework was of little use. Among them, there are a number whose main line of work were not cooperation projects in the south, but Awareness-Raising and Development Education actions, despite the fact that use of the Logical Framework in these types of modalities/instruments was widespread, as analysed in the next section.

Use of the Logical Framework depending on the intervention instruments/modalities

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

As a main conclusion it could be noted that, for the Development NGOs surveyed, the Logical Framework is mostly used to plan and manage their projects (in the traditional sense of the term, interventions with a duration no greater than 2 years), and for Awareness-Raising and Development Education actions. For other modalities/instruments, such as humanitarian action and/or co-development, use of the LF is much less frequent. However, even in the first two, there were important details shown by the qualitative information of the surveys and the in-depth interviews carried out.
As for projects, close to 30% of the Development NGOs surveyed (most recently created or with a limited volume of activity) commented that in the case of “small/punctual actions” the Logical Framework was not the ideal tool and/or it was not used, or at least not in a formal manner, following all the steps. Many stated that, in this same respect, for small projects the Logical Framework is not so necessary, rather “something more adapted and/or reduced”. In fact, it can happen that many of the initiatives that Development NGOs consider as “small projects” are not projects in a strict sense (or at least not with the characteristics that the doctrine requires from them as a “set of inter-related actions aimed at a superior objective and which seek the sustainability of their effects once their implementation has concluded”). On many occasions, it could be rather that they are punctual deliveries of goods and services to vulnerable populations, with a low demand for planning and for which it is obvious that use of the Logical Framework would be “overdoing” it. In other cases, in particular small Development NGOs, their initiatives would be more continuous activities than projects as such, meaning that the LF would not be entirely suitable either. Finally, other organisations point out that in small projects there is hardly any availability of resources for the identification (or their use for this purpose would be inefficient in proportion to the reduced size of the intervention pursued), meaning that it does not make much sense to consider more or less complex tools for this purpose.

As for Awareness-Raising and Development Education actions, despite the fact that the quantitative analysis carried out shows a high level of use by Development NGOs of the Logical Framework to identify and manage them, there is much more criticism / many more limitations mentioned repeatedly in the interviews carried out than in the case of projects. In fact, 20% of the Development NGOs surveyed stated that the Logical Framework did not adapt well to these types of interventions. They consider that Awareness-Raising and Development Education actions require different processes and approaches; more flexible, adaptable and specific than those of the Logical Framework. Some entities pointed out that the level of participation of other external agents (in addition to the technical team of the Development NGOs and their volunteers) in these actions is lower than in cooperation projects in the South, meaning that the usefulness of the LF as a common tool for identification (with local partners, for example) is much lower. Quite a few Development NGOs (20% according to the surveys) specialised in Awareness-Raising, Development Education, Participation, Popular Education and Political Advocacy categorically stated that the Logical Framework was of “no use” or “did not work” meaning that they were immersed in processes to consolidate valid alternatives to it.

Use of the Logical Framework for programmes (understood as more complex interventions, sometimes composed of a number of projects and with a duration greater than 2 years) was much lower than in the case of projects. In general there was an agreement in stating that the Logical Framework did not offer the flexibility necessary to adapt on the fly in these types of long-term interventions, sometimes with approaches very close to those of processes, and in which the circumstances that arise often mean that not only do the activities have to be adapted, but also the results and even the objectives, going beyond the rigidity that the LF seems to demand. It is significant that 43% of the Development NGOs surveyed (mostly Development NGOs with a significant volume of activity) stated that in the case of proposals inserted in medium to long-term processes, the Logical Framework was not the best tool.

Even less used and more controversial seems to be the use of the LF in the case of Humanitarian Action interventions, among the Development NGOs surveyed. 20% of them declared that this approach was not adequate for these interventions and in the interviews held this opinion was confirmed beyond any doubt. The opinion of one of them is significant: “…in Humanitarian Actions the LF is not a tool that adapts to the needs and priorities of these types of interventions. The LF is based on a prior analysis of the context, background, etc. which is impossible to do in emergency situations…”. Another Development NGO stated that the LF was only used in these types of interventions when the financial backer required it, but that otherwise they would not use it. Similarly, some entities admitted that in Humanitarian Action interventions the LF was used more by Development NGOs than assumed by the partner and/or used on the ground for identification and diagnosis. Finally, it was also stated that on many occasions emergency aid was punctual and purely temporary meaning that there was not much point in talking about objectives, results, activities, etc. as is the case with the LF.
Finally, use of the LF for co-development interventions was hardly mentioned by the Development NGOs participating, although the scarce weight of this modality still and the lack of agreement and clear concepts in relation to it prevented a deeper analysis of the weaknesses and/or limitations of the LF in this respect.

**Use of the Logical Framework depending on the sources of financing**

![Diagram showing the use of Logical Framework depending on sources of financing]

- 62% of the Development NGOs worked with own funds and public funds and used the Logical Framework in the same way.
- 38% used it differently with own funds.

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

90% of the Development NGOs included in the study worked with own funds and public funds. Most of them stated that they used the Logical Framework in the same way, both for the planning/management of projects with own funds and those financed with public funds. This is a point in favour of the thesis whereby the LF is not seen as an imposition of the donors on the Development NGOs to receive funds and justify them. There is no specific profile of Development NGO (large, small, sector they are active in, etc.) among those that responded in this way, but rather there were entities of all types and sizes.

However, this conclusion cannot be stated categorically, as a representative number of the Development NGOs surveyed (almost 40%) pointed out, in turn, that they did apply the LF tool differently in both cases. There does not seem to be a specific profile of Development NGO in these cases either. In general, most of the answers in this group stated that they used the Logical Framework in a more reduced manner, with more flexibility and adaptation to the circumstances and specific needs of each case/entity, when they worked with own funds.

A number of Development NGOs stated that with own funds “the approach and methodology of the Logical Framework is used to identify, plan and manage the intervention, but not so much the specific and standard formats that public entities normally require to record them.” In many of these cases, they would set a “general framework of basic objectives and activities, without the need to establish intermediate results” that would allow them to monitor the progress of the intervention, with an approach closer to processes.

In other cases it is stated that with own funds “we do not itemise as much, and in turn there are more personal approaches, there is more freedom to set useful indicators, even if they are not so orthodox, and they focus on a wider distribution of internal tasks.”
Some Development NGOs focused the differences on the greater weight of certain aspects such as “urgency, confidence and priority in the identification of interventions with own funds”. Another, in similar terms, referred to “prioritising aspects such as the needs of the Local Partner”.

**Function / utility of the Logical Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A way of formulating and presenting proposals in a logical, summarised and clear manner</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A requirement of public institutions to receive approval</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tool for monitoring efficacy and efficiency</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A participative tool for identification and planning</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A way of assessing proposals by local partners and appreciating their capacity</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An instrument to assess the final impact and the lessons learned</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

There has been a certain agreement among the Development NGOs surveyed when describing the main functions/usefulness offered by the Logical Framework as a tool. However, the weight of each aspect for each of the Development NGOs was variable, without any clearly standing out among the rest, meaning that it is not possible to state that there is a univocal concept in the Development NGO sector in the BAC when defining and understanding the essence of this approach, where we have different points of view that co-exist.

The most repeated by the Development NGOs would be those that see in the Logical Framework a tool to formulate and present proposals in a more or less logical, summarised and clear manner, mainly to public entities. In relation to this, Development NGOs also prioritise the vision that the Logical Framework is a requirement of most public entities, which must be met in order to achieve the approval of the proposals submitted to them. Development NGOs seem to consider the more “formal” and “external” aspect of the Logical Framework (to summarise, express, present the prior work) as slightly more relevant than its “deeper” and more “internalised” function in Development NGOs as a participative tool for planning, identifying and monitoring interventions, and for more in-depth internal learning, measuring impacts and/or establishing ties with partners (all aspects that seem to be covered in a complementary manner with other instruments by Development NGOs).

However, these last aspects are also mentioned by a number of Development NGOs (in particular small and medium-sized ones) although normally after the previous ones. Worth mentioning are those that perceive and use the Logical Framework as a tool to monitor the efficacy and efficiency of an intervention, followed at a short distance by others that value this instrument as a participative tool for the identification and planning of projects.

Finally, certain aspects of the Logical Framework are mentioned with a much lower priority, such as its use to assess the proposals of local partners and to appreciate their capacity, in addition to
being an instrument to assess the final impact and the lessons learned. We can conclude, therefore, that this tool would not be entirely suitable for these relevant purposes, according to most Development NGOs, using other alternatives instead.

Main advantages / strengths perceived of the Logical Framework

According to the set of answers received and the interviews carried out there are two advantages / strengths clearly perceived by a large majority of Development NGOs (in particular those with a greater volume of activity and/or those that are more consolidated) which refer mainly to the clarity, and apparent internal logic it offers when formulating, presenting and justifying projects:

- The Logical Framework as an intervention (and formulation) logic that is easily understandable and simple to follow and carry out
- The Logical Framework is a means of clearly expressing the objectives of the project and the steps to be followed to achieve it, in addition to being a monitoring tool for the whole process

Along with the above, other positive aspects of the Logical Framework were repeatedly highlighted by more than one Development NGO (in particular those that work with a large volume of projects), that refer to more to its advantages for monitoring results and for working with shared approaches with all the participating agents, when identifying and managing a project:

- A work tool accepted by most agents that work in Development Cooperation
- It allows for the elaboration of subsequent assessments
- It allows for a clear identification of the problems and a choice of the alternatives
- If the indicators are adequate and coherent with the intervention, they offer the chance to measure the progress of the results and objectives
- It is a good planning instrument
- If it is applied throughout the process of the project, it helps to perceive the globality and the relationship that exists between the needs detected with the anticipated results
- It is useful for monitoring the efficacy and efficiency of the project and for measuring the results
- A methodology that despite the difficulties, resistance, etc. makes more participative, viable and sustainable projects possible
- A tool that simplifies the processes and facilitates understanding within the complex process involved in the identification and formulation of projects
Finally, there are a wide range of strengths, perceived individually by certain Development NGOs, many of them related with the measurement of the impact and the efficiency:

- It measures the quantitative variables correctly
- A consolidated methodology that offers “control” and defines with quite a few guarantees all the phases of elaboration of a cooperation project
- It systematically investigates the causes of the problems
- It solidly supports the decision-making process
- An effective tool to assess the project’s impact and contrast it with reality
- During the identification it helps to always return to the project’s objective, which is particularly important in populations with multiple deficiencies
- Applicability to different environments, projects and situations
- It helps to approach activities in a coherent and logical manner without leaving out activities or resources that are important to achieve the objective
- It introduces aspects related with the link between the budget and the proposal of the project

Main weaknesses / inconveniences of the Logical Framework

Two weaknesses are clearly pointed out by a large number of Development NGOs consulted (without it being possible to appreciate a specific profile among those that did so), which have to do, on the one hand, with the rigidity and excessive simplification of reality that it obliges to, and on the other hand, with the difficulty of working with this approach without the necessary prior training of all the parties involved:

- It tends to be a rigid planning method that is not always a true reflection of reality and which is not very flexible when faced with the inevitable changes that arise during the project
- All the people/entities involved in the planning of the project must have received prior training

Along with the above, there is also certain agreement among more than one Development NGO with respect to a series of inconveniences of the Logical Framework, which are related to the poor adaptation of this tool to certain realities, processes and ways of thinking (in particular in the context of countries in the South), the excessive weight of the quantitative variables as opposed to the qualitative variables, and the difficulty of involving all the relevant agents reflecting not only problems, but also their interests and potentials. It is interesting to note that most Development NGOs that pointed out these aspects responded more to a certain profile of an entity with a limited number of activities/projects, along with a high percentage of public financing.

