



ACT Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool

To be used in conjunction with: A Guide for ACT International Members and Forums Undertaking Organizational Capacity Assessments

Final Draft Version
13th February 2008

TABLE 1: Membership Commitments

The purpose of this table is for members to assess their conformity to the commitments undertaken through the ACT Cooperation Agreement. It is obligatory for all members to complete this table as part of Phase 1 of the Capacity Development Initiative. As the ACT Cooperation Agreement is revised to take account of new policies and principles adopted by the ACT Emergency Committee so additional elements will be added to subsequent versions of this table

Ref.	Capacity Element	Sources of information	Level of Capacity			
			1 'Nascent'	2 'Developing'	3 'Maturing'	4 'Mature'
MC1	Awareness of ACT Mission and content of ACT's Policies <i>(see OCA Guide for a list of all ACT approved policies)</i>	Questionnaire or interviews with either: all staff or; a representative sample of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only a handful of staff are aware of ACT's mission Staff are unaware of the content of ACT's policies No information/training sessions being held to better inform staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than half the staff are aware of ACT's mission Whilst some staff are aware of the content of some of ACT's policies the majority are not Information/training sessions being held infrequently to better inform staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of staff are aware of ACT's mission Whilst the majority of staff are aware of the content of some of ACT's policies few are aware of the content of all the policies Information/training sessions being held on regular basis to better inform staff 	All staff well informed of ACT mission and policies and identify closely with them
MC2	Awareness of and fulfilment of ACT Cooperation Agreement	Questionnaire or interviews with either: all staff or; a representative sample of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only the director is aware of the ACT Cooperation Agreement and the roles/responsibilities obligated to them as either a funding or implementing member. The organization fulfils few of its roles responsibilities as listed under each section for either Funding or Implementing (as relevant) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some staff are aware of the ACT Cooperation Agreement and their roles/responsibilities as either a funding or implementing member. The organization fulfils at least half of its obligations as listed under each section for either Funding or Implementing (as relevant) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most staff are aware of the ACT Cooperation Agreement and their roles/responsibilities as either a funding or implementing member. The organization fulfils more than half of its obligations as listed under each section for either Funding or Implementing (as relevant) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff are aware of the ACT Cooperation Agreement and their roles/responsibilities as either a funding or implementing member. The organization fulfils all of its obligations as listed under each section for either Funding or Implementing (as relevant)
MC3	ACT Visibility	Reflection/review by staff on visibility in relation to assets (buildings, vehicles, etc.) communications (written and verbal) and profile of organisation in country. Interviews with key informants in other organisations in the country	Membership of ACT International is not apparent in any of the public representation of the organisation	Membership of ACT International is not apparent in the majority of the public representation of the organisation	Membership of ACT International is apparent in the majority of the public representation of the organisation	Membership of ACT International is apparent in all the public representation of the organisation and the organisation positively projects its identity as an ACT International member (while maintaining its individual identity)

MC4	Coordination with other ACT members (in countries where there is not an ACT Forum)	Reflection/review by senior management Interviews with heads of other ACT members in country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation does not coordinate its activities with other ACT members The organisation does not participate in collaborative meetings The organisation is not supporting the formation of a Forum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation sporadically coordinates its activities with other ACT members The organisation participates only sporadically in collaborative meetings The organisation is not actively encouraging the formation of a Forum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation often coordinates its activities with other ACT members The organisation often participates in collaborative meetings The organisation is actively encouraging the formation of a Forum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation coordinates well with other ACT members and often plays a proactive role. The organisation always participates in collaborative meetings and often hosts and directly supports collaborative activities The organisation is actively encouraging the formation of a Forum and is offering meeting facilities and staff-time to make it happen
MC5	Participation in the ACT Forum (in countries where Forums have been established)	Reflection/review by senior management Interviews with staff of other Forum members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation rarely attends meetings of the Forum Staff of the organisation are unfamiliar with the Policy and Guidelines for National and Regional ACT Forums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation regularly attends meetings of the Forum but there is little consistency in who represents the organisation The representative contributes little to the discussions Only a few staff are familiar with the Policy and Guidelines for National and Regional ACT Forums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation regularly attends meetings and activities of the Forum The organisation plays an active role in meetings and activities of the Forum The organisation does not regularly provide facilities and staff resources in support of the work of the Forum Most staff are familiar with the Policy and Guidelines for National and Regional ACT Forums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation plays a full and active role in the meetings and activities of the Forum The organisation regularly provides facilities and staff resources in support of the work of the Forum All staff are familiar with the Policy and Guidelines for National and Regional ACT Forums
MC6	Conformity to Appeal Procedures	Reflection/review by senior management, Programme and Fundraising departments and other relevant staff. Interviews with relevant staff in ACT CO.	Organisation never or very rarely conforms to ACT's Appeal procedures and guidelines. Timeliness and quality of the proposal including budget is seriously deficient.	Organisation sometimes conforms to ACT Appeal procedures and guidelines. Timeliness and quality of the proposal and budget is low, requiring revision	Organisation usually conforms to ACT Appeal procedures and guidelines. Timeliness and quality of the proposal and budget is satisfactory.	Organisation always conforms to appeal procedures and guidelines. Timeliness and quality of the proposal and budget is consistently excellent.
MC7	Conformity to ACT Reporting Guidelines	Reflection/review by staff. Interviews with relevant staff in ACT CO.	The organisation shows very low conformity to Reporting Guidelines. Timeliness and quality of narrative and financial reporting to the ACT CO is seriously deficient (e.g. many reports long overdue and those submitted are of poor quality)	Inadequate conformity to Reporting Guidelines. Timeliness and quality of narrative and financial reporting to the ACT CO is barely adequate (e.g. some reports are overdue and the quality of some of the submitted reports is poor)	Timeliness and quality of narrative and financial reporting to the ACT CO is satisfactory. Reports generally submitted on time and their quality is adequate though could be improved	Timeliness and quality of narrative and financial reporting to the ACT CO is consistently excellent.

