LogFrame EXAMPLE - Peace Mediation

German Federal Foreign Office - Division S03

Funding area crisis prevention, conflict management, stabilisation and peacebuilding

Project:	Constructive Dialogue in Region X
Project no:	123
Implementing organisation:	4Peace&Dialogue!
Duration:	01.01.2020 - 31.12.2020

Project objectives
(as per section 2.1.a
of the application) **:**   To strengthen relations and dialogue among stakeholders from across the conflict divide and develop joint options for security arrangements in region X

Logical framework: Impacts result from the **o**utcome of the **o**utput of the **i**nput contributed (I-O-O-I).

*If you plan on implementing the project with a local **partner organisation** and on transferring project funds to them, please distinguish between both organisations involved by adding your respective acronyms after the resources to be contributed and the planned activities. Please also ensure consistency between the LogFrame, activity timeline and financial plan (activities should be numbered identically).*

Please use the LogFrame to provide a detailed and verifiable account of your project planning. It should be apparent which concrete steps you considerer realistic at the time of proposal writing, how these build upon each other and on what information you have based your assumptions. Please be as specific as possible when describing each step and state all details relevant to the specific context and project, such as the names of the conflict parties you are planning on working with, the conflict issues to be addressed, the techniques to be employed, the sequencing of formats and/or topics, how participants will be selected, and places and dates.
(These aspects are only an example and may vary depending on the context.)

Indicators are important signposts that signal whether project implementation and the expected change are on track. Formulated in the most specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) way possible, they can provide critical project-management information.

Under risks and adjustments, please outline your contingency plans should the above-mentioned steps not occur as expected.

The fictitious dialogue process provided below as an example is based on three ideal-type standard formats that build upon each other (bilateral talks, intra-group formats to prepare each side separately and an inter-group format including all sides). Dialogue processes can naturally consist of further or other formats. It is important to demonstrate how the outcomes of each format make the next format possible. The indicators are examples based on the above-mentioned steps and should always be customised to fit the specific context and project.

	Logical framework *In what steps do you expect to achieve the targeted impact?*	Indicators *What project-related qualitative and quantitative indicators can be used to verify the various items?*	Verifiability *What sources of data or information do you use to check the indicators? Where, how, when, from whom and how often is information gathered?*	Risks and adjustment *What unexpected and undesired effects can arise as regard to implementation and impact? How will you deal with them? What countermeasures and alternative implementation options exist?*
Contributed resources (INPUT) *Access, methods, knowledge*	Continuous bilateral cooperation and engagement with groups A, B and C (currently the relevant groups as regards reviving the dialogue process, see conflict analysis) since 2016; establishment of a basis of trust and direct communication channels.	• The existing communication channels **reach all** 3 groups and are used frequently. • **All** 3 groups **express** the wish for continued cooperation. • **All** 3 groups **agree** to the suggested approach.	• Email communication • Contact lists • Previous project reports • Mandate given to the implementing organisation by groups A, B and C to revive the dialogue process	
	Expertise in applying dialogue-process methods, such as group facilitation and communication techniques, as well as experience of planning activities sensitive to the degree of escalation, political context and conflict parties to be involved, thus enabling us to reach and engage groups A, B and C and to revive the dialogue process incrementally.	• The activities are prepared in a methodologically sound way: (1) The activities **build upon each** other (starting with bilateral talks, followed by intra-group preparatory workshops, and culminating in inter-group roundtables) and thoroughly **prepare** each group to engage in the dialogue process and move progressively from less to more sensitive issues. (2) The **selection** of participants follows a two-step process: individuals selected for the first activity select the stakeholders for the second and third activities. The **criteria for participation** are political affiliation and position, relevance vis-à-vis the issue of security arrangements in region X, and ethnic background. The utmost consideration is given to the inclusion of female representatives and stakeholders where possible. • The project staff's skills – such as expertise in group facilitation and communication techniques, experience of process design for dialogue processes in escalated conflict settings and in-depth knowledge of the socio-political context – **reflect** the project needs. • Track record of dialogue initiatives **implemented successfully** in similar contexts, such as track II dialogue processes conducted on security arrangements and federalism in regions Y and Z respectively (see website for details).	• Project proposal (conflict analysis, process design) • Project proposal (output 1, 2, 3 as shown in this LogFrame) • CVs of project staff • Previous project reports and evaluations • Website of the implementing organisation	