- It is based on a European-Western thought, analysis and planning structure
- It is a very linear tool and for proposals within the framework of long-term social processes it is limited
• It is structured in a way that may not be adequate in other cultural or social environments (e.g. indigenous peoples)

• Sometimes it is semantically strained and formulations are reached that cannot be communicated

• Some organisations in the South are not used to it

• Difficulty to involve all the relevant parties, analysing not only the problems but also potentials, interests, expectations, etc.

• Excessively focused on economicist, tangible and quantifiable results and very little on other types of qualitative effects that are more suited to processes

• Until getting used to it, it is confusing, repetitive and complicated to understand

• It is limited when working on transversal issues (e.g. gender issues)

• In some contexts the construction of indicators is complicated by the lack of maturity of public institutions and the high cost of reports elaborated by private entities

• By itself it does not offer the chance of knowing about a project’s impact

Finally, some Development NGOs consulted (without them responding to a specific profile) added, in a more disperse and punctual way, other aspects of the Logical Framework that they considered negative, many of them related to more ideological-political aspects of its use:

• It is a general analytical tool, meaning that it is politically neutral

• Sometimes it is interpreted as a tool imposed from the North by the financial backers, without which it is impossible to capture funds. This sometimes leads to a perverse use of the LF, generating ideal formulations

• Little objectivity. A subjective tool at the service of the interests of the financial backers; a large difference among the financial backers in the demands and assessment

• It does not contemplate the action of other interventions that pursue the same objectives, meaning that the results have been achieved thanks to other synergies or actions and not specifically to the project; there is therefore the risk of bias in the interpretation of some indicators

• Different interpretations of the logic

• Sometimes tools cease to be such and become an end in themselves

• Excessive demands in small projects and with few possibilities of quantification

• It takes time and practice to convert a desire for change into a project structured within a correct Logical Framework

• Evaluators who do not know how to use the methodology

• Much knowledge on the context is necessary for the planning of the LF to be real

• It is more theoretical than practical
The Logical Framework and work with local partners

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Most Development NGOs consulted (over 60%, mainly large organisations with an important volume of activity) considered that use of the Logical Framework facilitated their work with local partners. Among the main reasons cited, both in questionnaires and in the interviews held, we have:

- It means having the same work tool, known and shared by both (the Development NGO and its local partner), which allows them to “speak the same language” and work together, in an organised manner based on the same steps and taking into account the same key aspects, among which having clear final results and objectives to be achieved, known by both, is important.

- Use of the Logical Framework by Development NGOs and their local partners allows them to establish a framework in which responsibilities, roles and compromises with one another are clearly established.

- Use of the Logical Framework served as a kind of “check-list” with which to request information in an organised and coherent manner from their partners, both for the identification and for the monitoring of an intervention.

However, the above statement must be clarified as an important percentage of those surveyed (20%) did not answer this question and 47% of Development NGOs stated that in the case of working with community organisations, with a weaker level of organisation and/or training, the Logical Framework was not the most suitable tool. Even those that defended the suitability of the Logical Framework for working with local partners pointed out in the questionnaires and/or interviews aspects that could limit and/or condition this statement. Thus, many of them pointed out that:

- It only facilitates their work when the use of this tool has been agreed upon with the local partners, but not when it is imposed from the North in a rigid manner and “without any other options” (which is very often the case).

- The local partners must have adequate training in the Logical Framework to make it an adequate tool. Otherwise, its use makes working together very difficult.

- The lack of time, and/or resources for an adequate in-depth identification based on the Logical Framework, or its excessive simplification and concentration in the objectives-results-activities matrix (and less in the context analysis) means that all the previous experience, knowledge and potential of the local partners is often left out.
Finally, a smaller group of Development NGOs (although certainly relevant, around 20%, many of them religious congregations and/or organisations with a limited volume of activities) directly considered that the Logical Framework did not facilitate working together with their local partners. The reasons cited were, mainly, that it was a tool imposed from the North, but not internalised by their local partners and inadequate for their work processes and habits. They also pointed out that the requirement of using the Logical Framework without also providing training on the subject for the local partners and generally applying it with certain haste to present proposals to donors, generated dysfunctions and rejection among them, clouding relations with Development NGOs in the North.

The Logical Framework depending on the geographical area of the intervention

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

A vast majority of Development NGOs surveyed (close to 80%) considered that use of the Logical Framework was not ideal as a tool for planning and managing Development Cooperation interventions in Africa.

From the in-depth interviews carried out, two main causes can be deduced to justify the above statement. On the one hand, according to the Development NGOs themselves, in Africa the partners and the rest of the local agents are weaker, less consolidated and have a low level of education, all of which complicates the use of the Logical Framework as a common and shared tool (as this is an essential aspect for Development NGOs, as has been explained in the analysis of the previous section).

On the other hand, it has also been pointed out that in many African countries where work is carried out, there are fragile, unstable and changing social, political and/or economic contexts. According to the Development NGOs, this makes a serene, systematic and in-depth identification, as required by the Logical Framework Approach, difficult. In addition, the cause-effect, linear and excessively abstract logic of the Logical Framework clashes, according to those surveyed, with the changing context full of risk factors, unforeseen circumstances, etc. meaning that very often it is extremely difficult to maintain the initial intervention logic, just as it was designed.
The Logical Framework and the gender / women's empowerment approach

Most of the development NGOs surveyed (almost half) did not see particular difficulties to work on the gender approach and/or specific empowerment interventions related to women, applying the Logical Framework. In general, the most repeated reason was that, as a tool, it depends more on the use given to it than on it in itself to be capable of covering gender issues and/or adapting to interventions that pursue the empowerment of women. Thus, what is important is the inclusion of this aspect as a transversal issue in all phases of the identification and planning process proposed by the Logical Framework Approach, including the use of other specific tools, complementary to it although also within it, to diagnose and/or work on gender issues and women's empowerment (tools that, by the way, a number of Development NGOs stated they were unaware of).

Some Development NGOs stated that use of the Logical Framework with a strong emphasis on gender issues as transversal elements, as has been done by most donor public institutions, has contributed positively to raising awareness regarding the importance of working on this aspect in their interventions. Along the same lines, other organisations pointed out that the analytical and participative approach that the Logical Framework encourages (although only "when it is properly applied and the necessary time and resources for it are available") the participation of women and the identification of their practical and strategic needs in the initial diagnosis, in addition to actions related to both in the subsequent design of the intervention, (which could all "go unnoticed" with less systematic diagnoses).

The Development NGOs which considered that the Logical Framework was not ideal for interventions with a gender-based and/or women's empowerment approach (around 30%) stressed the fact, however, that the changes related to aspects of gender inequality and women's empowerment normally refer to long-term processes in which it is very complicated to achieve specific and tangible results within the time frame and with the excessively quantitative model imposed by the Logical Framework. Thus it was stated that this tool led, on many occasions, to "becoming too optimistic when recording the changes pursued in the formulations, in addition to being unrealistic and insincere" when describing the changes effectively achieved in the final reports. According to a number of Development NGOs, "qualitative aspects common to these types of interventions, such as changes in attitudes, self-esteem, roles, leadership, etc. are difficult to measure with the Logical Framework's usual quantitative, and sometimes short-termist indicators".

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
Most of the Development NGOs surveyed (55%) stated that they did not know of any alternative tools to the Logical Framework for the planning and management of Development Cooperation interventions. Only 1 out of 3 of those surveyed stated that they were aware of these alternatives, coinciding their profile with that of Development NGOs of a certain size and with an availability of resources for training and internal reflection in this respect (although there were not necessarily those with a longer track record or entities that work in a specific sector).

The main channels through which they had learned about the alternatives to the Logical Framework were, for a vast majority, through direct contact with other organisations, both from the North (40%) and the South (40%). In this respect, there does not seem to be a greater specific impulse encouraging any entities to consider and use alternative tools to the Logical Framework,
but rather it is similar in both, although it is worth mentioning that in most of the cases where
they had learned about them through local partners, this had happened in Latin America (hardly
any cases in Asia and none in Africa). Only 20% of the entities stated that they had learned
of alternatives to the Logical Framework through training courses and/or the doctrine. This
information reveals, on the one hand, a certain lack of reflection in the doctrine and/or training
on offer for this subject. On the other hand, it can also be interpreted as the difficulty to approach
these issues at a theoretical-formal level, where the exchange of practices that arise from necessity
and/or daily application among peers is more appropriate.

![Alternatives to the LF have been analysed/discussed in the Development NGO](image)
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**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

If we take a step further, from the knowledge to the real and effective attempt at its application,
a vast majority of the Development NGOs surveyed stated that in practice they had not analysed
or discussed internally any alternatives to the use of the Logical Framework as a planning and
management tool for their Development Cooperation interventions. Despite the deficiencies
and criticism found in this tool, as has been seen previously, the truth is that they do not seem
to prevent most entities from going out and researching and/or testing other models. It is worth
pointing out that the few Development NGOs that had considered/tested alternative tools to the
Logical Framework (only 20%) correspond to a profile of entities that are consolidated in their
respective sectors, with significant work experience and an important volume of activity.

Particularly prominent are Development NGOs that work on infancy, with an in-depth approach
to rights and/or Awareness-Raising, Development Education and Political Advocacy interventions,
who agree that “the Logical Framework Approach is based mainly on needs rather than on rights”. The
opinion of one of them is significant: “Our tool for analysis is the United Nation’s Convention on the
Rights of the Child... we have debated on whether the Logical Framework is not valid as a tool and on
what proposals we could make to the financial backers... from our point of view, carrying out an analysis
of the violations of rights that take place within the contexts where we work allows us to identify the
guarantors and those responsible for making sure these rights are fulfilled; the factors that prevent the
fulfilment of those rights and defining actions to make progress and achieve their full fulfilment; and the
Logical Framework not always allows us to carry out this analysis”.

![Alternatives to the LF have been analysed/discussed in the Development NGO](image)
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Most of the Development NGOs surveyed thought that it would be interesting to extend the knowledge and application (even as a pilot test) of alternative tools to the Logical Framework (only 20% think that there is no need to test new approaches, methods or tools). However, they detect important difficulties to do this. If we analyse the causes most repeated by the Development NGOs surveyed (over 55%) when asked about the reasons why they have not analysed / tested other alternatives to the Logical Framework, there is a widespread perception among them that it would bring difficulties in relations with public donors (presenting and/or justifying proposals), given the large-scale use they make of this tool (often in quite a rigid manner). Obviously, the profile of the Development NGOs that gave this answer corresponds rather to medium or small-sized entities, or large ones but with a small percentage of own funds, and which all depend to a large extent on public subsidies.

