

# LOGICAL FRAMEWORK TEMPLATE



International Federation  
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Click the links for [definition of terms](#), example [logframe 1](#) and [example 2](#) and [project/programme planning guidance manual](#) on Fednet

## ***[Project Name] LOGFRAME***

OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
<b>Goal</b>			
<b>Outcome 1</b>			
<b>Output 1.1</b>			
<b>Output 1.2</b>			
<b>Output 1.3</b>			
<b>Activities</b> <i>Activities may often be included in separate document (activity schedule) for practical purposes</i>	Inputs/resources	Costs & sources	
<b>Outcome 2</b>			
<b>Output 2.1</b>			
<b>Output 2.2</b>			
<b>Output 2.3</b>			
<b>Activities</b>	Inputs/resources	Costs & sources	
<b>Outcome 3</b>			
<b>Output 3.1</b>			
<b>Output 3.2</b>			
<b>Output 3.3</b>			
<b>Activities</b>	Inputs/resources	Costs & sources	

*Continue to add additional rows for outcomes, outputs and activities as necessary*

## IFRC Logical Framework (logframe) – Definition of Terms

<b>OBJECTIVES</b> (What we want to achieve)	<b>INDICATORS</b> (How to measure change)	<b>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</b> (Where / how to get information)	<b>ASSUMPTIONS</b> (What else to be aware of)
<p><b>Goal</b></p> <p>The long-term results that an intervention seeks to achieve, which may be contributed to by factors outside the intervention.</p>	<p><b>Impact Indicators</b></p> <p>Quantitative and/or qualitative criteria that provide a simple and reliable means to measure achievement or reflect changes connected to the goal.</p>	<p>How the information on the indicator will be collected (<i>can include who will collect it and how often</i>).</p>	<p>External conditions necessary if the Goal is to contribute to the next level of intervention.</p>
<p><b>Outcomes<sup>1</sup></b></p> <p>The primary result(s) that an intervention seeks to achieve, most commonly in terms of the knowledge, attitudes or practices of the target group.</p>	<p><b>Outcome Indicators</b></p> <p>As above, connected to the stated outcome.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>External conditions not under the direct control of the intervention necessary if the outcome is to contribute to reaching intervention goal.</p>
<p><b>Outputs</b></p> <p>The tangible products, goods and services and other immediate results that lead to the achievement of outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Output Indicators</b></p> <p>As above, connected to the stated outputs.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>External factors not under the direct control of the intervention which could restrict the outputs leading to the outcome.</p>
<p><b>Activities<sup>2</sup></b></p> <p>The collection of tasks to be carried out in order to achieve the outputs.</p>	<p><b>Process Indicators</b></p> <p>As above, connected to the stated activities.</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>External factors not under the direct control of the intervention which could restrict progress of activities.</p>

<sup>1</sup> When there is more than one outcome in a project the outputs should be listed under each outcome – see the examples on the following pages.

<sup>2</sup> Activities may often be included in separate document (e.g. activity schedule / GANTT chart) for practical purposes

## EXAMPLE 1: WATER AND SANITATION PROJECT

OBJECTIVES (What you want to achieve)	INDICATORS (How to measure change)	MEANS OF VERIFICATION (Where & how to get information)	ASSUMPTIONS (What else to be aware of)
<b>Goal:</b> Reduce death and illness related to Water and Sanitation related diseases in the targeted communities	G1 % (percentage) reduction in water and sanitation related diseases among target population G2 % of children under 36 months with diarrhoea in the last two weeks	Ministry of Health / WHO statistics Records from village clinics	
<b>Outcome 1</b> Improved access to and use of sustainable sources of safe water in target communities	1a % of people in the target communities using minimum 25L of safe water per day 1b % of targeted households with access to an functional water source 1c % of water points managed by local WatSan committees 1d # hours spent by women in fetching water daily	1a,b,d Household survey 1c Key informant interviews with WatSan committee members	Civil war / hostilities do not return Improved access to clinical health facilities
<b>Outputs</b> 1.1 Community water points constructed or rehabilitated	1.1a # (number) of water points constructed to national standard (140) 1.1ab% of water handpumps rehabilitated to national standard (35)	"Community Facility Inspection" field report	Low rainfall does not limit overall water supply.
1.2 Community management of water points is improved	1.2a # of communities with a WatSan committee established 1.2b # of WatSan committees with technicians trained to perform basic maintenance on water points 1.2c % of WatSan committees collecting adequate charges to maintain the water points	1.2a Household survey Key informant interviews with WatSan committee members	No major disputes or conflicts within the community
<b>Outcome 2</b> Improved access to and use of sustainable sanitation facilities among targeted communities	2a % of people in the target communities using latrines on a daily basis 2b % of targeted households with access to functional latrines meeting national standard 2c % of latrines managed by local WatSan committees	2a,b Household survey 2c Key informant interviews with WatSan committee members	Civil war / hostilities do not return
<b>Outputs</b> 2.1 Sanitation facilities constructed	2.1a # of fully functioning household latrines constructed (3,500)	"Community Facility Inspection" field report	Flooding or other environmental problems do not affect sanitation facilities