MC8	Conformity to ACT Code of Conduct (CoC) on Sexual Exploitation, Abuse of Power and Corruption	Reflection/review by senior management. Questionnaire or interviews with either: all staff or; a representative sample of staff	Very low awareness of, and implementation of, the CoC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of staff unaware of the provisions of the CoC. CoC not included as part of hiring process. Breaches of CoC not monitored or investigated. 	Awareness of CoC but level of implementation is less than adequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff unaware of the provisions of the CoC. CoC not included as part of most hiring processes. Breaches of CoC not consistently monitored or investigated 	Awareness of CoC and level of implementation is adequate but there is room for improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some staff unaware of the provisions of the CoC. CoC not included in all hiring processes. CoC monitoring is undertaken and some breaches have been investigated but both could be improved 	Awareness of CoC and level of implementation is excellent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff aware of the provisions of the CoC. CoC included in all hiring processes. CoC monitoring is undertaken and breaches are consistently investigated CoC monitoring and investigation is required of implementing partners
MC9	Conformity to Gender Policy (policy not yet finalised and adopted but likely indicators included here)	Reflection/review by senior management, Programme staff, all female staff and other relevant staff	Very low awareness of, and implementation of, the Gender Policy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of staff unaware of the provisions of the Policy Organisation and programme data not disaggregated by age and sex. Programmes do not involve women girls, boys and men in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes Hiring and staff development policies and organisational culture discourages women from decision-making positions No women in decision-making positions 	Awareness of Gender Policy but level of implementation is less than adequate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff unaware of the provisions of the Policy Some organisation and programme data are disaggregated by age and sex. Some programmes involve women girls, boys and men in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes Some changes are being introduced to hiring and staff development to remove barriers to women. However, organisational culture remains unchanged and serves to discourage women from decision-making positions. No women in decision-making positions 	Awareness of Gender and Protection Policy and level of implementation is adequate but there is room for improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of staff aware of the provisions of the Policy Most organisation and programme data disaggregated by age and sex. Most programmes involve women girls, boys and men in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes Hiring and staff development policies encourage women to take up decision-making positions but aspects of the organisational culture have the effect of discouraging women from decision-making positions Very few women in decision-making positions 	Awareness of Gender and Protection Policy and level of implementation is excellent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff aware of the provisions of the Policy All organisation and programme data disaggregated by age and sex. All programmes involve women girls, boys and men in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes Hiring and staff development policies and organisational culture encourage women to take up decision making positions Approximate gender balance has been achieved in decision-making positions
MC10	Conformity to HIV & AIDS Policy	Reflection/review by senior management and those responsible for HIV & AIDS in organisation. Questionnaire or interviews with either: all staff or; a representative sample of staff	No conformity to the provisions of ACT's Policy on HIV in Emergency and Humanitarian Work	Conformity to some provisions of ACT's Policy on HIV in Emergency and Humanitarian Work but many aspects remain to be addressed	Conformity to most provisions of ACT's Policy on HIV in Emergency and Humanitarian Work but there is room for improvement in relation to some aspects of the Policy	Excellent conformity to ACT's Policy on HIV in Emergency and Humanitarian Work

MC11	Conformity to Guiding Principles on Material Aid	Reflection/review by staff. Interviews with relevant staff in ACT CO.	No conformity to ACT's Guiding Principles on Material Aid	Conformity to some provisions of ACT's Guiding Principles on Material Aid but many aspects remain to be addressed	Conformity to most provisions of ACT's Guiding Principles on Material Aid but there is room for improvement in relation to some aspects	Excellent conformity to ACT's Guiding Principles on Material Aid
MC12	Awareness of the NGO/ Red Cross Code of Conduct and Sphere Humanitarian Charter	Questionnaire or interviews with either: all staff or; a representative sample of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of staff not aware of Code of Conduct and Humanitarian Charter. No briefings/trainings provided for staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst many staff are aware of Code Conduct and Humanitarian Charter few are well informed No briefings/trainings provided for staff Stakeholders are not informed of their rights in relation to the Code of Conduct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff are well informed of Code of Conduct and Humanitarian Charter Some briefings/trainings provided but more are needed. The organisation has begun informing stakeholders of their rights in relation to the Code of Conduct but this is limited to a minority of programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff well informed of Code of Conduct and Humanitarian Charter. Briefings/training sessions being held on a regular basis. The organisation informs stakeholders of their rights in relation to the Code of Conduct in all its programmes
MC13	Adherence to the NGO/ Red Cross Code of Conduct and Sphere Humanitarian Charter	Reflection/review by senior management Questionnaire or interviews with either: all staff or; a representative sample of staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No system in place to monitor or review adherence Indications that Code of Conduct and Humanitarian Charter have not been adhered to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems for monitoring and reviewing adherence are poorly developed Indications that Code of Conduct and Humanitarian Charter have not always been adhered to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems for monitoring and reviewing adherence are adequate but could be improved. Indications that Code of Conduct and Humanitarian Charter have not always been adhered to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems for monitoring and reviewing adherence are well developed. Code of Conduct and Humanitarian Charter are being consistently adhered to.
MC14	Attainment of Sphere Standards	Reflection/review by senior management and programme and project staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No programmes are planned, implemented, monitored or assessed in relation to Sphere Standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some programmes are planned, implemented, monitored and assessed in relation to Sphere Standards. Some of these monitored programmes do not attain or exceed standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most programmes are planned, implemented, monitored and assessed in relation to Sphere Standards Some programmes do not attain or exceed standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All programmes planned, implemented, monitored and assessed in relation to Sphere Standards. Standards attained or exceeded in all programmes.

Notes:

TABLE 2: Disaster Preparedness and Response Capacities

The purpose of this table is for members to assess their capacities in relation to the core purpose of ACT's Mission. It is obligatory for all members to complete this table as part of Phase 1 of the Capacity Development Initiative.

Ref.	Capacity Element	Sources of information	Level of Capacity			
			1 'Nascent'	2 'Developing'	3 'Maturing'	4 'Mature'
DPR1	Experience in Disaster Preparedness (DP)	Reflection/review by management and programme staff	Organisation has no recent experience (within last 5 years) of direct involvement in DP projects	Organisation has recent experience in DP but has not yet begun to 'mainstream' DP within the work of the organisation	Organisation has substantial experience in DP and is currently working to mainstream DP into the work of the organisation	Organisation is continuously involved in disaster preparedness projects and has successfully mainstreamed DP into the work of the organisation
DPR2	Awareness of Hazards and Vulnerabilities	Reflection/review by management and programme staff	Organisation has not undertaken a review of hazards and vulnerabilities	Organisation has undertaken a review of hazards and vulnerabilities but the review was not comprehensive (e.g. it excluded certain areas and/or sources of information)	Organisation has undertaken a systematic and comprehensive review of hazards and vulnerabilities but the information is not being regularly updated and some of the information is now out of date	Organisation has undertaken a comprehensive review of hazards and vulnerabilities, updates the information at regular intervals and uses the analysis as a basis for project planning.
DPR3	Linkage with national disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies (including ACT Forums, if one exists)	Reflection/review by management and programme staff. Interviews with chair/lead of national disaster preparedness and response forum. Interviews with other agencies	Organisation has no links with national disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies (including ACT Forums)	Organisation has links with national disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies but the links are poorly developed (e.g. the organisation does not participate on a regular basis in the forums or is represented only at a junior level)	Organisation has good links with national disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies but it does not collaborate in joint projects with other forum members and has no clearly defined role in national or forum response plans.	Organisation actively participates in national disaster preparedness and response forums, collaborates in joint projects with other forum members and has a clearly defined role in national and/or forum response plans.
DPR4	Location of current programmes of the ACT member and its national/local partners in relation to areas of high risk and vulnerability	Reflection/review by management and programme staff of the ACT members and those in its national/local partners. Interviews with chair/lead of national disaster preparedness and response forum. Interviews with other agencies	Current programmes are located in areas of comparatively low risk and vulnerability. The organisation has little knowledge of and organisational linkages to the areas of high risk and vulnerability are very limited	Current programmes do include area of high risk and vulnerability but the bulk remain in areas of comparatively low risk and vulnerability. The organisation has limited knowledge of and organisational linkages to the areas of high risk and vulnerability	Current programmes are divided between areas of comparatively low risk and vulnerability and areas of high risk and vulnerability. The organisation has good knowledge of and organisational linkages to the areas of high risk and vulnerability but these could be improved.	The bulk of the organisations programmes are located in areas of the highest risk and vulnerability. Its knowledge of, and organisational linkages within the areas of high risk and vulnerability are excellent