Along with the difficulty described above, a quarter of the Development NGOs surveyed pointed out a the lack of knowledge/theoretical training with other models and alternatives to the Logical Framework in order to test them when planning and managing their development cooperation interventions. This perception is coherent with the little weight of training as a source of knowledge of other alternatives to the Logical Framework for Development NGOs, as has been analysed in the previous sections.

Finally, and less important than the previous ones (around 10% of the Development NGOs surveyed, respectively) there was mention of practical-internal difficulties within the actual Development NGO, or in relations with local partners, when testing alternatives to the Logical Framework.
As was the case of public entities, many of the alternative tools to the Logical Framework that the Development NGOs surveyed stated that they had tested in practice when planning and managing their interventions, were not really alternatives but rather variations more or less similar to the additional/complementary methods for carrying out the identification in interventions. They mentioned “the methodology of the German GTZ,” “the SWOT,” “continuous assessment,” or they simply acknowledged the use of “other internal methodologies similar to the Logical Framework” but without a detailed description of which ones. Although they can be perceived by many Development NGOs as different tools, they do not differ substantially from the Logical Framework (understood as an approach, and not merely reducing it to the Logical Framework Matrix), as described in detail in section 2.1 of this study.

But the alternative methods pointed out by a number of other Development NGOs do have more specificity and weight, called “Outcome Mapping,” “Results-Based Management (RBM),” “Prospective Planning” and “Strategic Planning,” where the first two are maybe the most defined conceptually and the most well-known among the few entities that have tested alternative tools to the Logical Framework. For a more detailed description and characterisation of the above tools the initial sections of this study can be consulted again. It is interesting to point out that, on most occasions, the initiative to use these alternative tools came from the local partners, rather than from the Basque Development NGOs.

A number of them (Outcome Mapping, Prospective Planning) have in common that they pay close attention to the subjects or parties involved and to the transformation processes and changes of behaviour, more than to (or in addition to) the development objectives of the intervention. In the end the internal learning of all the participants in these types of models is level with (or even above) the mere accountability of the goals achieved to the donors.

On other occasions (Management through Results) the strict, abstract complex and, in a way, “timeless” cause-effect vertical structure of the Logical Framework (Objectives→Results→Activities) is flexibilised through a simpler definition of results in the short, medium and long term, based on the definition of a basic outline that describes the problem or issue to be intervened on. Their intervention strategy, their coherence, is carried out following the logic of reaching targets, partial and final results.
Finally, other alternatives (Strategic Planning, Balanced Scorecard) attempt to frame specific projects or interventions in wider processes that are strategic and flexible, taking more into account the contribution of the former to the latter (among a number of other factors) than the direct attribution of specific results to the projects mentioned.

However, in practically all the cases described in the questionnaires and interviews carried out, the small impact and the difficulty to implant all these alternative models in the Development NGOs was pointed out. Some of the reasons cited were:

- largely due to the difficulties already mentioned above, such as the “demands” of the public financial backers to use the Logical Framework,
- due to the lack of sufficient training to research and apply new, quite complex approaches,
- due to the difficulty, lack of resources and time to carry out identification and/or management processes that are truly participative, with all the parties involved.

For this reason these alternative initiatives are carried out by Development NGOs on a small scale, as pilot schemes and usually with interventions financed with own funds, many of which are in the field of Development Education and/or interventions with a strong focus on rights. As for the geographical area, most of them referred to experiences in Latin America, where there was a special bonding and mutual understanding with the partners, who had a high level of training and internal development.

In many of the above cases, they do not propose strictly abandoning the Logical Framework, but rather they seek to "complement it, although sometimes they way they fit in with each other can lead to problems, particularly as regards the public donors." Very often these tests were unsatisfactory and the Development NGOs acknowledged that "at the end of the process we ended up with the traditional Logical Framework".

In any event, there have been hardly any assessments carried out of these types of interventions based on alternative tools in a way that would offer the chance to carry out an in-depth assessment of their success, advantages or weaknesses in comparison to using the traditional Logical Framework. We have not detected any significant efforts or experiences to communicate and/or share these experiences with other Development NGOs, precisely because they have not been properly tested and are not at all consolidated enough at an internal level within the actual organisation.
4.3 HOW THE PARTNERS IN THE SOUTH SEE THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Degree of knowledge and application of the Logical Framework

Like in the case with the Development NGOs in the North, there are no partner organisations in the South that categorically state that they do not use the Logical Framework as a cooperation project planning and management tool (which is coherent, since both carry out their work based on similar shared models and tools).

In addition, a vast majority of partners in the South (75%) use the Logical Framework in a full and “convinced” way, not only in a formal way to summarise and formulate objectives, results, indicators, etc. in a matrix, but also to identify and plan interventions from the start. And they do it, in turn, in a participative manner involving all the other local agents (authorities, social and base community organisations, etc.) in these processes. Only a few organisations, normally religious congregations and with a strong tradition or which work in Africa, showed a more limited and restricted use of the Logical Framework.

Along with the above, a number of entities from the South stated that they used other modalities of application of the Logical Framework, among which there was “its use as a monitoring and assessment tool” (which is, in itself, one of the original and genuine uses of the Logical Framework as a project management tool).

A number of them also agreed in highlighting the use of “some elements of the Logical Framework such as the strategic planning tool”. In reality, in many cases they are local entities with a limited number of projects/programmes (sometimes just one) meaning that in practice there is usually some confusion between the operative planning of the interventions carried out by the organisation and the planning of more strategic aspects of the entity as such (although in theory they are two aspects that are located at different levels and which require different tools).
 Degree of usefulness of the Logical Framework as perceived by the partners in the South

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

Apart from being widely used by the Partners in the South, the Logical Framework is spontaneously perceived by most of those surveyed (62%) as a highly useful tool for the planning and management of their development interventions. The remaining 38% considered it as a tool with an average usefulness. None of the entities consulted considered that its usefulness was low.

Most of the entities pointed out that its main usefulness consisted of focusing on the objectives to be achieved, and its use as a tool to clarify and show the agents involved what they set out to achieve. Others indicated that they applied the Logical Framework, but "the specific reason for the application of the Logical Framework in our work is the consideration of the cultural variables that directly influence the completion of the projects and programmes. In addition to the analysis of the context and social-political situation in our country which often varies"

Use of the Logical Framework depending on the intervention instruments/modalities

Your organisation uses the LF as a tool for:

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
Similarly to the answers given by Development NGOs, local partners use the Logical Framework mainly to plan and manage their development projects and programmes. In this sense, its use for programmes is significantly higher to that declared by the Development NGOs in the North, while the partners in the South did not mention the limitations of the Logical Framework in these types of long-term interventions, unlike the Development NGOs in the North.

A number of entities reiterated that, in the case of projects with few components/results (particularly in the case of infrastructures), use of the Logical Framework raised difficulties because the description of objectives, results and activities was excessively repetitive. However, like in the case of Development NGOs in the North, here we should consider the extent to which an action composed by the mere construction can, by itself, be considered a project according to the typical characteristics described earlier.

Use of the Logical Framework tool by the partners for other types of interventions, such as Humanitarian Action, Co-Development, Awareness-Raising, etc. was much less frequent. The reasons can be due, in part, to its inferior suitability for them given the same limitations that were pointed out by the Development NGOs (although the comments expressly made by the local partners in this respect were much fewer). We should also take into account a possible lower incursion of the local partners surveyed in these other intervention modalities, different to traditional projects/programmes. Within the section “Other modalities” they mentioned “strategic planning” and “political advocacy”.

Some partner entities mentioned that “although the use of the Logical Framework is similar for all types of interventions, there are differences regarding the information-collecting techniques”. Along the same lines, others reinforced the idea that the “Logical Framework, as such, can be used for all modalities, but it is essential to give it the necessary flexibility and adaptability for each one of them”. Finally, some stated that the ideal scenario would be to “use the Logical Framework for all kinds of interventions, but in some cases (significantly in the case of emergencies) there is not enough time”.

Use of the Logical Framework depending on the sources of financing

| Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys |

In general practically all the partners consulted (over 80%) stated that they apply the Logical Framework in the same way, whether it is for interventions with own funds or with external funds, a much higher percentage than the result of the same survey among Development NGOs. This information confirms the conclusion that this tool is spontaneously perceived as useful by these entities, and not as an imposition of the Development NGOs or other entities in the North with whom they work.
Along the same line as the Development NGOs, the few partners in the South who stated that they use the Logical Framework in a different manner when working with own funds pointed out that in these cases this tool was used “in a simpler, more simplified and adapted manner.” Specifically, one of them mentioned the interesting approach of “using the analysis of problems and the desired impact as a basis to plan the activities that will lead to it more flexibly, revising them depending on the intermediate results that are achieved along the way.” Others directly stated that although they did not apply the Logical Framework in the same way with own funds, their target was to “do so fully in the short to medium-term.”

### Function / utility of the Logical Framework

- A way of formulating and presenting proposals in a logical, summarised and clear manner
- A participative tool for identification and planning
- An instrument to assess the impact and learn lessons
- A tool to monitor the efficacy and efficiency of the project
- A requirement of the Development NGOs we work with to collaborate with them
- Others

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

The main functions/utilities of the Logical Framework perceived by the local partners do not differ, essentially, from those mentioned by Development NGOs of the BAC (and in many cases, the assessment of both coincides in each aspect). There are no significant differences in the assessment carried out depending on the type of organisation, sector or geographical area of their intervention.

Again most entities pointed out the more instrumental/formal function of the Logical Framework when formulating and presenting proposals in a summarised and clear manner (over 50% placed this aspect at the top of the list).

But they also highlighted its use as an identification and planning tool, and to monitor the project’s efficiency. Its usefulness to assess the impact and the lessons learned is, for the partners in the South, even higher than for Development NGOs in the North. Although they also expressed the idea that the Logical Framework was rather a requirement of the Development NGOs with whom they work, it was not placed at the top of the list by any of the entities consulted.
In addition to these, other additional uses of the Logical Framework were pointed out by the local partners consulted:

- *input for the systematisation of experiences* (actually very linked to the internal learning function)
- *an internal and external communication tool*
- *an instrument to assess processes and strategies*

**Main advantages / strengths perceived of the Logical Framework**

Most of the local partners consulted (almost one third) stressed the advantages of the Logical Framework as a tool for the monitoring, assessment and justification of the results and objectives obtained by the project. They also highlighted, in this respect, aspects of clarity for the teams on the ground in charge of executing the project, in addition to transparency and accountability of these results before the Development NGOs and the donors. Possibly, the usual role of implementer on the ground played by these organisations (as opposed to the Development NGOs in the North, generally more focused on planning and/or presenting before donors) is the reason why this aspect is highlighted. Some of the opinions in this respect:

- **It is a supporting element for monitoring and assessment**
- **It is excellent for monitoring, assessing and reporting, both for the donor and the implementer, offering transparency and clarity to the team in charge of carrying out the activities**
- **It offers a clear visualisation of the factors that show us that the project or programme’s target has been reached**
- **It is good for projects with specific timelines, aimed at results, in order to see to what extent they have been achieved**
- **The project’s environment can be analysed and its success or failure can be measured**
- **It helps to appreciate the contribution that each one of the activities makes towards achieving the objectives set**

Along with these advantages/strengths, also highlighted were others (also by an important number of partners, around 30% of those surveyed) related to the conceptual clarity, logic, and simplicity that the Logical Framework offers when summarising and condensing the work carried out during the planning, formulation and presentation of development projects.

