Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs

DARWIN INITIATIVE

Funded by UK Government

Workshop for Darwin Stage 2 Applicants

31st October 2019

Group exercises & additional resources

1. Mapping a project design

Working as a group, you will be given the components of a logframe taken from a Darwin Initiative Project. You will also be given some post-it notes and pens. In your groups:

- Identify the problem statement
- Identify the project activities, outputs, outcome and impact
- Think about the 'why'
    - Is it clear?
    - Do you have any questions about the change process?
    - Are there any leaps of logic/evidence gaps?
    - What risks and assumptions are there?
- Map the project components onto logframe format and discuss as a group

You will need to think about:

- How activities are combined to achieve outputs (what processes need to occur)
- How those outputs combine to effect intermediate change (outcome)
- The critical assumptions that need to be considered
- The particular contextual issues that need to be considered
- Does this project design truly address the problem statement?
- Are project components necessary and sufficient to bring about intended change?

Feedback to plenary.

The table below, taken from the Stage 2 Application form, may provide useful frames of reference. Once you have completed the exercise, think about how you may use these tools to improve your own project design.

Darwin Plus and IWT Logframe format:

Impact:

*

You have entered 0 words (30 words max)

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Outcome:			
*	0.1, 0.2, etc. *	0.1, 0.2, etc. *	*
You have entered 0 words (30 words max)			
Output 1:	1.1, 1.2, etc.	1.1, 1.2, etc.	
Output 2:	2.1, 2.2, etc.	2.1, 2.2, etc.	
Output 3:	3.1, 3.2, etc.	3.1, 3.2, etc.	

2. Evidence Exercise

Stage 1

- Sort out the indicators from the 'Means of Verification' (MoV)
- Identify which indicators are appropriate to each level of the results chain (Output or Outcome)
- Map onto relevant part of your logframe
- Assess quality of indicators against SMART criteria. Consider how they could be improved. Identify at least one example to feed back to the plenary.

Stage 2

- Take the 'MoV' identified in step 1 and match to the corresponding indicator
- Discuss the MoV in turn. Is it feasible*? Will it produce high quality evidence? Is it relevant to the indicator? Is it sufficient? Remember, evidence should be independently verifiable, so internal project reports alone won't be enough. Such MoV should be triangulated with independent evidence
- If MoV are not appropriate or feasible, discuss more robust alternative(s)
- In light of the evidence assessment, review whether alternative wording of indicator would be more appropriate to reflect the result and a realistic likelihood that evidence may be collected to verify / measure it

*Feasibility should consider time, resources, expertise

Additional materials

SMART Indicators

At home, have at least 1 colleague review the logframe indicators included in your application. Have them undertake a SMART analysis of each indicator, assessing whether it is:

1. **Specific:** Is it Specific? Appropriately phrased for the level in the project results hierarchy (e.g. is an input indicator used as an output indicator, is an output indicator used as an outcome indicator?) Will it measure whether the output will be achieved, or measure whether the outcome delivers the change that is anticipated

2. **Measurable:** How will the indicator be measured? Will it need a baseline to be established first?

3. **Achievable:** Can the project achieve the indicator in the time scale and with the resources available to it? Is the information that needs to be collected to measure the indicator available at an acceptable cost?

4. **Relevant:** Will the indicator deliver relevant management information that may be used to improve the project's performance?

5. **Time-bound:** Is there an indication of when the indicator milestone is expected to be met?

Score out of 10 for the SMARTness of each outcome indicator i.e. score out of 2 for S, out of 2 for M etc.

2 = fits the requirements

1 = ok but weak

0 = weak and does not meet the requirements

Examples from existing projects

Below is a table of example good and less good indicators from existing Darwin projects.

	Output	Outcome
Good	At least 90% of fisher folk (n=600) are using recommended fishing equipment and respecting local fishing regulations by 2016.	Six community associations are active (as demonstrated by meeting minutes) across the entire catchment and are working together to address catchment scale issues by year 3.
Less good	Increased use of recommended fishing equipment, and adherence to regulations amongst local fisher folk.	Community associations are established and strengthened.
Good	By end year 3, at least 30 investigations into traders or trade routes of CITES-listed sharks and rays species have been undertaken by the marine wildlife conservation unit (baseline = 2).	By 2018 at least 100 specialised shark and manta fishers have transitioned to alternative sustainable fishing or non-fishing practices (baseline = 0), that increase incomes by >25% (from $1 a day to $1.25) and offer long term livelihood security.
Less good	A greater number of investigations carried out into those involved in the illegal wildlife trade.	Number of specialised shark and manta fishers is reduced and incomes of non-fishers increased.
Good	Confirmed list of public offices, officers, and other stakeholders that will be involved in the daily implementation of the ABS measure to be implemented, including 'outreach officers' who will be needed to help stakeholders operate under the system created.	By 2017, 4 'on the record' negotiations initiated involving government authorities and local communities for access and benefit-sharing agreements that would contribute to improved economic development of poor rural women and men, and create conservation incentives in Benin and Madagascar. By 2018 at least two ABS agreements finalised following procedures proposed and or adopted by the project.
Less good	A greater number of households within the project area are engaged in alternative livelihoods activities.	An increase in the number of project beneficiaries engaged in more than one conservation programme.
Good	10 reserve staff and 40 community members trained in grassland management techniques by the end of year 2.	At least 50% of households (disaggregated by gender i.e. Female-headed vs Male headed) report average improvement in wellbeing scores by year 3 compared to year 1 baseline.

Useful Links in relation to quality of evidence

Bond: https://www.bond.org.uk/resources/evidence-principles

DFID, 2014
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/291982/HTN-strength-evidence-march2014.pdf

Preparing an M&E Plan

As part of your application preparation, consider how you will implement your monitoring by drafting an M&E plan. You may use the template below.

You will be required to do this as a new project anyway, and it is a good way of sense checking your planned monitoring framework that out set out in your logframe.

Template

Indicator	Means of Verification	What needs to be monitored / evaluated?	Methods for data collection	Sampling (who/what will be included? How many?)	Timing (when and how often is information required?)