DPR5	Disaster Preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction work undertaken by national/local partners	Reflection/review by management and programme staff of the ACT member and by the management and programme staff of the national/local partner organisations	None of the organisation's national/local partners undertake DP and DRR programmes or have begun to attempt to mainstream DP/DRR into the work of their organisations	Some of the organisation's national/local partners undertake DP and DRR programmes and some have begun to attempt to mainstream DP/DRR into the work of their organisations	Most of the organisation's national/local partners undertake DP and DRR programmes and many have mainstreamed DP/DRR into the work of their organisations	All of the organisation's national or local partners undertake DP and DRR programmes and have successfully mainstreamed DP/DRR into the work of their organisations
DPR6	Experience in Disaster Response	Reflection/review by management and programme staff	Organisation has no recent experience (within last 5 years) of direct involvement in disaster response operations. Organisational and staff capacities for effective disaster response are very limited.	Organisation has recent experience of direct involvement in disaster response operations. Plans for developing organisational and staff capacities for effective disaster response are in place	Organisation has substantial recent experience of direct involvement in disaster response operations. Organisational and staff capacities for effective disaster response are being developed/maintained	Organisation is very experienced in disaster response operations and is frequently involved in disaster response operations in different parts of the country. The organisation has strong organisational and staff capacities in disaster response.
DPR7	Coverage of 'life critical' sectors by current programmes (Life critical sectors = health, nutrition, water and sanitation, food security, shelter, protection and mental health/psychosocial support)	Reflection/review by management and programme staff.	Current programmes do not cover any of the 'life-critical' sectors. The ability of the organisation to respond effectively in relation to these sectors is very limited.	Current programmes cover less than half of the 'life critical' sectors. The organisation is able to respond effectively in relation to these sectors.	Current programmes cover most but not all of the 'life critical' sectors. The organisation is able to respond effectively in relation to these sectors	Current programmes cover all of the 'life-critical' sectors. The organisation is able to respond effectively in relation to all the 'life critical' sectors
DPR8	Technical competence of programme/sectoral staff	Reflection/review by management, Programme and HR departments and staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the programme/sectoral staff have technical/professional qualifications relevant to their area of responsibility • None of the relevant staff have received training in the last 2 years on disaster preparedness and response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the programme/sectoral staff have technical/professional qualifications relevant to their area of responsibility • Some, but not all the relevant staff have received training in the last 2 years on disaster preparedness and response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the programme/sectoral staff have technical/professional qualifications relevant to their area of responsibility • All relevant staff have received training in the last 2 years on disaster preparedness and response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the programme/sectoral staff have technical/professional qualifications relevant to their area of responsibility • All relevant staff receive regular training on disaster preparedness and response
DPR9	Understanding of role and comparative niche in disaster response	Reflection/review by management and programme staff. Interviews with chair/lead of national disaster preparedness and response forum. Interviews with other agencies	The organisation is unclear as to the roles it intends/will be required to play in the event of likely disasters and its comparative strengths in relation to other agencies	The organisation has some idea as to the roles it intends/ will be required to play in the event of likely disasters and its comparative strengths in relation to other agencies. However these have not yet been incorporated into its Strategic and Contingency plans	The organisation has clear idea as to the roles it intends/will be required to play in the event of likely disasters and its comparative strengths in relation to other agencies. However these have not yet been fully incorporated these into its Strategic and Contingency plans	The organisation is very clear as to the roles it intends/will be required to play in the event of likely disasters and its strengths in comparison to other agencies. These have been fully incorporated into its Strategic and Contingency plans.

DPR10	Preparation of disaster response Contingency Plans	Reflection/review by management and programme staff.	Organisation has not yet attempted to prepare a disaster response Contingency Plan.	Organisation has/is preparing a disaster response Contingency Plan. However it does not cover all parts of the organisation and/or the process is still to be completed.	Organisation has a disaster response Contingency Plan. However, elements of it have not been reviewed recently and require updating	Organisation has a comprehensive disaster response Contingency Plan that is regularly reviewed and updated.
DPR11	Emergency Needs Assessment	Reflection/review by management and programme staff.	The organisation has not identified teams that would be responsible for undertaking initial rapid emergency assessments or the subsequent detailed emergency assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has identified teams that would be responsible for undertaking initial rapid emergency assessments and the subsequent detailed emergency assessments Women are poorly represented in the teams Arrangements for their mobilisation are unclear and they have not trained together Methods for assessing needs do not differentiate between the needs of women, girls, boys and men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has pre-identified teams that would be responsible for undertaking initial rapid emergency assessments and the subsequent detailed emergency assessments Women are not adequately represented in the teams Some, but not all, have received training on needs assessments Arrangements for their mobilisation are clear and they do train together but they have not yet worked together in an actual disaster response Some but not all of the methods for assessing needs differentiate between the needs of women, girls, boys and men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has pre-identified, fully-trained teams responsible for emergency assessments and the subsequent detailed emergency assessments The teams achieve approximate gender balance Arrangements for their mobilisation are clear and the teams regularly train together in periods between disasters All of the methods for assessing needs differentiate between the needs of women, girls, boys and men
DRP12	Linkage with ACT Rapid Support Team (RST)	Reflection/review by management and programme staff. Interviews with RST personnel and ACT Programme Officer	Organisation has little familiarity with the ACT Rapid Support Team concept and has no arrangements in place that would enable it to link effectively with an RST	Organisation is familiar with the RST concept but has not yet completed plans for working with an RST in the event of a major disaster	Organisation is familiar with the RST concept and has completed plans for working with an RST in the event of a major disaster. However, the RST mechanism has not been incorporated into contingency planning exercises	Organisation has close links/experience with the RST mechanism. Has well developed plans for working with RST in event of major disaster. RST mechanism is incorporated into contingency planning exercises
DPR13	Ability of the Human Resource, Finance and Administrative systems to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in event of a disaster	Reflection/review by all staff	HR, Finance and Admin systems have not been specifically reviewed and strengthened to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster.	HR, Finance and Admin systems have been reviewed with regard to rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster but much of the necessary strengthening to enable them to cope has yet to be carried out.	HR, Finance and Admin systems have been reviewed and strengthened to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster. However, some of the necessary strengthening to enable them to cope has not yet been completed.	HR, Finance and Admin systems have been successfully strengthened to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster.