- **It helps to keep things organised, in order to visualise better the orientation of the project**
- **It gives the project coherence, by establishing objectives, results, targets, indicators and specific activities**
- **It is a methodology that is easily understood by all**
- **It is short, precise and easy to use**
- **It facilitates the logical design of the project or programme**
In addition to the above two, as the main strengths/advantages of the Logical Framework, a number of other ones were also mentioned though not considered as important, related mainly to two central aspects: on the one hand, regarding its contributions as an intervention planning and identification tool that incorporates coherence and justification for the approach and design chosen; on the other hand, as a means of sharing the projects with others, channelling the opinions of multiple local agents/groups, sharing decisions with them and socialising the problems and alternatives chosen participatively.

- A participative and effective tool that facilitates the inclusion and empowerment of the local agents
- A participative approach that mobilises everyone’s energies, including the beneficiaries
- It is good for sharing the programme with others, because it can be summarised and easily understood with a single page
- It can help diagnose problems and tackle a specific problem, choosing between different options
- It helps to develop the project's elaboration process based on a consensus of opinions
- It facilitates a contextualised assessment of the problems to be faced and is useful for defining strategies

Main weaknesses / inconveniences of the Logical Framework

There is much agreement, almost unanimity, among the local partners consulted with respect to the main weaknesses of the Logical Framework. A vast majority (over 75%) pointed out its limitations to adapt to wider communitary and/or social processes, usually long-term and not always based on “problems”, and to visualise its progress and impacts, beyond the mere quantitative indicators.

- It is not an adequate instrument for the assessment and adjustment of communitary and social processes, nor for impact assessment, as it mainly proposes monitoring based on quantitative indicators
- It is too focused on problems and not enough on opportunities and vision
- It is more adequate for the resolution of problems than for the development of processes
- In five-year programmes it is hard to foresee the risks and the hypotheses that can change; the budget is closed and there is no possibility for variations if there are fluctuations
- The situation where, if the result or target is not reached, the intervention has not been successful
- The Logical Framework Approach is not adequate for political advocacy processes and strategic development
- It is not valid for processes in which the results are not easily measured (such as education or role changing), they require a long period of time and depend on many external factors
A large number of entities consulted, quite related to those mentioned above, also agree that there are certain negative aspects related to the rigidity and poor flexibility imposed by the Logical Framework, imposing terminologies and “cause-effect” thought processes, required by the donors but not always shared or appropriated for local contexts, which can hide certain aspects of an intervention that are as relevant or more so than the objectives-results-activities.

- There is a risk that the LFM poorly represents the results of the analysis due to being too summarised and because attention is focused on it, information from the analysis is lost and with it the ability to successfully complete the project.
- Reality is not “square” like the tool.
- When it is used rigidly, it can lead to a very narrow approach by the people leading the process.
- The forms for the design of the project do not always allow the information collected during the identification process to be consigned.
- Reality is broad and complex, the Logical Framework is a partial analysis of this reality. The processes of reality can be planned, but it is not possible to guarantee 100% the fulfilment of the hypotheses or changes planned.
- The cause/effect relationship is not always unidirectional; problems can arise from multiple causes and a strategy can have a variety of effects.
- Regarding the difficulties that can arise and which sometimes impose changes on the project, it is like a wall that cannot be touched without losing the support of the financial backers.
- It should be a flexible instrument which allows for margins of error and corrections due to the dynamics of the realities on the ground.

Finally, a number of entities pointed out some other difficulties related to the negative impact the Logical Framework had on their relations with Development NGOs and donors, which are quite relevant:

- Different donors use and require different forms and terminology, (general, specific objective, results outcome, output, impact…) which can enormously complicate the presentation and the joint monitoring of the same project for a number of them.
- They must have good knowledge and have training in the terminology and methodology of the Logical Framework… this can lead to bias when collaborating with Development NGOs of the North, leaving out the partners of the South that do not use this methodology, but which are not necessarily any worse than the others.
Almost all the partners in the South surveyed (over 80%) considered that the Logical Framework made the work of the Development NGOs of the North that they collaborated with easier. Again, as in the case of the latter, the quasi-universal nature of the Logical Framework receives particular attention, meaning that it allows them to “speak a common language” between entities in the North and South, and even between the local partners and their various donors, encouraging feedback among them all.

In a similar sense, they point out that the use of a common tool allows them to reach agreements that are perceived in the same way by all parties, clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of each regarding management and the goals to be achieved by the intervention in a transparent way that everyone is familiar with (“everyone knows what is expected of each other and of the project”). It also allows them to “anticipate deviations of the plan by both parties in real time and to work together on the ideal alternatives to correct them”.

It must be pointed out that very often many of the entities which stated that the Logical Framework facilitated working together with Development NGOs of the North explained that this only happens when it is done with proper flexibility and adaptability, and not as an imposed method. Along the same lines, an entity eloquently stated that “the Logical Framework is probably better for support interests/roles, supervision, reporting, control and accountability of the Development NGOs and entities of the North, than for the implementing organisations in the South, which with this tool are made responsible for achieving tangible and specific results with the funds received, despite not having any control over the risk factors and previous hypotheses”.

The few entities (around 10%) that categorically responded that the Logical Framework did not facilitate working together with Development NGOs from the North justified their answer by stating that the multiplicity of formats based on this approach and required by donors and Development NGOs of the North placed serious obstacles for the internal management of the partner in the South when “organising and coordinating all of them”. Similarly, they pointed out that the rigidity of the approach brought by the Logical Framework prevents the adaptation of the management and monitoring, making it hard to adapt to the real changing needs and contexts, and enormously complicating the composition of the profiles of the local teams (“very often the workforce dedicated to management and administration is even larger than that carrying out the activities”).

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
The Logical Framework and the gender / women’s empowerment approach

Most of the partners in the South consulted (56%) stated that the Logical Framework was an ideal tool to work on gender issues and women’s empowerment. Almost all of them went further and considered that “thanks to its versatility and its logic it allows you to articulate basic elements to make proposals that promote the empowerment of women”. More specifically, it has been pointed out that “the process of analysis and identification required by the Logical Framework favours the visibility of these aspects as transversal issues or by helping groups of women to participate and identify their specific problems in order to turn them into objectives and measure them with indicators”.

There was, however, a relevant number of entities consulted (a quarter of them) which stated that they had not found in the Logical Framework the most suitable tool to work on gender issues and/or women’s empowerment. Essentially, as in the case with the Development NGOs, the main reasons had to do with the fact that these actions are long-term processes, which does not fit in well with the Logical Framework Approach, excessively focused on "short-termist and quantifiable results".

Alternatives to the Logical Framework for Partners in the South

Source: ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
Most of the partners in the South (around two thirds), like in the case of the Development NGOs of the BAC, were not aware of alternatives to the Logical Framework for the planning and management of their interventions. Only 20% stated that they were aware of these alternatives, most of them from Latin America (and 1 from Asia). No African entities stated that they were aware of alternatives to the Logical Framework.

The entities that gave an affirmative answer had had contact with these alternatives mainly through external consultants (through their participation in internal training processes and/or the planning and assessment of their interventions). One organisation had received information from the Public Administration. Unlike the Development NGOs surveyed, their partners in the South did not highlight their experience and contact with other Development NGOs and/or cooperation entities as a source of alternative models to the Logical Framework.

**Source:** ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys

As for the attempt to effectively apply an alternative tool to the Logical Framework made by the entities in the South consulted, again we find very few examples (only 1 out of 10 said they had actually done so). The reasons cited by the entities themselves are the following:
The feeling among the local partners that there is no need to look for substitutes of the Logical Framework is far more widespread than among the Development NGOs in the North, this being the main reason why no alternative formulas have been tested. This statement was made mainly by Latin American entities, while others in Africa and/or Asia were slightly more critical of it and were open to other approaches and/or tools.

Most of the difficulties perceived by the local partners to experiment with other approaches seem to be more of an external nature, related to possible complications with their partner Development NGOs in the North and to the viability of submitting proposals and receiving funds from public entities. There is also a certain lack of training on the subject, although this is not considered to be prioritary. There did not seem to be any important difficulties at an internal level, within the local entity itself, to test alternatives to the Logical Framework.

*Source:* ECODE based on quantitative data obtained through surveys
The alternative most repeated by the few local organisations which stated that they had tested alternative formulas to the Logical Framework is Management Through Results (MTR). It coincides, thus, with one of the options also highlighted by Development NGOs in the North (in fact it was a joint attempt by Development NGO-Partner in the South, following the initiative of the latter) and we refer to the comments made regarding the same subject above. However, it should be noted that there was a different appreciation or perception of this initiative among both entities: while the Basque Development NGO considered that “…it has been very difficult and complicated... it cannot be used as a substitute for the Logical Framework”, its partner in the South stated that “after its incorporation as a tool through the support of a consultancy, we have seen an important improvement in the performance of the programme managed.”

Again, like in the case of public entities and Development NGOs, along with the above tool some entities occasionally use a series of tools that do not seem to be real alternatives to the Logical Framework, but rather they reproduce the same model (GOPP, traditional planning). In these cases, the advice offered by the local partners was to not be too “obsessed” with the planning matrix, reinforcing the steps and instruments that lead to it, and flexibilising it by incorporating markedly qualitative indicators, particularly in the case of social organisational processes and political negotiations.

In other cases, they are rather complementary and/or accessory instruments to it, more related to strategic planning and management of the organisation as a whole, and not as much a specific
project-programme, although we must again stress that in the case of “small” entities with a single programme, the organisational and operative levels can (and normally do in practice) be confused.

Thus the "Program Expenditure Adjusted Credit" mentioned by some entities is, above all, used by public entities, with a strong emphasis on optimising the available resources and it is there to provide an answer to the contradictions implicit in the Traditional Budget (setting resources based exclusively on inputs). In particular its aim is that the State and the institutions that integrate it have a programmatic instrument that links the production of goods and services to be achieved with the objectives and goals outlined in the development plans.
5. CONCLUSIONS

• In general the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) seems to be in good health in the BAC. Despite the criticism and theoretical and/or practical limitations attributed to it, the truth is that almost all Development NGOs and their partners in the South we consulted, apply it in their daily practice in one way or another, and in addition the majority see it as a useful tool. And this, though with subtle differences, regardless of their size, seniority, volume of activity, sector, etc.