	Detailed knowledge of the political context and conflict dynamics, as well as cultural understanding through work in region X since 2015.	• The planned approach and activities **include all** relevant conflict-party actors. • The planned approach and activities **address** the issues relevant to conflict resolution. • The planned approach and activities **respect and reflect** cultural sensitivities.	• Project proposal (actor-mapping, selection of participants) • Project proposal (outputs 1, 2, 3 as shown in this LogFrame) • Previous project reports and evaluations	
Activities and products (OUTPUT) *Bilateral talks, dialogue/mediation events, training, publications*	Output 1 18 bilateral talks with *relevant representatives** from groups A, B and C in region X.	• At least **15** bilateral talks **conducted** in region X. • **All** representatives identified as relevant **accept** the invitation. • **All** representatives identified as relevant **attend** at the **requested level**.	• Invitation • Meeting reports • Financial documents	
*Under the German Peace Mediation Framework (July 2019), relevant actors are defined as individuals who (a) help to bring about a solution to a conflict; (b) are directly or indirectly affected by it; and/or (c) can help to shape possible solutions and will be affected by their implementation. Please see alignment with conflict analysis and actor-mapping in the project proposal under section 1 d.	Output 2 3 - 6 intra-group preparatory workshops focused on eliciting interests and providing training in negotiation and communication techniques with *relevant stakeholders* from groups A, B and C conducted in regions Y and Z.	• At least **3** intra-group preparatory workshops **conducted** in regions Y and Z. • **All** stakeholders identified as relevant **accept** the invitation and the suggested activities. • **All** stakeholders identified as relevant **attend** at the **requested level**.	• Invitation and agenda • Lists of participants (stating political affiliation and position, ethnic background and gender) • Meeting reports • Financial documents	
	Output 3 2 – 3 inter-group roundtables in the capital on security arrangements in region X focused on building trust and developing options for joint solutions with *selected stakeholders* from groups A, B and C (participating together).	• At least **1** inter-group roundtable in the capital on security arrangements in region X. • **All** selected stakeholders **accept** the invitation and the suggested activities. • **All** selected stakeholders **attend** at the **requested level**.	• Invitation and agenda • Lists of participant (stating political affiliation and position, ethnic background and gender) • Meeting reports • Financial documents	

Expected direct outcomes (OUTCOME) *Conflict awareness and behaviour of stakeholders addressed, capacity development*	Outcome 1 (resulting from Output 1) *Relevant representatives* from groups A, B and C are willing to discuss security arrangements in region X and see their interests are recognised by the dialogue facilitator; trust in the dialogue facilitator has increased, thus leading to willingness among the groups to prepare their own constituency for a dialogue process.	• **All** representatives identified as relevant **discuss** security arrangements in region X with the dialogue facilitator. • Talks with representatives identified as relevant **move from positions** towards assessing the constituencies' **interests.** • **All** representatives identified as relevant **present options** for preparing their own constituency for a dialogue process. • **All** representatives identified as relevant **request/mandate** follow-up activities with their constituencies.	• Meeting reports • Mandate to work with constituencies from groups A, B and C • Documents related to follow-up activities	
	Outcome 2 (resulting from Output 2) *Relevant stakeholders* from groups A, B and C have agreed on key issues for negotiations and/or red lines for engaging in a dialogue process and strengthened their negotiation and communication capacities, thus resulting in enhanced in-group cohesion and willingness to engage with stakeholders from the other conflict parties.	• **All** stakeholders identified as relevant **demonstrate an understanding** of and capacities in negotiation and communication techniques. • **All** stakeholders identified as relevant **agree on the key issues** for negotiations. • **Red lines** for engaging in a dialogue process **are identified**. • (Public) statements **communicating similar interests** on key conflict issues are made by stakeholders from **all** 3 groups. • **All** stakeholders identified as relevant request/mandate follow-up activities or **reach out to/meet** other stakeholders from across the conflict divide.	• Activity protocol (including exercises, role plays, contributions towards discussions demonstrating active participation by individuals) • Feedback forms • Joint papers (intra-party documents) • Public statements • Documents related to follow-up activities • Media reports	
	Outcome 3 (resulting from Output 3) *Selected stakeholders* from groups A, B and C develop a joint agenda, engage in discussions across the conflict divide about security arrangements in region X and identify common interests and options for joint solutions; trust between selected stakeholders from groups A, B and C develops and they increasingly refrain from using escalating/dehumanising language.	• **All** selected stakeholders **agree** to discuss security arrangements in region X during the dialogue process. • **All** selected stakeholders **actively engage** in discussions across the conflict divide about security arrangements in region X. • **At least 5** common interests are **identified** and **formulated** accordingly. • **At least 3** options for joint solutions regarding security arrangements in region X are **developed.** • **All** selected stakeholders **use** constructive and de-escalating language during and outside meetings. • **At least 1** (public) statement **recognising** the legitimate concerns of the other side is made by selected stakeholders from each of the three groups.	• Participant lists (stating political affiliation and position, ethnic background and gender) • Meeting reports • Joint documents (agenda, interests/joint options formulated) • Public statements • Media reports • Documents related to follow-up activities	

Expected further-reaching impacts (IMPACT) *Conflict system and societal/political context beyond the stakeholders addressed*	Contribute towards rebuilding and strengthening relations between relevant stakeholders from group A, B and C.	• Relevant stakeholders from all 3 groups accept each other as legitimate discussion partners, including outside and beyond the project-initiated dialogue process. • Lines of communication between relevant stakeholders from all 3 groups are direct, regular and robust (in terms of withstanding times of heightened tensions), including outside and beyond the project-initiated dialogue process.	• Public statements • Media reports • Personal anecdotes • Surveys • Project evaluation documents	
	Contribute towards strengthening a culture of dialogue and supporting its institutionalisation.	• Binary narratives towards the resolution of the conflict are increasingly replaced by more inclusive approaches. • Relevant stakeholders from all 3 groups (publicly) promote and commit to dialogue and cooperative approaches towards conflict resolution. • Dialogue and cooperative approaches towards conflict resolution are taken up in official documents, agreements, procedures etc.	• Public statements • Media reports • Personal anecdotes • Surveys • Government decrees, official documents • Project evaluation documents	
	Contribute towards reducing tensions and bringing about an improved security situation.	• Reduction in escalating rhetoric across the conflict divide. • Reduction in the number of incidences of violence in region X. • Public perception of security has increased in region X.	• Public statements • Media reports • Personal anecdotes • Survey • National statistics on violence • Project evaluation documents	