DPR14	Ability of Procurement & Logistics to cope with rapid 'scale-up' in event of a disaster	Reflection/review by all staff Interviews with potential suppliers	Procurement & Logistics systems have not been specifically reviewed and strengthened to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster.	Procurement & Logistics systems have been reviewed with regard to rapid scale-up in the event of a disaster but much of the necessary strengthening to enable them to cope has yet to be carried out.	Procurement & Logistics systems have been reviewed and strengthened to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster. However, some of the necessary strengthening to enable them to cope has not yet been completed	Procurement & Logistics systems have been successfully strengthened to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster.
DPR15	Ability of Information Technology and Communications systems to cope with disasters and the need for rapid 'scale-up' in event of a disaster	Reflection/review by all staff Interviews with communications specialists/providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications and IT systems have not been specifically reviewed and strengthened to cope with a disaster and the need for rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster • Communications and IT systems are vulnerable to disasters which affect the national telephone systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications and IT systems have been reviewed with regard to likely disasters and the need for rapid 'scale-up' • Much of the necessary strengthening to enable them to escape damage/cope has yet to be carried out. • Communications and IT systems are vulnerable to disasters which affect the national telephone systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT and Communications systems have been reviewed and strengthened to cope with likely disasters and the need for rapid 'scale-up' • Some of the necessary work to enable them to cope has still to be completed • Some aspects of the systems remain vulnerable to disasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications and IT systems have been successfully strengthened to cope with a rapid 'scale-up' in the event of a disaster. • Systems will be able to operate in the event of most types of disaster
DPR16	Access to funding sources to enable rapid 'scale-up' in event of a significant disaster	Reflection/review by management and programme staff and those responsible for fundraising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of a significant disaster the organisation will be <u>wholly</u> dependent upon funding available from ACT Rapid Response Fund and what might be raised through an ACT Appeal. • No attempts have been made to develop alternative funding sources • The organisation does not have emergency funds held in reserve to fund initial response activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of a significant disaster the organisation will be <u>largely</u> dependent upon funding available from ACT Rapid Response Fund and what might be raised through an ACT Appeal. • Attempts to develop alternative funding sources have met with only limited success. • The organisation has emergency funds held in reserve but these are very limited and the procedures for their release are not clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of a significant disaster the organisation will be <u>largely</u> dependent upon funding available from ACT RRF and what might be raised through an ACT Appeal. • Attempts to develop alternative funding sources have met with success and are likely to generate complementary funding from a range of sources. • The organisation has emergency funds held in reserve that would be adequate to fund initial response activities for localised disasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of a significant disaster the Organisation has successfully developed relationships with a range of international and in-country funding sources that it will be able to access in the event of a disaster and thereby complement funding through ACT. • The organisation has emergency funds held in reserve that would be adequate to fund initial response activities even in large scale disasters.
DPR17	Effectiveness of national/local partners in disaster response	Reflection/review by management and programme staff in the organisation and those of its national/local partners	None of the national/local partners have significant experience or competence in disaster response	Some of the national/local partners have significant experience and competence in disaster response	Many of the national/local partners have significant experience and competence in disaster response	All of the national/local partners have significant experience and competence in disaster response

DPR18	Testing of disaster response procedures	Reflection/review by management and all staff	The organisation <u>never</u> holds rehearsal and/or 'dry run' exercises to test the efficacy of its disaster response procedures.	The organisation <u>rarely</u> holds rehearsal and/or 'dry run' exercises to test the efficacy of its disaster response procedures.	The organisation holds rehearsal and/or 'dry run' exercises to test the efficacy of its disaster response procedures but they are not organised on a regular basis.	The organisation <u>frequently</u> holds rehearsal and/or 'dry run' exercises on a regular basis to test the efficacy of its disaster response procedures.
DPR19	Quality of response programmes	Reflection/review by management and programme staff	None of the emergency response programmes reach or exceed Sphere Minimum Standards	Only some of the emergency response programmes reach or exceed Sphere Minimum Standards	The majority of the emergency response programmes reach or exceed Sphere Minimum Standards	All of the emergency response programmes exceed Sphere Minimum Standards
DPR20	Conformity to IASC's Framework for Gender Equality Programming (IASC Gender Handbook) www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/gender	Reflection/review by management and programme staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff of the organisation are unaware of the IASC Gender Handbook and its framework for gender equality programming Response programmes do not conform to any aspect of the IASC's framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some staff are aware of the IASC Gender Handbook and its framework for gender equality programming Response programmes conform to only one or two aspects of the framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff are aware of the IASC Gender Handbook and its framework for gender equality programming Programmes conform to no more than half of the aspects of the framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff are aware of the IASC Gender Handbook and its framework for gender equality programming Programmes conform to all aspects of the framework
DPR21	Conformity to the generally accepted principles of best practice for protection-focused humanitarian work (ALNAP, UNHCR, etc.)	Reflection/review by management and programme staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff of the organisation are unaware of the protection risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes Response programmes contain elements that may increase the affected population risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some staff of the organisation are aware of the protection risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes The organisation is conscious of protection issues in its programming but the response programmes still contain elements that present risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff of the organisation are aware of the protection risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes The organisation is conscious of protection issues in its programming The response programmes do not fully address all protection needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff of the organisation are aware of the protection risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes Response programmes are fully conscious of protection issues Response programmes do not contain any elements that may present risks to the population.
DPR22	Addressing environmental issues	Reflection/review by management and programme staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff of the organisation are unaware of the environmental risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes Response programmes contain elements that are actually damaging to the environment (e.g. lowering the water table, polluting the local environment or depleting forest resources) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some staff of the organisation are aware of the environmental risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes The organisation is conscious of environmental issues in its programming but the response programmes still contain elements that are actually damaging to the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many staff of the organisation are aware of the environmental risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes The organisation is conscious of environmental issues in its programming The response programmes contains elements that are potentially damaging to the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staff of the organisation are aware of the environmental risks present within the context or potentially present within their programmes Response programmes are fully conscious of environmental issues Response programmes do not contain any elements that are potentially damaging to the environment)