• Use of the Logical Framework by public entities in the BAC is varied. Those who manage a greater volume of funds for cooperation and have solid and trained teams of technicians regularly include this approach in their terms and conditions and forms. In turn, a high number (up to 70%) of smaller entities do not apply it in their budget and/or equipment and many of them even state that they have not even heard of it.

• There are different visions, approaches and degrees of understanding the Logical Framework among the different cooperation agents consulted in the BAC: from those who see it as a comprehensive and integral tool to identify, plan and manage an intervention (Logical Framework Approach), to those who use it, mainly, to summarise and present in a clear and organised manner the diagnoses that have been carried out beforehand, based on other more flexible and adapted tools, not restricted to the proposals of the Logical Framework (Logical Framework Matrix). In general, this second approach/vision of the Logical Framework slightly predominates over the first, both for public entities and Development NGOs and their partners in the South.

• Development NGOs, their partners in the South and public entities analysed in the BAC agree that the main advantages/strengths of the Logical Framework are its clarity, simplicity and internal logic, which give the intervention and its identification process an appearance of rationality, making it easily understood by all the parties involved. They also highlight the easy monitoring and verification of targets and results, including the accountability it offers concerning the funds invested and the achievements obtained with them.

• Among the most common criticism levelled at the Logical Framework by different parties in the BAC, most agree that the tool is very rigid, its scarce consideration of the external factors that influence the achievements, its “narrowness” when analysing reality (which is artificially simplified), and its high technical level and poor cultural adaptation to local contexts, which limits real participation by many agents in the South.

• The partners in the South consulted, more established in the target communities and often with strong ideological approaches that take precedence over technical/methodological aspects, criticise the difficulty of fitting projects based on the Logical Framework in the wider processes they support. The longer-term approach of the latter, not based on problems/needs but on long-term social transformations and development targets, bring many problems in practice. This normally leads to “cutting pieces” from said processes to turn them into projects, using the Logical Framework artificially, and assigning them quantifiable and often
unrealistic targets and indicators, moved by the need to submit ambitious and “closed” proposals to the Development NGOs and donors of the BAC to receive financing.

• In general terms the Logical Framework is not perceived as a tool that is “imposed” by Development NGOs on their partners in the South. Most Development NGOs and partners consulted state that they use it participatively and jointly together and both state that its use facilitates working together, as there is a “common language” known by all. Its function as a tool for internal communication between the parties involved is also highlighted, as it allows them to have a clear and well-known work framework concerning the achievements and responsibilities expected from each of them.

• As for the perception of “demandability” of the Logical Framework by public entities in the BAC, there are slight differences depending on the sources consulted. Although a high percentage of Development NGOs do perceive the use of this tool as a necessary requisite to obtain the approval of projects by public donors, most of them stated that they applied the Logical Framework in the same way, both to interventions financed with public subsidies and to those financed with own funds (although in this last case it is usually applied with slightly more flexibility). If we look at public entities, it is surprising that a large number of those consulted (almost half) declared that the strict and formal adaptation to the methodology of the Logical Framework in the proposals submitted does not have, in practice, such importance when assessing them and awarding subsidies to Development NGOs.

• Most of the forms of public entities analysed, based on the Logical Framework, suffer from certain rigidity when expressing key information of a project, focusing it excessively on the more quantitative aspects referred to targets-results-activities. According to the Development NGOs and even to a large portion of the technical teams themselves of these entities, this could be limiting the adequate visualisation of other important aspects that show a deep and real experience and/or knowledge concerning the context. It has also been pointed out that they can encourage bias, favouring the Development NGOs that “master” the methodology of the Logical Framework and submit theoretically perfect projects after working on them in the “office”, but not always with a solid base and fieldwork. On the other hand, this demand for quantifiable achievements linked to the Logical Framework leads in many cases to an overestimation in the final reports of the net impacts really attributable to a project, arguing that it is extremely difficult to prove, in a rigorous manner, whether they were a direct result of the project or not.

• In line with the above, certain aspects considered as essential by the doctrine (in particular in relation to the new currents of Management for Development Results), Development NGOs and their partners in the South, when identifying, designing and managing an intervention for development, hardly have room or are given any relevance in most presentation and/or monitoring forms of projects by public entities analysed (essentially aimed at accountability, but not as much at internal learning). In particular there is a perceived lack of analyses by agents and the evolution expected of each one, the deep and detailed analysis of risks and alternative actions, regular mechanisms of feedback and internal learning, the inclusion and coherence of specific projects in wider development processes and objectives, the more qualitative and/or partial indicators to measure progress (and not just final results).

• In most cases, the terms and conditions of the public entities analysed in the BAC do allow space for certain modifications of the original design or planning matrix of a project, provided that they are not essential aspects of the same (objectives, partners, target population). However, in practice, most Development NGOs surveyed hardly revise and/or adapt them, and this even if there are changes in
the context and/or there are unforeseen factors, where there is a certain tendency to “stick” to the initial Matrix. To a large extent this is done due to certain fear of “looking bad” before the donors, as the latter think that there was an incorrect identification, and also due to the difficulty of “breaking the consensus” achieved with the rest of the local agents involved during the identification, concerning the objectives-results agreed upon.

• Due to the above, in addition to limiting the coherence and impact of an intervention, it greatly complicates the final assessment of a project, as the Planning Matrix it was based on is often not really valid, or because the latter does not allow/encourage taking into account relevant aspects that escape from the “narrowness” of the information collected in said chart. In extreme cases, it reaches a point where the Planning Matrices, as outlined in the forms, are assessed more than the projects actually carried out.

• Most agents agree that the best field for the application of the Logical Framework, with respect to the different instruments/modalities for cooperation, is limited to a specific type of intervention, such as “traditional” projects. Even in these cases, in the actions that are “small”, specific and/or with strong components of infrastructures, many voices point out that strict use of the Logical Framework can be excessive, disproportionate and/or lead to artificial and unnecessary repetitions when defining targets-results-activities. This has led a few “large” public entities to not demand the Logical Framework (or at least not in a strict sense) to finance these types of actions.

• For the rest of the instruments/modalities, the suitability of the Logical Framework does not seem so clear. In the case of Programmes, with more complex and long-term internal structures, a lack of flexibility and a phased internal structure are blamed. However, very often the rigour and “orthodoxy” demanded of the Development NGOs by public entities when formulating programmes is greater, given the important volume of funds requested for them and the pluriannual commitments acquired, which means that not only is it not dispensed with, but there is a more strict use of said tool of the Logical Framework.

• The Logical Framework does not seem to be fully suitable for humanitarian interventions, where the unquestionable limitations to carrying out a systematic and deep diagnosis and/or formulation as required by said tool seem to be incompatible with the need to act in an urgent and coordinated manner, according to the Development NGOs and other entities consulted. Other specific tools such as the COMPAS method, the Analysis of Vulnerabilities and Capacities, etc. are normally used. Despite this, in must be taken into account that a large portion of the public entities of the BAC are not strictly dedicated to the initial response to disasters, but rather to post-emergency rehabilitation, meaning that it may make more sense to apply tools based on the LFA for their management.

• For the interventions of Awareness-Raising and Education for Development, many public entities and Development NGOs consulted definitely prefer to apply other more specific tools adapted to them, more suited to processes in which the adaptation of methodologies, process indicators, participation and transformation of agents, etc. are valued (and not so much exclusively results measurable in the short-term). Among the most important, segmented assessments, outcome mapping, prospective planning, etc., are mentioned.

• In the case of direct Agreements of public entities with other cooperation agents, both in the North and South, although the Logical Framework is still used, some of them test certain approaches and adaptations of it “ad hoc”, which allows for
more flexibility and continuity of the actions. The greater margin of public entities for this when they act directly, with respect to the strict requirements of the terms and conditions and calls for Development NGOs, along with a different approach when working on public programmes/policies, seems to lead to this. However, no cases have been detected where the latest approaches/models arising from the new architecture of cooperation and tested by international agencies such as the UN, GTZ, CIDA, etc. have been applied (systemic approaches, Management for Development Results, etc.), not even as pilot schemes. A possible reason could be that, unlike direct state cooperation (in which broader aid modalities are used, such as budget support, technical assistance, etc.) public entities in the BAC continue to replicate the “traditional projects” that they finance through Development NGOs, even in cases in which they intervene directly, without the involvement of the latter.

• As for geographical areas, most Development NGOs consulted expressed the view that the use of the Logical Framework was particularly difficult for those working in Africa, as it could lead to bias when receiving approval for projects in this region. The main limitations consisted in the greater weakness of local partners when learning about/applying this methodology, along with the usual fragility of their social, economic and political contexts, making in-depth diagnoses required by the Logical Framework and “ideal” intervention approaches difficult due to the strong influence of external factors. This has led some public entities to issue specific calls for Africa, or to reserve a certain % of funds for projects in this region, flexibilising the strict methodological requirement of the Logical Framework when assessing these kinds of proposals.

• The adaptation of the Logical Framework as a tool for interventions with a strong focus on gender and/or aimed at empowering women offers nuances, depending on the entities in the BAC. Most highlight the fact that, as it is a neutral instrument, it neither benefits nor damages, depending rather on the use made of it and the internal work approach of the Development NGO. However, many Development NGOs and public entities state that the impulse traditionally given to the gender-based approach as a transversal element associated with the Logical Framework has significantly contributed towards raising awareness among all agents concerning these aspects when diagnosing and/or incorporating actions to the design. On the other hand, as a negative aspect, it has been pointed out that rigidity, “short-termism” and the need for quantification in projects based on this tool do not fit in well with flexible, qualitative and more long-term processes usually required by gender and/or women’s empowerment issues.

• Bar occasional exceptions, among those responsible for public entities, among Development NGOs or their partners in the field, there is no adequate knowledge concerning tools and new/alternative approaches to the Logical Framework. In general, it is seen as interesting by most of them (very few consider it unnecessary) but they mainly cite a lack of formal training and/or knowledge on particular successful cases in practice. The difficulties of internal management, coordination with partners in the South, or the reluctance of public entities to test other models is also highlighted, but with less importance.

• Planning and management of interventions based on a genuine and operative Right-Based Approach has only been tested by a small number of Development NGOs in the BAC. This approach focuses not as much on needs/problems (as the LFA) as on rights that can be demanded, involving the subjects of rights and also obligations, and including relevant indicators to measure progress not only at an individual level, but also at a collective level, etc., as defended by agencies such as the UNHCR or UNDP. This approach has not been known or applied in depth by most public entities of the BAC, although there are many mainly generic references to Human Rights as principles and/or transversal in their terms and conditions and forms.
• The scarce attempts at applying alternative methods/approaches to the Logical Framework by Development NGOs of the BAC (such as Outcome Mapping) have generally been pilot schemes, in projects with own financing and/or at the initiative of their local partners to try and alleviate the limitations found on the ground. In some cases these initiatives have failed or have ended up returning to the Logical Framework faced with the difficulties found. In any event, there has been very little diffusion of experiences of an effective systematisation/assessment of interventions based on approaches other than the Logical Framework, to try and evaluate their advantages and disadvantages.