## EXAMPLE 1: WATER AND SANITATION PROJECT

OBJECTIVES (What you want to achieve)	INDICATORS (How to measure change)	MEANS OF VERIFICATION (Where & how to get information)	ASSUMPTIONS (What else to be aware of)
2.2 Sanitation facility use is promoted	2.2a # of demonstration toilets constructed (25) 2.2b # of awareness session on use of latrines (25) 2.2 c # of people reached by sanitation promotion activities (2000)	"Community Facility Inspection" field report	
2.3 Community management of sanitation facilities is improved	See also indicator 1.2a 2.3a # of community WatSan committees with technicians trained to perform basic maintenance sanitation facilities 2.3b % of WatSan committees collecting adequate charges to maintain the sanitation systems	Key informant interviews with WatSan committee members	No major disputes or conflicts within the community
<b>Outcome 3</b> Enhanced practice of safe hygiene and sanitation in the household	3a % of households storing drinking water in separate, covered containers. 3b % of households storing food in sanitary, covered containers	Household survey	Civil war / hostilities do not return
<b>Outputs</b> 3.1 Household knowledge increased on safe hygiene & sanitation	3.1 % of people (men/women) who can correctly identify at least 3 critical times when to wash hands.	Household survey	Cultural practices (unknown to project team) do not go against practices promoted
3.2 Household training on safe hygiene and sanitation provided	3.2a % of households trained in safe hygiene and sanitation practices including at least one female member. 3.2b # of trainings on safe hygiene and sanitation practices given	Training report.	People continue to have sufficient time to attend training

## EXAMPLE 2: COMMUNITY & SCHOOL DISASTER MANAGEMENT (DM) PROJECT

Objectives	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
<p><b>Goal:</b> Reduce deaths and injuries related to disasters in the Eastern District.</p>	<p>G1: ratio of deaths caused by disaster to number of people exposed to a disaster in the target district <i>(10:100,000 within 2 years)</i></p> <p>G2: % of injuries caused by disasters within population exposed to a disaster in the target district <i>(5% within 2 years)</i></p>	<p>G1: Xland Government Disaster Management Agency statistics for the region <i>(analysed by project manager, annually)</i></p> <p>G2: Sample survey by branch disaster management officers <i>(reviewed 6 monthly by project manager)</i></p>	<p>No major unexpected epidemics, serious civil unrest or “mega-disaster” occur.</p>
<b>Community Disaster Management Capacity Building</b>			
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> The capacity of communities to prepare for and respond to disasters is improved.</p>	<p>1a: % of people in participating communities who practise 5 or more disaster preparedness measures identified in the community DM plan <i>(80% in 2 years)</i></p> <p>1b: % of targeted communities with identified response mechanisms in place <i>(80% in 2 years)</i></p>	<p>1a: Focus group discussions during CDMC meetings <i>(monthly, by CDMC members &amp; Red Cross volunteers)</i>.</p> <p>1b: CDMC meetings/DM plans <i>(collected &amp; verified by project officer)</i></p>	<p>The political and security situation remains stable allowing community-level actions to be carried out.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.1:</b> Community Disaster Management Plans are developed and tested by Community Disaster Management Committees (CDMCs).</p> <p><b>Output 1.2:</b> Early warning systems to monitor disaster risks are established.</p> <p><b>Output 1.3:</b> Communities’ awareness of measures to prepare for and respond to disasters is improved.</p>	<p>1.1: # of participating communities that have a tested Disaster Management Plan <i>(16 [out of 20] within 2 years)</i></p> <p>1.2: % of communities with an early warning system in place <i>(90% within 2 years)</i></p> <p>1.3: % of people [of which 50% are female] in participating communities who can identify at least 5 preparedness and 5 response measures. <i>(75% within 1 year)</i></p>	<p>1.1: Copies of DM plans <i>(collected by project manager)</i></p> <p>1.2: Field officer’s report</p> <p>1.3: Focus group discussions <i>(every 3 months, by National Society volunteers &amp; project staff)</i> – cross-checked during annual disaster simulation <i>(annually by CDMC members &amp; National Society project officers)</i></p>	<p>The economy remains stable, and food shortages do not become acute.</p> <p>The security situation in the country does not prevent implementation of the DM plan.</p> <p>Local political leaders support implementation of the findings of the VCA.</p>
<p><b>Activities (for Output 1.1)</b></p> <p>1.1.1 Organize 10 community planning meetings.</p> <p>1.1.2 Engage volunteer peer facilitators.</p>	<p><b>Inputs/resources</b></p> <p>1.1.1: Space to hold meetings, trainers/peer facilitators, training materials</p> <p>1.1.2: Per diems</p> <p>1.1.3: Computers, printers, awareness-raising</p>	<p><b>Costs &amp; sources</b></p> <p>CHF 20,000 (appeal), CHF 2,000 (locally raised funds), volunteer time, donated space for meeting/training</p>	<p>People in the community have no new demands on their time preventing them from participating.</p>