DPR23	Conflict sensitive programming (Do No Harm)	Reflection/review by management and programme staff. Interviews with representatives of agencies working in the same area and representatives of the affected population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff of the organisation are unaware of the Do No Harm and the role that humanitarian programmes may play in increasing or reducing tensions and conflict • Response programmes contain elements that are actually increasing tensions and conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some staff of the organisation are aware of the Do No Harm and the role that humanitarian programmes may play in increasing or reducing tensions and conflict • The organisation is conscious of the need for conflict sensitive programme but some programmes continue to contain elements that are actually increasing tensions and conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most staff of the organisation are aware of the Do No Harm and the role that humanitarian programmes may play in increasing or reducing tensions and conflict • The organisation is conscious of the need for conflict sensitive programme and is changing its programming procedures • Some programmes continue to contain elements that are potentially increasing tensions and conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All staff of the organisation are aware of the Do No Harm and the role that humanitarian programmes may play in increasing or reducing tensions and conflict • The organisation is conscious of the need for conflict sensitive programme and has changed its programming procedures • None of its programmes contain elements that are potentially increasing tensions and conflict
DPR24	Independence from Government and other potential parties to a conflict	Reflection/review by the Board, management and staff. Interviews with representatives of government, opposition parties, other agencies and civil society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is perceived to be closely linked to either the Government or other potential parties to a possible conflict that would jeopardise its humanitarian role in the event of a possible conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is perceived to have links with either the Government or other potential parties to a possible conflict that could jeopardise its humanitarian role in the event of a possible conflict • There is little understanding among the general public of its mission and impartial stance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is perceived to be free of any links with either the Government or other potential parties to a possible conflict • Though there is understanding among the general public of its mission and impartial stance, this is limited to certain groups/areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is perceived to be independent from the Government and other potential parties to a possible conflict • The organisation is held in high regard by most sections of the population and its mission and impartial stance is widely recognised
DPR25	Security Guidelines and Procedures	Reflection/review by management and all staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation does not have any security guidelines • There is no assigned member of staff with responsibility for monitoring security and ensuring staff safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has developed security guidelines but they are not comprehensive and poorly conform to ACT's Principles of Safety and Security (PASS) • Many staff are not familiar with their provisions • A member of staff has been assigned responsibility for monitoring security and ensuring staff safety but they have not been trained and are unclear of their role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has developed comprehensive security guidelines which mostly but not completely conform to ACT's Principles of Safety and Security (PASS) and are not regularly updated • Staff are aware of their provisions but often do not follow them • A designated and appropriately trained member of staff has responsibility for monitoring security and ensuring staff safety but they feel unsupported by senior management in their role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has comprehensive security guidelines that fully conform to ACT's Principles of Safety and Security (PASS) and are regularly updated a • The security guidelines are fully understood and followed by staff • A designated member of staff has clear responsibility for monitoring security and ensuring staff safety

TABLE 3: General Organisational Capacities

The purpose of this table is for members to assess their capacities in relation to generic organisational capacities. If a member has undertaken an assessment of its general organisational capacities within the last two years and wishes not to repeat the process, it may apply to the Capacity Development Officer for permission to skip this table as part of Phase 1 of the Capacity Development Initiative.

Ref.	Capacity Element	Sources of information	Level of Capacity			
			1 'Nascent'	2 'Developing'	3 'Maturing'	4 'Mature'
GO1	Board Effectiveness	Reflection/review by Board, Senior management and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No board or independent body exists to provide policy direction or oversight. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the board or independent body have been identified but have not yet assumed a leadership role. The board is attempting to micro-manage rather than provide oversight. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board's membership is stable and functioning The board is able to differentiate between its role and that of management. The board is aware of its responsibility to provide oversight and represent the interests of stakeholders but is not consistently doing so. Mechanisms for obtaining input from stakeholders are in place but not being used consistently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board provides overall policy direction and oversight. The board provides accountability and credibility. Board is composed of committed members who represent the varied interests of the stakeholders. The board has an approximate gender balance Mechanisms are in place to obtain appropriate input from stakeholders.
GO2	Mission/goal	Reflection/review by Board, Senior management and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a vague idea of its vision and mission and the contribution it is attempting to make. The mission is understood by only one or a few members of the board or senior management. The activities carried out by stakeholders may have little relationship to the mission of the organisation. Implementation plans are developed by senior management without input from staff or stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision and mission may be clarified internally but it is not widely understood by the public. The mission is not reflected in planning or job functions. Planning is done by senior management with little input from staff and stakeholders. Female members of staff were poorly represented in the process of developing the mission and in planning decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision and mission are clear to staff, stakeholders and outsiders. Strategies and objectives are aligned with the mission. Implementation planning may be conducted by senior management and linked to the budgeting process with some input from staff or stakeholders. Female members of staff were not well represented in the process of developing the mission and in planning decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has clearly articulated mission/goals which are understood by all stakeholders. Strategies are aligned with mission, realistic and take the form of clear objective statements as to how they can be achieved. Implementation plans are jointly developed by senior management, staff and other appropriate stakeholders. The organisation has an updated Strategic Plan as the primary basis for its operational activities Women have been well represented in the development of the mission and in planning decisions.

GO3	Legal status	Reflection/review by Board, Senior management and staff and interview with legal advisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation may or may not be legally registered according to local regulations. The organisation does not benefit from whatever fiduciary and taxation status is permissible under local law. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation is registered but has not yet integrated financial and legal advice into planning and management decisions. The organisation is not in compliance with some local reporting and labour requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has integrated appropriate expert advice into planning and management systems. The organisation is generally in compliance with local reporting, tax and labour requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation is properly registered according to local regulations. The organisation benefits from the financial and legal status permissible under local law.
GO4	Stakeholders	Reflection/review by Board, Senior management and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation's links with the stakeholders are weak. The organisation views its community as passive beneficiaries rather than as potential partners. The organisation is unable to identify key stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation's outreach to stakeholders is improving. Certain influential members of the community may be consulted or invited to participate in some decisions because they are seen to have a stake in the outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation's stakeholders are well defined and their needs and views are considered in planning and decision-making. The organisation is coming to view the community and other stakeholders as partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation's stakeholders are well-defined. The organisation recognises the community and other stakeholders as partners. Community needs assessments results are integrated into the planning process. The organisation's mission and strategies are reviewed by stakeholders.
GO5	Leadership	Reflection/review by Board, Senior management and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an individual or a few individuals in the organisation who control most functions. Management style is directive and staff members primarily provide technical input. Management does not articulate clearly the organisation's purpose to staff. Board and senior management lack a clear understanding of their respective roles. Leadership lacks understanding of its responsibility to stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most decisions are made by the board, sometimes with input from one or two staff members. Staff have little understanding of how management makes decisions. Leadership is still seen primarily as directive and controlling, rather than enabling self-direction to employees and monitoring their performance. Leadership is aware of stakeholders but do not make themselves available. Leadership positions are occupied solely by male members of staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior management's relationship to staff is more consultative and management decisions are delegated. Staff increasingly understand, but are not systematically involved in decision-making. Leadership understands that one of its primary roles is to provide overall direction and monitor performance, but it is still concerned with control. More effort is made by leadership to contact and involve stakeholders. Female members of staff are poorly represented in leadership positions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board and senior management have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities as providers of overall direction. Leadership style of senior management is participatory. Senior management is responsible to all stakeholders. Leadership is accessible to all stakeholders. Approximate gender balance exists in leadership positions
GO6	Organisational structure and culture	Reflection/review by Board, Senior management and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has no clearly defined organisational structure and lines of authority and responsibility are not clearly defined. The organisation has no management policies. The organisation has no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a defined organisational structure but lines of authority remain unclear and authority tends to be exercised by an individual or a few individuals. The organisation has developed systems and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a defined organisational structure with clear lines of authority and responsibility. The organisation's administration places emphasis on the areas of responsibility but does not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a defined organisational structure with clear lines of authority and responsibility. Management policies to ensure regular audits of organisational development are in place.