• Many of the alternatives to the Logical Framework mentioned by the public entities, Development NGOs and/or partners in the South were not really such, but rather different modalities or adaptations of the tool to make it more participative and/or comprehensive (like the “ZOPP” method of the GTZ, or the Project Cycle Management adopted by the EC). In other cases they were more specific tools used mainly for diagnosing and designing, which are not at all incompatible with the approach of the Logical Framework but focus on its adaptation and appropriation by the actual target communities (as is the case of the Participative Rural Diagnosis and Rapid Rural Diagnosis, both mentioned by numerous public entities, SWOT, etc.).

• Despite still having ties with the Logical Framework, one of the most repeated (and sometimes tested) methods by Development NGOs and partners in the South does have a greater specificity: Results-Based Management or Management through Results. Here the idea is to flexibilise the strict, abstract complex and, in a way, “timeless” cause-effect vertical structure of the Logical Framework (Targets–>Results Activities) through a simpler definition of results in the short, medium and long term, based on the definition of a basic outline that describes the problem or issue to be intervened on. The emphasis is more on the final results (or impacts) than on the products created by the project to achieve them. The intervention strategy is carried out following the logic of reaching targets, partial and final results. However, there has not been an adequate distinction between the traditional “Results-based Management” and the new trends of “Managing for Development Results” (MfDR) that emerged after the MDG and the last international conferences (Paris and Accra) to tackle the new architecture of development.

• Other important alternatives to the Logical Framework tested by the Development NGOs in the BAC and reflected on by the doctrine, have tried to stress not so much the problems to be resolved, but the different agents that must contribute towards it, describing their interrelations, the targets associated to each one and/or the behavioural changes expected in each of them, always treating them as active subjects who play an important role in the actual intervention. The degree of evolution and development of said changes will be measured during the actual development of the intervention and can be adjusted more or less flexibly. It is the case of the so-called “Outcome Mapping”, used traditionally for projects with a strong component of skills development, and also those known by the doctrine and a few Development NGOs (hardly any in the BAC) as “Social Frameworks”.

• To a lesser extent, some Development NGOs in the BAC mentioned having tested, as an alternative to the Logical Framework, what is called “Prospective Planning”. This “circular” methodology is normally used for educational processes, for the long-term strategic planning of organisations and/or public policies in a global sense, although they can be applied to projects. It is about defining interventions based not so much on “past” problems or realities, but on future “goals, dreams or ideals” that each agent has, defining wider scenarios in which the specific actions of a project are inserted. The tools for the definition of scenarios and the selection of alternatives have a strong scientific and experimental basis, although a strong participation of the communities is not ruled out.
There is hardly any knowledge, on the part of most agents of the BAC consulted, on other tools/approaches tested in an international context, with more innovative and flexible approaches to plan and manage increasingly complex interventions for cooperation, with the participation (and reinforcement) of a large number of agents and which respond to the challenges of sustainability and quality required by the Paris and Accra Principles. There are, for example, tools such as the “Systemic concepts” or “Capacity WORKS” (partly based on the former), the latter officially implanted and massively used by the GTZ for its interventions for cooperation since the year 2009, and of which a large number of assessments have been made which shed a positive light on its
6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AGENTS IN THE BAC

6.1 FLEXIBILISE AND ADAPT THE USE OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Taking for granted that the Logical Framework is the common tool universally accepted for the planning and management of projects in the BAC, it does not seem viable, nor advisable, to suggest its radical substitution for another model, at least in the short term. It is necessary, therefore, to take advantage of its positive aspects, but to minimise or correct the inconveniences perceived by most agents consulted, particularly in relation to its excessive rigidity, allowing in a way for its adapted use (at least during a transition period) within the framework of, and working towards, newer approaches and models such as Management for Development Resources or Systemic Project Management. To this end:

• There must be guarantees that the planning and management tools and models proposed by the Logical Framework are used in a participative manner and agreed upon with all local agents, without them being an imposition of the Development NGOs and/or donors. The public entities of the BAC must make sure that these aspects are adequately reflected in terms and conditions and forms, and that they are evaluated when assessing the proposals. It is necessary to avoid the approval of “methodologically perfect” projects based on the Logical Framework, but without a real and solid base on the ground.

• Project identification and design tools must not be exclusively restricted to those collected by the traditional orthodoxy of the Logical Framework (analysis of agents, analysis of problems and analysis of alternatives). Instruments and techniques that are more flexible, participative and/or adapted to local contexts (such as those used in the Participative Rural Diagnoses) can and must complete the list of those available to this end.

• The importance of the Planning Matrix should not be overstated (objectives-results-activities) nor should the quantitative indicators in it be abused. Certain aspects of the context and pertinence with public policies, the adaptation and coherence with wider strategic processes and the added value of the Development NGOs and their partners, the feedback mechanisms and internal learning, sustainability, etc. must be likewise reflected by the Development NGOs in their proposals and assessed by the central public entities, even if they are not strictly reflected in the traditional "4x4" matrix. They must also encourage and allow the use of more qualitative-style indicators, remembering that “measurable”, does not necessarily mean “quantifiable”.

• It is necessary to give more weight to the role played by different agents/groups participating in the intervention. In addition to (or even instead of, for the more daring) analysing problems that emerge from the past, an attempt must be made to discover the future aspirations, skills and goals of each key participant in an intervention, including their interrelations, promoting and measuring the progress of the same as regards achieving the goals proposed and those that contribute towards them.
• Development NGOs, partners and public entities must place emphasis on a deep and detailed description of the external factors and risks facing a project, in particular those that have a duration greater than 24 months. A schematic and “mechanical” description, with “standard” suppositions of the last column of the typical planning matrix, is not enough. The progress of said factors must be analysed and reported during the development of the intervention. And as a key aspect, strategies and/or alternative paths to reach the proposed targets must be defined from the start, in the event that the risks identified (or other similar risks) occur.

• In line with the above, “freezing” the planning matrix initially designed for a project must be avoided allowing it, in turn, to be modified as much as and whenever it is necessary throughout the duration of the intervention, in order to achieve the goals pursued. This requires public entities to broaden as much as possible the situations that allow the modification of a project, communicating to the Development NGOs that their request in this respect will not necessarily be seen as a failure or a deficiency of it. As for Development NGOs and their partners, it is necessary in said cases to gather all the agents initially involved again, looking for consensus and transparency and avoiding unilateral modifications of the multilateral agreements reached initially.

All the above is applicable to any kind of project. However, it is important to highlight that in the case of those carried out in Africa, usually with weak social structures, poor education, unstable authorities and changing contexts, the Development NGOs themselves find it particularly difficult to stick to the strict orthodoxy of the Logical Framework. In order to avoid bias due to this when assessing and approving proposals, public entities must try to be particularly flexible in these cases. Some entities have included positive discrimination measures for these types of interventions and/or they have even made specific announcements for them, separate from the “standard” announcements, which would be interesting to replicate.

6.2 DO NOT EXCEED THE OPTIMUM APPLICATION SCOPE OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Almost all agents consulted agree on the usefulness of the Logical Framework as a planning and management tool for “typical traditional” projects (interventions lasting less than two years, with a single specific goal, a limited number of agents, etc.). However, it is no less true that there is, among all of them, a reluctance to apply this tool to other types of instruments / modalities of cooperation. Despite this, and possibly faced with the lack of knowledge of specific models for the same, it seems that the Logical Framework has an “attractive force” and is tended to be applied by Development NGOs and public entities to all kinds of modalities, generating many inconveniences and/or dysfunctions.

Thus, for these other modalities (including new instruments for cooperation) it is necessary to intensify the search and allow the use of specific tools and/or profound adaptations of the Logical Framework by Development NGOs and public entities, to carry out an adequate management of the aspects that define them. In particular:

• In the case of punctual actions and/or actions with a reduced scope (very often they are not projects in the strict sense of the word) the use of the Logical Framework must be “relaxed” to avoid “oversizing” and encouraging excessive literature and unnecessary repetitions when presenting the proposals. There are punctual examples of relevant public entities in the BAC that have already put in place specific terms and conditions/forms for these types of actions and it would be interesting to reproduce them.
• On the other hand, in the case of programmes with a certain duration and greater scope, (actions in a number of sectors, multiple goals, complexity of agents), it is necessary to exercise a high degree of flexibility, in particular regarding the aspects already mentioned in the first recommendation of this chapter. Despite there being an important volume of resources at stake, public entities must understand that greater flexibility does not equal less rigour regarding identification, formulation or accountability. It is important to emphasize this rigour, not so much to define in detail from the beginning the results, activities, costs that will be incurred in 3-4 years’ time (an improbable exercise, and not very recommendable) but to define with precision and depth the final goals to be achieved, the long-term planning of all agents, the intervention strategies that are coherent with the added value of each one and the risks that the intervention will face, employing alternative strategies in the event of them materialising.

• In the case of Humanitarian Action interventions, there are appropriate methodologies such as COMPAS, Diagnosis of Vulnerabilities and Capacities, etc. which achieve a balance between the necessary urgency and flexibility of the design, appropriate for interventions of this type, with the incorporation of the desirable quality and systematisation standards. The Development NGOs must try to use them and the public entities collect them and permit their application in terms and conditions and forms (even when done in a combined manner with the LFA, for the cases of post-emergency or rehabilitation).

• Something similar happens in the case of actions for Awareness-raising and Education for Development, for which there are procedures and tools that are more focused on long-term processes, not so quantified, and which particularly take into account the coordination and collaborative work and coherence of the issues dealt with along with global development agendas. Methodologies such as Outcome Mapping, segmented assessment, prospective planning, etc. are demanded by most Development NGOs specialised in these types of interventions, and must be taken into consideration by public entities.

• Although certain Development NGOs and local partners with a limited volume of actions in operation (sometimes a single project) confuse both levels, the Logical Framework is not ideal to carry out the strategic planning and/or global management of organisations. There are more adequate instruments for this, some imported and adapted from the private sector (such as the Balanced Scorecard or Process Maps, etc.) which give the strategy analysis and definition a more global scope, highlighting more strategic and ideological aspects (mission, vision, values, etc.) in addition to (or above) more operative issues.

• Finally, for the modalities of direct cooperation developed by public entities (in particular those with a longer tradition and volume of resources) there are new tools and instruments that offer the possibility of adapting to the increasing complexity of the world of cooperation, and advancing in line with the recent Paris and Accra principles. In particular, we are talking about approaches like the Capacity Development, Management for Development Results and/or systemic approaches, that public entities should know about and consider, (in particular whenever they try to develop aid interventions/modalities that differ from the traditional projects financed through Development NGOs).
6.3 INCORPORATE MORE OPERATIVE ASPECTS OF A RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH

Although it is true that the concept of Human Rights appears repeatedly in the terms and conditions and forms of public entities in the BAC, on most occasions they are generic mentions of principles or transversal issues, but very operative and definable in practical aspects when identifying, planning and managing interventions.