## EXAMPLE 2: COMMUNITY & SCHOOL DISASTER MANAGEMENT (DM) PROJECT

Objectives	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions
1.1.3 Develop/translate community DM awareness materials.	materials, translator		
<b>Activities for other outputs</b>	<b>Inputs &amp; resources for other outputs</b>	<b>Costs &amp; sources for other outputs</b>	
<b>School-based Disaster Management Capacity Building</b>			
<b>Outcome 2</b> The capacity of schools to prepare for and respond to disasters is improved	1a: % of schools that have passed the annual disaster safety inspection from the Ministry of Disaster Management ( <i>80% within 2 years</i> )  1b: % of participating schools that have successfully conducted 1 disaster simulation ( <i>60% within 1 year and 80% within 2 years</i> )	1a: Ministry of Disaster Management records  1b: Project reporting system through a simulation checklist	The political and security situation remains stable allowing school-level actions to be carried out.
<b>Output 2.1</b> School Disaster Management plans are developed and tested at participating schools. <b>Output 2.2:</b> School Disaster Management Groups (DMGs) are formed in participating schools. <b>Output 2.3:</b> Disaster risk reduction lessons are included in the curriculum.	1.1: # of participating schools that have a new DM Plan tested ( <i>20 [out of 25] within 2 years</i> )  1.2: % of DMGs that have at least 2 teachers/staff, 2 parents, 2 students, and conduct regular monthly meetings ( <i>80% within 2 years</i> )  1.3: % of students [of which 25% are female] in the targeted schools who have received disaster preparedness and disaster risk education	1.1a: Copy of school DM plan ( <i>checked by project manager, every 6 months</i> )  1.2a: DMU meeting minutes ( <i>checked by project manager, every 6 months</i> )  1.3a: School classroom reports ( <i>project manager &amp; volunteer, every 6 months</i> )	Students are not taken out of school by their parents.  The majority of teachers remain in their jobs for at least 1 year.
<b>Activities (for output 2.1)</b> 2.1.1 Organize 10 school planning meetings. 2.1.2 Train school teachers in facilitating DM planning. 2.1.3 Develop/translate school-based DM awareness materials.	<b>Input/ Resources</b> 2.1.1: Space to hold meetings, trainers/peer facilitators, training materials 2.1.2: Classroom, training materials 2.1.3: Computers, printers, awareness raising materials, translator	<b>Costs &amp; sources</b> CHF 10,000 (appeal), CHF 3,000 (locally raised funds), volunteer time, donated space for meeting/training	People in the community have no new demands on their time preventing them from participating
<b>Activities for other outputs</b>	<b>Inputs &amp; resources for other outputs</b>	<b>Costs &amp; sources for other outputs</b>	