			<p>systems to measure congruence between stated mission and operational culture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has no system to ensure appropriate involvement of staff in decision making. 	<p>policies but they have not been implemented, are not regularly followed, nor have they been reviewed.</p>	<p>confer the necessary authority on individuals to permit them to operate effectively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation is not effectively incorporating the organisational structure into assigned tasks nor using it to assess organisational development or ensure accountability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems are in place to regularly measure congruence between stated mission and operating culture. Systems are in place to ensure appropriate involvement of all levels of staff in decision making. Organisation has operational systems to ensure mutual accountability.
GO7	Planning	Reflection/review by Board, Senior management and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation carries out some planning but with little or no input from staff and stakeholders. The organisation makes decisions and plans activities without reference to the agreed-upon strategies to achieve the mission. There is little assessment of the resources required to undertake activities. Plans, once implemented, are neither reviewed nor modified. Resources are not planned for nor allocated properly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual operating plans are developed and reviewed primarily by senior staff without reference to the previous year's planning, analysis of resource availability or other factors which could affect implementation. Annual plans are developed with limited input from stakeholders or staff. Monitoring is not taking place and plans, once implemented, are not being revised. Planning continues to be short term and is based on available resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic and short-term planning is conducted primarily by senior management. Staff and stakeholders may have some input in the planning but they are not involved in decision-making. There are occasional reviews and revisions of implementation plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inputs from appropriate stakeholders are taken into account during planning. Implementation plans reflect a strategic plan. Implementation plans are updated. Resources are planned for and allocated properly. Flexibility exists to adjust plans as a result of the monitoring process.
GO8	Personnel	Reflection/review by senior management, HR/Personnel team and staff (including a separate assessment of opinions of female staff)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no formal personnel procedures to administer salaries and benefits or to record personnel data. Formal employment procedures do not exist. Recruitment processes are not defined, transparent nor competitive. Recourse procedures do not exist. The systems and culture of the organisation are not attractive to female staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic personnel administration systems exist but informal employment practices continue. Positions are not advertised externally and there are no common procedures for determining qualifications for employment, recruitment, hiring, and termination. Recourse procedures and mutual respect have not yet been integrated into the organisational culture The systems and culture of the organisation are not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strategic value of human resources and the need to integrate personnel practices into the strategic planning process are not fully understood. All necessary personnel systems are formalised and implemented although occasionally informal mechanisms are used. Recourse procedures and mutual respect have been integrated into the organisational culture Programmes and procedures are in place to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection criteria for staff are in place. The recruitment process is clearly defined. Recruitment processes are transparent and competitive. Job descriptions are clearly defined. Staff are deployed according to job descriptions. Management encourages mutual respect among staff. Staff are aware that recourse procedures for staff exist. All female members of

				attractive to female staff but the organisation is developing programmes and procedures to improve the situation.	make the organisational culture more attractive to female staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many, but not all, female members of staff regard the organisation as an attractive place for them to work 	staff regard the organisation as an attractive place for them to work and feel at ease within it
GO9	Programme development	Reflection/review by senior management, programme department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme development is largely donor or staff-driven with little input from stakeholders and is managed on a project-by-project basis. Programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, if done, are carried out based on donor requirements. Monitoring, evaluation and reporting activities are not included in the programme design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual projects are developed within an overall programmatic framework. Occasional evaluations conducted at the request of funders are undertaken by outsiders. Stakeholders are involved only as recipients of a programme. No comprehensive system exists for determining the purpose and objectives of programmes/projects or for monitoring and evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive system exists for programme development and implementation. This system is sometimes one imposed by a funder, or may have been developed by the organisation itself. Either system can provide the information required by the funder and allows for monitoring and evaluation to be carried out by the staff. Stakeholders are consulted on programme design and are involved in implementation and evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders and staff are involved in programme design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Programme design incorporates monitoring, evaluation, and reporting activities. Programme modifications reflect use of monitoring, evaluation, and reporting findings.
GO10	Administrative procedures	Reflection/review by senior management, Administration department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No administrative procedures or manuals exist. Administrative procedures are informal and organisation staff lack a common understanding of them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative procedures are increasingly formalised. Administrative procedures are not being fully utilised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative systems are formalised and functioning. Administrative procedures and manuals exist but are not referred to regularly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative procedures and manuals exist. Administrative procedures are adhered to. Procedures and operating manuals are updated regularly.
GO11	Risk Management	Reflection/review by senior management, finance department, internal/external auditors, programme department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit and stock taking, if conducted, are irregular. No external audit is carried out. The organisation has no plans to develop risk management systems (to identify, assess and address risks which prevent accomplishment of its aims, mandate and mission) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audits and stock taking continue to be sporadic. External audits carried out at request of funders The organisation is considering the development of risk management systems (to identify, assess and address risks which prevent accomplishment of its aims, mandate and mission) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audits and stock taking are now integrated into the organisations' systems. External audits are carried out annually. The organisation is developing risk management systems (to identify, assess and address risks which prevent accomplishment of its aims, mandate and mission) but they have not been completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular audit of inventory is conducted. Annual external audit reports include a review of management practices. Recommendations on management practices in annual external audit reports are implemented. The organisation has developed, approved and is now implementing risk management systems (to identify, assess and address risks which prevent accomplishment of its aims, mandate and mission)