It does not seem, a priori, contradictory to combine aspects of the LFA and the Human Rights-Based Approach. However, as for Development NGOs, only a few are incorporating this approach in an integral and deep manner in their interventions, working not so much on problems, but on rights and international frameworks that protect them, actively involving the subjects of rights but also of obligations and gathering specific indicators to this end.

It is necessary that public entities of the BAC think deeply about all these issues, establishing a dialogue with the Development NGOs that have analysed them in more depth, and progressively incorporating specific aspects of them in their terms and conditions/forms, without this being incompatible with a continued use of the Logical Framework (as has been done recently by the AECID, for their so-called “Agreements” with Development NGOs).

For this it could be convenient to increase the knowledge, diffusion and application of the interesting materials already published within the framework of the BAC in this respect (the Office of Development Cooperation of the Basque Government has published in 2009, in collaboration with GARAPEN BIDEAN, the Human Rights and Development Workshop, the “Methodological Guide for the Incorporation of Human Rights in Development Cooperation”).

Although it is obvious that the rights-based approach is universally applicable, certain sectors/areas in which the international frameworks for the protection of rights are more developed and/or consolidated (such as in infancy, women, health or education) seem to be more adequate for Development NGOs and public entities to start to go into it in greater depth.

6.4 ENCOURAGE TRAINING, RESEARCH AND EXCHANGES OF EXPERIENCES

Most Development NGOs, partners in the South and public entities agree that it would be interesting to learn about/test other alternative methods to the Logical Framework, but almost all of them (and in particular the medium-sized and small Development NGOs) see the lack of training and/or knowledge regarding anything other than the traditional Logical Framework as an obstacle. It is therefore necessary to decisively encourage this field in the BAC in order to minimise the risk of “getting stuck” in concepts and tools that could be losing part of their validity, while at a global level other contexts of cooperation and other agents consider new alternatives for the future.

This paper attempts to present a first global and comprehensive scenario concerning the issue, but there is much room for reflection on each one of the alternative methods to the Logical Framework which are described here; their characteristics, their compatibility with the Logical Framework and combinations of other models, their usefulness and real viability in practice, etc. All this can be carried out with research, studies, congresses, etc., which must be supported by public entities, and in particular by those with greater resources for this purpose, such as the Basque Government.

Training deserves a special mention in the Logical Framework Approach for the heads of “small” public entities with more limited funds and/or technical teams for cooperation. Given that most of those included in this profile state that they are unaware of this tool, it is difficult to speak of them
revising and/or using it. It would be interesting to focus training in the Logical Framework of these groups with a critical perspective from the start, taking advantage of their more “open” view of this tool, not “contaminated” by the prolonged use of it as is the case with others. The role of diffusion, coordination and dynamisation of Euskal Fondoa for this is essential.

In addition, there must be a contribution towards the ongoing training of Development NGOs in the BAC in these issues. It will be necessary to combine more formal courses and training (possibly in the case of smaller entities that first need to strengthen their knowledge base concerning basic aspects of the Logical Framework), along with workshops to exchange knowledge, in practice, of alternatives that have been already tested by other agents and are loaded with a realistic assessment of them. This option has been highlighted repeatedly by the Development NGOs consulted. Along with public entities, the role of the Development NGO Coordination Platform of the Basque Country to encourage these types of activities among its members seems to be essential.

Finally, the role the partners in the South can and must play in this field must not be forgotten. On the one hand there must be a commitment to training, minimising the fact that a lack of knowledge on the methodology of the Logical Framework by some of them can lead to bias, leaving organisations and/or valid proposals out, even if they do not strictly follow the format of the Logical Framework. On the other hand, new solutions and alternatives arise, on many occasions, from the needs and limitations of the Logical Framework perceived by those who work directly in the field. It is thus necessary to listen to their voices and intensify the exchange of experiences and innovative models among them and among the Development NGOs and public entities of the BAC, in the search for greater knowledge and the development of common models.

6.5 PILOT TESTING OTHER APPROACHES/TOOLS

Many of the Development NGOs that perceive serious limitations of the Logical Framework feel, however, “inhibited” when testing alternatives to it in practice. Pressure from a number of sources, mainly the demands of donors to approve projects based on the Logical Framework, difficulties to adapt processes and/or internal management structures that are already consolidated, and even problems to communicate new tools to their partners, in the end lead to them continuing with the approach of the Logical Framework in the belief that “better the devil you know than the devil you don’t know yet”.

It is necessary to stop this trend and offer favourable frameworks for the entities that want to explore alternative tools in more depth. And to this end it seems interesting to encourage, on a small scale and as pilot schemes, these initiatives. However, we must be realistic, so therefore:

- It is preferable to select interventions financed mainly with funds from the Development NGOs themselves that are public subsidies, given the greater flexibility shown in these first cases
- For this it is convenient to look for solid local partners, with important management skills, with whom there is a long tradition of collaboration based on a strong understanding and mutual communication
- It is important to test interventions that are suitable for this, normally those with which the Logical Framework has greater limitations (i.e. long-term programmes, in complex contexts and/or with multiple agents)

On the other hand, public entities in the BAC have in their Direct Cooperation an ideal field to test alternative tools/approaches to the Logical Framework. And this thanks to the flexibility permitted by these instruments and to the type of components that could be used (technical assistance, institutional and skills strengthening, etc.) and its continuity over time (the agreements are normally renewed periodically). It is necessary for the public entities to not restrict their direct
interventions to replicating the projects they finance through Development NGOs, and to consider not only the intrinsic value of testing new models to improve the quality of these interventions, but also the potential effect that they could have, in the event of being successful, on other agents (Development NGOs in particular). In this way a contribution can be made towards generating added value in development cooperation by the public sector, beyond the traditional role of financing that these entities adopt.

In any event, whether it is the Development NGOs/partners who test new pilot tools, or public entities, it is important **to assess the interventions managed with them**, evaluating their suitability, their acceptance by all the parties involved and their effective contribution towards achieving the goals set. In particular, it is convenient **to compare their performance with respect to that achieved in similar interventions by the traditional Logical Framework**, in order to learn lessons and thus make adaptations and progress with them. As a last step, and in line with the previous recommendation, all these assessments must be shared with the remaining agents in order to achieve as much diffusion and responses as possible, helping to dynamise and feed the debate on this issue.
7. ANNEXES

7.1 PROFILE AND LIST OF ENTITIES CONSULTED

PUBLIC ENTITIES

- BASQUE GOVERNMENT
- REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OF ALAVA
- REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OF BISCAY
- REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OF GUIPUZCOA

- CITY COUNCILS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>EIBAR</td>
<td>LAUDIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRETXABALETA</td>
<td>ELGOIBAR</td>
<td>LEGORRETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRIGORRIAGA</td>
<td>GALDAKAO</td>
<td>MANCOMUNIDAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKIO</td>
<td>GERNIKA</td>
<td>BIDEBERRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEASAIN</td>
<td>GETARIA</td>
<td>(ELGETA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRGA</td>
<td>GETXO</td>
<td>ANTZUOLA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILBAO</td>
<td>HONDARRIBIA</td>
<td>LEINTZGATZAGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONOSTIA-SAN SEBASTIAN</td>
<td>IDIAZABAL</td>
<td>ORIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LASARTE-ORIA</td>
<td>OROZKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOPELANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEVELOPMENT NGOS

- ALBOAN
- ASOCIACIÓN AFRICANISTA MANUEL IRADIER
- BATEGINEZ
- BEHAR BIDASOA
- BERRIKUNTZA ERAKUNDEA
- BULTZAPEN
- CALCUTA ONDOAN
- CARITAS BILBAO
- CIRCULO SOLIDARIO EUSKADI
- CODESPA
- CRUZ ROJA GUIPUZCOA
- EDEX CENTRO DE RECURSOS COMUNITARIOS
- EMAUS FUNDACIÓN SOCIAL
- F.I.S.C. - Fundación Innovación Social de la Cultura - K.S.B.E. - Kulturaren Sozial
- FUNDACIÓN ANESVAD
- FUNDACIÓN AYUDA MAS
- FUNDACIÓN DESARROLLO SOSTENIDO / GARAPEN IRAUNKORREKO FUNDAZIOA / FUNDESO EUSKADI
- FUNDACIÓN MUNDUBAT / MUNDUBAT FUNDAZIOA
- FUNDACIÓN PRIVADA INTERVIDA
- FUNDACIÓN PROCLADE YANAPAY
- FUNDACIÓN PROYDE-PROEGA
- SAVE THE CHILDREN FOUNDATION
- FUNDACIÓN TAU FUNDAZIOA
- GARAPENA
UNIVERSITIES

- UNIVERSITY OF DEUSTO
- UNIVERSITY OF THE BASQUE COUNTRY (UPV)

LOCAL PARTNERS

- AFESIP LAOS (LAOS)
- ALERT, ASSOCIATION FOR LEPROSY EDUCATION, REHABILITATION & TREATMENT (INDIA)
- ASOCIACION CORDES (EL SALVADOR)
- BETHANY SOCIETY (INDIA)
- CÁRITAS ARQUIDIOCESANA DEL CUSCO (PERU)
- CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y PROMOCIÓN POPULAR CENDIPP (PERU)
- CHILD RIGHTS FOUNDATION (CAMBODIA)
- CIOMAL FOUNDATION (SWITZERLAND)
- CORPORACIÓN ECOLÓGICA Y CULTURAL PENCA DE SÁBILA (COLOMBIA)
- FUNDACIÓN MAQUITA CUSHUNCHIC COMERCIALIZANDO COMO HERMANOS (MCCH) (ECUADOR)
- OFICINA DE DESARROLLO, COMPAÑÍA DE JESÚS (PERU)
- PROGRAMME NATIONAL DE LUTTE CONTRE LA LEPRE ET L’ULCERE DE BURULLI (PNLUB) DU BENIN (REPUBLIC OF BENIN)
- PROJET DITUNGA “PRODI” (DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO)
- SOCIA LOCAL DE INTERED (PERU)
- SŒURS CARMELITES DE LA CHARITE VEDRUNA (TOGO, GABON)
- UDAYANI SOCIAL ACTION FORUM (INDIA)
7.2 LIST OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS ANALYSED

PUBLIC ENTITIES OF THE BAC

- BASQUE GOVERNMENT
- REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OF ALAVA
- REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OF BISCAY
- REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OF GUIPUZKOA
- CITY COUNCILS:
  - AMURRIO
  - ARETXABALETA
  - AZPEITIA
  - BARAKALDO
  - BASAURI
  - BEASAIN
  - BILBAO
  - DONOSTI-SAN SEBASTIAN
  - DURANGO
  - EIBAR
  - ELGOIBAR
  - ERMUA
  - ESKORIATZA
  - GALDAKAO
  - GERNIKA
  - GETXO
  - HONDARRIBIA
  - HERNANI
  - IRUN
  - IURRETA
  - LAUDIO
  - LAZKAO
  - LEGAZPI
  - LEGORRETA
  - LEIOA
  - MONTARAGÓN
  - MUSKIZ
  - ORDIZIA
  - ORIO
  - RENTERIA
  - TOLOSA
  - URRETXU
  - VITORIA
  - GAZTEIZ
  - ZEGAMA
  - ZUMAIA

EUROPEAN DONORS

- German Cooperation
- British Cooperation
- Danish Cooperation
- European Cooperation
- Swedish cooperation

SPANISH COOPERATION AGENTS

- AECID
- CCAA:
  - ANDALUCIA
  - ARAGÓN
  - ASTURIAS
  - CANTABRIA
  - CASTILLA Y LEON
  - CASTILLA LA MANCHA
  - CATALUÑA
  - EXTREMADURA
  - GALICIA
  - ISLAS BALEARES
  - ISLAS CANARIAS
  - LA RIOJA
  - MADRID
  - MURCIA
  - NAVARRA
  - VALENCIA
### 7.3 MODELS OF RECORDS AND QUESTIONNAIRES USED

#### PUBLIC ENTITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

**1. IDENTIFICATION DATA OF THE PUBLIC INSTITUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Public Institution:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area/Department in charge of Development Cooperation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of person responsible/contact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail contact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone contact (direct):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. DATA ON REGULATIONS RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Public Administration’s own regulations</th>
<th>There are (yes/no)</th>
<th>Where can it be found (if possible we would be grateful if it could be sent by e-mail along with the questionnaire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Terms and Conditions for existing Development Cooperation aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last open call for Development Cooperation aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current forms for the presentation of proposals and reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE / APPLICATION OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

In your public institution, do you require or work with the Logical Framework in your terms and conditions and/or regulatory decrees on development cooperation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the public institution that you represent apply the Logical Framework in the following instruments?</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO projects</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO programmes</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct cooperation</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian aid / emergencies</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-development</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness-raising and development education</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instruments (specify here)</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there were any differences in the application of the Logical Framework for each of the instruments mentioned above, explain here:
4. ASSESSMENT OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

**What function/use does the Logical Framework Approach have, in your opinion, in development cooperation projects?** (score from 1 to 5, where 5 is the maximum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function/Use</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A participative tool for the identification and planning of projects</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A way to present proposals in a logical, summarised and clear manner</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An objective way to compare and assess proposals in order to determine which ones deserve to be approved as priorities</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A base with which to measure the results reached and therefore the efficacy of the project</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codesarrollo</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify here)</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What importance would you say is attached IN PRACTICE by your institution to the presentation of proposals based on the Logical Framework when approving or rejecting them (regardless of the existing specific assessment requirements)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In particular, do you think that approving proposals submitted by Development NGOs using the Logical Framework Approach usually means that the highest quality proposals of those submitted are approved?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Briefly explain your answer**

**In particular, do you consider that the Logical Framework Approach is ideal for interventions that work from a gender-based perspective?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Briefly explain your answer**

**Briefly point out what you consider to be the main advantages/strengths and inconveniences/weaknesses of the Logical Framework, according to your experience.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses/inconveniences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If you consider that there is a specific type of intervention for which the Logical Framework IS NOT the best approach, indicate which ones:**

- Depending on the sector
- Depending on the geographical area
- Depending on the duration
- Depending on the type and/or size of the NGO
- Due to other reasons (indicate)

**In particular, do you consider that the Logical Framework Approach is ideal for interventions that work from a gender-based perspective?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Briefly explain your answer**
### 5. Alternatives to the Logical Framework

**Has your Public Institution discussed/analysed any initiative to adapt and/or substitute the Logical Framework Approach with other tools when requesting and assessing proposals by Development NGOs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If so, indicate which and to what extent it has been effectively applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If not, what do you think were the reasons? (score from 1 to 5, where 5 is the most accurate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No alternatives are known of at a theoretical-doctrine level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does not seem to be necessary; the Logical Framework works fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring practical difficulties if applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring difficulties of a regulatory nature when assessing it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other motives (<em>indicate</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you aware of any alternative tool or methodology to the Logical Framework?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, indicate how you learned about it (doctrine, another public institution / NGO applies it, etc.)

Describe it briefly (if known in detail)
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## DEVELOPMENT NGO QUESTIONNAIRE

### 1. IDENTIFICATION DATA OF THE DEVELOPMENT NGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Development NGO</th>
<th>Experience of the Development NGO (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main geographical area/s of action (mark with an X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main sector/s of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of projects running (approx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of partners you work with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the budget from public entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of person responsible/position:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail contact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone contact (direct):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE / APPLICATION OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

**How is the Logical Framework mainly used in your organisation? (mark with an X)**

- We do not use it in our organisation *(explain in detail in section 4)*
- It is used jointly with all the local actors to identify and plan projects integrally from the start
- It is used jointly with our local partners, only to summarise and formulate the objectives, results, indicators, etc. in a matrix
- It is only used by our organisation to re-structure, organise and present the proposals we receive from our local partners to the donors
- Other modalities of application *(specify here)*

**What is the real level of PRACTICAL application/usefulness that you would say the Logical Framework has in your organisation for project management?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Does your organisation apply the Logical Framework in all its interventions? (if no interventions are developed leave the checkbox blank)**

- Projects
- Programmes
- Humanitarian aid / emergencies
- Co-development
- Awareness-raising and development education
- Other interventions *(specify here)*

- YES/NO

If there were any difference in the application of the Logical Framework for each one of the interventions mentioned above, explain here:

**Does your organisation apply the Logical Framework in the same way in the case of projects financed by public institutions and in that of projects supported with own funds?**

- YES/NO

If not point out the main differences
### What function/use does the Logical Framework Approach have, in your opinion, in development cooperation projects? (score from 1 to 5, where 5 is the maximum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function/Use</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A participative tool for the identification and planning of projects</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A way to assess the proposals of local partners and to appreciate their capacity</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A way to formulate and present proposals in a logical, summarised and clear manner</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A requirement of public institutions that is necessary to receive approval</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tool for monitoring the efficacy and efficiency of the project</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An instrument to assess the project’s final impact and to extract lessons</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others <em>(specify here)</em></td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. ASSESSMENT OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

#### Briefly point out what you consider to be the main advantages/strengths and inconveniences/weaknesses of the Logical Framework, according to your experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/advantages</th>
<th>Weaknesses/inconveniences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In particular, do you consider that the Logical Framework Approach facilitates collaboration and working together with your local partners

**YES/NO**

Briefly explain your answer

#### If you consider that there is a specific type of intervention for which the Logical Framework IS NOT the best approach, indicate which ones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depending on the sector</th>
<th>Depending on the geographical area</th>
<th>Depending on the duration</th>
<th>Depending on the type and/or size of the partner</th>
<th>Due to other reasons (indicate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In particular, do you consider that the Logical Framework Approach is ideal for interventions that seek the empowerment of women And for those that work from a gender-based perspective?

**YES/NO**

Briefly explain your answer
### 4. ALTERNATIVES TO THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your Organisation discussed/analysed any initiative to adapt and/or substitute the Logical Framework Approach with other tools when managing cooperation interventions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>If so, indicate which and to what extent it has been effectively applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, what do you think were the reasons? (score from 1 to 5, where 5 is the most accurate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No other alternatives are known of at a theoretical-doctrine level There is a lack of training 1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It does not seem to be necessary; the Logical Framework has worked fine up until now 1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring practical difficulties if applied in our NGO 1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring difficulties when collaborating with local partners 1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring difficulties when presenting proposals to Public Institutions and obtaining funds from them 1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other motives (indicate) 1 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of any alternative tool or methodology to the Logical Framework?</td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, indicate how you learned about it (doctrine, another NGO / local partner applies it, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Describe it briefly (if known in detail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

If not, what do you think were the reasons? (score from 1 to 5, where 5 is the most accurate)
### LOCAL PARTNERS QUESTIONNAIRE

#### 1. IDENTIFICATION DATA OF THE ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development NGO/s of the BAC it collaborates with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Organisation (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main sector/s of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of projects running (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% budget of Development NGOs of the BAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person responsible/position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone contact (direct):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE / APPLICATION OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

**How is the Logical Framework mainly used in your organisation? (mark with an X)**

- We do not use it in our organisation *(explain in detail in section 4)*
- It is used jointly with all the local actors to identify and plan projects integrally from the start
- It is used jointly with the Development NGOs in the North, only to summarise and formulate the objectives, results, indicators, etc. in a matrix
- It is only used by the Development NGO in the North to re-structure, organise and present our proposals to the donors
- Other modalities of application *(specify here)*

**What is the real level of PRACTICAL application/usefulness that you would say the Logical Framework has in your organisation for project management?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Does your organisation apply the Logical Framework in all its interventions? *(if no interventions are developed leave the checkbox blank)***

- Projects
- Programmes
- Co-development
- Codesarrollo
- Awareness-raising and development education
- Other interventions *(specify here)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there were any difference in the application of the Logical Framework for each one of the interventions mentioned above, explain here:
### 3. ASSESSMENT OF THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

#### Briefly point out what you consider to be the main advantages/strengths and inconveniences/weaknesses of the Logical Framework, according to your experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/advantages</th>
<th>Weaknesses/inconveniences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### In particular, do you consider that the Logical Framework Approach facilitates collaboration and working together with Development NGOs in the North?  
**YES/NO**

**Briefly explain your answer**

#### If you consider that there is a specific type of intervention for which the Logical Framework IS NOT the best approach, indicate which ones:

- Depending on the sector
- Depending on the geographical area
- Depending on the duration
- Depending on the type and/or size of the Organisation
- Due to other reasons (indicate)

**In particular, do you consider that the Logical Framework Approach is ideal for interventions that seek the empowerment of women? And for those that work from a gender-based perspective?**  
**YES/NO**

**Briefly explain your answer**
## 4. ALTERNATIVES TO THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

### Has your Organisation discussed/analysed any initiative to adapt and/or substitute the Logical Framework Approach with other tools when managing cooperation interventions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If so, indicate which and to what extent it has been effectively applied.

### If not, what do you think were the reasons? (score from 1 to 5, where 5 is the most accurate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No other alternatives are known of at a theoretical-doctrine level.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of training.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does not seem to be necessary; the Logical Framework has worked fine up until now</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring practical difficulties if applied in our Organisation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring difficulties when collaborating with Development NGOs in the North</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be interesting, but it would bring difficulties when presenting proposals to Public Institutions and obtaining funds from them</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other motives <em>(indicate)</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are you aware of any alternative tool or methodology to the Logical Framework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If yes, indicate how you learned about it *(doctrine, another NGO/local partner applies it, etc.)*

Describe it briefly *(if known in detail)*
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