GO12	Information systems	Reflection/review by senior management, IT team and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No system exists within the organisation to collect, analyse or disseminate data. • Information is collected randomly and manually. • Information is not shared among stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data utilisation potential is not understood. • A rudimentary electronic information system is in place but is not accessible to all staff. • Computers are used primarily for word-processing and bookkeeping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An information system is operational and most staff have access to it. • The information system is still primarily used for word-processing and book-keeping but individual staff understand and use data on an ad hoc basis. • There is no mechanism for integrating information from the system into the organisation's planning process. • There is no mechanism to disseminate or solicit feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems exist to collect, analyse, and report data and information. • Trained personnel are in place to manage information systems. • Systems are used to process, disseminate, and solicit feedback of information.
GO13	Programme reporting	Reflection/review by senior management, programme department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation does not report on the results of activities or evaluations to stakeholders. • The organisation is not sharing information based on lessons learned from activities and evaluations. • The organisation does not have the ability to prepare regular activity or evaluation reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation provides information on activities and evaluations only when requested or required by a funder. • The organisation shares information on activities only as required. • Report formats reflect donor needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation does not yet have an effective system through which to share information on lessons learned from its experience. • The organisation occasionally publishes the results of its activities and evaluations but it does not have a strategy for dissemination. • The organisation has developed some flexible report formats to reflect needs of different stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has the ability to produce appropriate reports. • The organisation regularly prepares activity reports. • The organisation regularly prepares evaluation reports. • The organisation publishes and disseminates information on its operations. • Reporting formats are flexible, varied and respond to stakeholder information requirements.
GO14	Human resources development	Reflection/review by senior management, HR/Personnel department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation does not conduct systematic appraisal of staff performance on which to plan for changes or improvements. • There is little or no understanding of the relationship between staff performance and the achievement of organisation objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a good match between staff responsibilities and skill requirements. • A staff appraisal system may exist but it is not necessarily based on job performance. • The organisation has identified resources with which to conduct ad hoc training of staff. • Personnel policies are not defined • No training is provided for volunteers working for the organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has a performance-based appraisal system in place which is not always applied or equitable. • Staff are sometimes assigned and promoted according to their job performance. • Staff development needs are assessed and used to develop training plans. • Personnel policies exist. • Provision of training for volunteers working for the organisation is patchy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A human resources development plan is in place. • Staff training is based on capacity, needs and objectives. • Opportunities exist to integrate skills acquired in training into the work environment. • Job appraisals and promotions are performance-based and equitable. • Personnel policies are adhered to. • Volunteers are included in the human resource development plan

GO15	Human resources procedures and practices	Reflection/review by senior management, HR/Personnel department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roles and job responsibilities of existing staff are unclear and changeable. • The limited staff are expected to carry out responsibilities beyond their expertise and some essential tasks are not done by anyone. • Job descriptions and work responsibilities are not documented. • Job performance is not assessed and there is no plan to improve staff performance. • The relationship between staff performance and the achievement of organisation programme objectives is not understood. • Salaries are not competitive nor do benefits exist. • Standard tax and labour regulations are not being respected. • No mechanisms exist for grievance or conflict resolution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the beginning of a link between senior staff responsibilities and expertise but some gaps continue to exist in skill requirements. • Job descriptions do exist, based on a supervisor's idea of the work to be accomplished. • A job performance system may exist but it is not necessarily based on performance as defined in a job description. • The organisation has identified some resources for ad hoc training of staff. • Some benefits exist but salaries are not competitive. • The organisation is respecting some existing tax and labour regulations. • Procedures for grievance or conflict resolution are in place but not utilised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs are well-defined and documented in job descriptions and work assignments. • All core skills required to perform job functions exist within the organisation. • A performance-based appraisal system is in place and staff are assigned and promoted according to performance. • Some human resource planning does take place but is still not integrated with job performance or the strategic planning process. • A training plan exists based on an assessment of staff development needs. • Salaries and benefits are structured but not fully competitive. • Tax and labour regulations and requirements are generally respected. • Grievance and conflict procedures are randomly followed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job descriptions are documented and updated. • Job descriptions are respected. • Clearly established links exist between staff capacity and the organisation mission. • Salaries are clearly structured and competitive. • The benefits policy is documented and implemented. • The organisation conforms to standard tax and labour regulations and requirements. • Supervision occurs on a regular basis. • Grievance and conflict resolution procedures are used when necessary. • Health and safety policy is in place.
GO16	Diversity	Reflection/review by senior management, HR/Personnel department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff and board do not represent the diversity of the community or the interests of stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No policy exists but among some levels of the organisation there is some awareness of and interest in the value and need for representation from the various members of the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies exist to diversify the board and staff but their composition does not yet fully reflect that of the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The diversity of the community is reflected in the composition of the board and staff.
GO17	Work organisation	Reflection/review by senior management, HR/Personnel department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little understanding of the need to organise work beyond issuing directives. • No mechanisms are in place to co-ordinate work activities of different staff. • There is little understanding of what it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work is organised by supervisors. • Little attention is paid to work flow or to consciously organising work beyond work plans. Individual, unit or project work plans are developed but these plans are not co-ordinated across functions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A top-down mentality continues to dominate and senior management make most major decisions. • A variety of work methods are utilised. • Staff are recognised as being able to make useful suggestions about how their own work should be organised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff meetings are held regularly. • Staff participate in management decisions. • Team work is encouraged. Information is shared freely among all staff members.] • Staff teams are encouraged to take initiative and be self-

			<p>means to work as a team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings are irregular, do not have a pre-determined purpose and agenda, are dominated by interests of a few, and do not reach concrete conclusions. • Staff provide technical input only and are not involved in or informed of decisions. • No formally recognised lines or mechanisms exist for intra-organisation communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular meetings of staff are conducted according to known procedures. • Selected staff are consulted on some decisions. • Intra-organisation communication is conducted on an informal basis. • Consciousness is developing on the part of staff and management that communication breakdowns and overlaps occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team work is encouraged and work plans are shared across units and work sites. • Communication is open and inter-hierarchical and links organisational unit/project structures. • Staff know how to participate in meetings and are aware of how decisions are made. 	<p>motivated.</p>
GO18	Accounting	Reflection/review by senior management, Finance department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation's financial procedures are incomplete. • The organisation's accounts are not yet set up for individual projects and operating funds are not separated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic financial recording systems are in place. • Account categories exist and project funds are separated but some cross-project funding takes place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the organisation's funds are separated and it generally tries to avoid cross-project financing. • Financial procedures and reporting systems are in place and function partially. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial procedures and reporting systems are in place and function fully. • Account categories exist for separating project funds.
GO19	Budgeting	Reflection/review by senior management, Finance department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgets are inadequate and if they do exist are produced due to donor requirements. • The use of budgets as a management tool is not understood and the reliability of projections is questionable. • The organisation has no budget controls in place. • The organisation has no financial unit to prepare and manage budgets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgets are developed for project activities but are often over or under-spent. • The executive director or accountant is the only staff who knows and understands budget information. • Budget controls are not in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total expenditures often diverge from budget projections. • Department and organisational unit heads are consulted by financial manager(s) about budget planning and expenditures. • The budget reflects programme plans. • The budget is controlled on an organisational basis. • The budgeting process does not incorporate a gender analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budgeting process is integrated into annual implementation plans. • A financial unit responsible for the preparation management and implementation of the annual budget exists. • Annual financial projections are made. • The annual budget is implemented. • The budget is controlled on an organisational basis. • The budgeting process incorporates a gender analysis

GO20	Stock controls/audit	Reflection/review by senior management, Procurement and Logistics department, Finance department, internal/external auditors and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has no clear procedures for handling payables and receivables nor does procurement or stock controls exist. • No audits or external financial reviews are performed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has established financial controls but has not yet implemented procedures. • Independent audits or external financial reviews are rarely performed and then only at the request of a funder. • Stock controls have not been established nor implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has adequate financial and stock control systems. • Independent audits or external financial reviews are performed periodically at funder's request. • Internal audits are being conducted on an ad hoc basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock control systems exist. • Stock controls are followed. • Procurement systems are in place and are being used. • Internal audits are conducted on a regular basis. • External audits are conducted on a regular basis. • Expenses are controlled by project allocations.
GO21	Financial reporting	Reflection/review by senior management, Finance department, internal/external auditors and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has no system for reporting on its financial status. • If financial reports are produced they are donor-driven. • Financial reports are inaccurate, incomplete, difficult to understand and not produced in a timely fashion. • If financial reports exist they are not used for planning or review purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has a system in place to produce financial reports but these are still produced in response to donor demand. • Financial reports are not timely or complete enough to be used in long-term planning. • Financial reports are not reviewed by the fiscal committee of the board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation occasionally produces accurate and complete financial reports which it makes available to the board and management. • The organisation uses financial reports, when available, in long-term planning. • Annual financial reports are prepared by external auditors and disseminated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An annual financial report is prepared by a registered firm of auditors and is published and disseminated. • Report includes balance sheet and attachments • Report is reviewed by the fiscal committee of the board. • Report is used for planning and review purposes.
GO22	Diversification of income base	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Fundraising/Finance department and staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is dependent on one funding source. • The organisation lacks capacity to diversify funding base or tender for contracts. • The organisation has no cost-recovery or income generation activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is aware of the need to diversify its funding base but has not yet developed a plan or strategy to do so. • The organisation has not yet developed the capacity to tender for contracts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has identified more than one international donor but has yet to develop local contacts. • The organisation has developed a plan for cost-recovery and income generating activities but has yet to implement activities. • The organisation has skills to tender for contracts but has yet to win any bids. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has multiple funders. • A cost-recovery/income generation plan is in place. • The organisation has the ability to tender for, and has won contracts. • The organisation has a strategy to diversify funding sources.

GO23	Sectoral expertise	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, field staff and general staff. Interviews with other agencies working in the same sectors to obtain their perceptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has some good ideas about how to meet needs of target groups. • The organisation has little operational or programme experience. • The organisation has no sectoral expertise or track record. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has increasing expertise in a targeted sector but is not yet recognised as an expert. • The organisation has the capacity to access additional expertise as required in a targeted sector. • The organisation continues to deliver services which do not always reflect the changing needs of stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is recognised as having significant expertise in its targeted sector and is being invited to contribute to sectoral discussions. • The organisation is able to deliver effective and appropriate services to stakeholders. • The organisation is beginning to build fee-for service and other cost recovery mechanisms into its service delivery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has relevant sectoral expertise. • Its expertise is recognised by the full range of stakeholders. • The organisation is capable of adapting programme and service delivery to the evolving needs of stakeholders.
GO24	Stakeholder commitment/ ownership	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, and staff. Reflection/review by individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation's services are defined by funders or managers with no involvement from stakeholders. • The organisation's programmes (since they do not reflect actual needs) are not efficient, adequate, cost-effective nor timely. • The organisation is not providing capacity building training/technical assistance to stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation seeks stakeholder input into defining services but does not do so in a systematic or comprehensive manner. • The organisation has identified resources for ad hoc training of stakeholders in programme and technical areas. • The organisation's programmes are not efficient, adequate, cost-effective or timely. • The organisation has not identified resources to support the organisational capacity building of stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has mechanisms in place to involve its stakeholders in project planning and implementation and monitoring and evaluation. • The organisation has plans to transfer management responsibilities to stakeholders and to provide training and organisational development support to build its capacity. • Programmes are becoming more efficient, adequate, cost-effective and timely. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme priorities are based on actual need. • Programme priorities and services are defined in collaboration with stakeholders. • Programmes are efficient, adequate, cost-effective, and timely.
GO25	Marketing and awareness building	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, staff and by individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation makes no effort to market programmes to stakeholders. • The organisation does not educate nor build awareness among stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has no awareness of the need to market programmes. • The organisation is educating and building awareness on an ad hoc basis based on available resources, not stakeholder need. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has undertaken marketing activities but still lacks a strategy. • The organisation has a plan to build awareness and educate stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programmes are actively marketed to stakeholders. • The organisation actively educates and builds awareness among stakeholders.

GO26	Stakeholder relations	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, staff and by individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation's agenda is largely donor- and management-driven with little or no input from stakeholders. • The organisation is located in an urban centre and its headquarters are a long distance from where it carries out activities, making it difficult to involve stakeholders effectively. • The organisation develops systems and programmes in a top-down manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation's work is focused in the field and it is viewed as an ally by stakeholders. • The organisation has growing credibility with its target stakeholders and with funders interested in the same programme sectors. • The organisation is not yet viewed as a partner by stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation operates from a field project site. • The organisation involves stakeholders in decision-making. • The organisation views stakeholders as being responsible for providing counterpart resources. • The organisation provides resources to enable target communities to develop organisational capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is seen as credible by stakeholders. • The organisation is seen as a valuable resource by stakeholders. • The organisation-stakeholder relationship is one of partnership for a common purpose.
GO27	Inter-organisation collaboration	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, staff. Reflection/review by management and programme staff of UN agencies and NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation does not have experience of working with other NGO and UN agencies • The organisation is not known or trusted by the organisation community. • The organisation has no plans to work in collaboration with other NGOs active in the same region or same sector. • The organisation has little understanding of its role in advocacy or development of public policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation is increasingly known and trusted by others in the NGO community but as yet has little experience in working collaboratively with other NGOs • The organisation has no experience of working with UN agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation works with international or other local NGO. • The organisation participates in and supports NGO networks, but as yet does not play a leadership role in any NGO coalitions. • The organisation has had some experience of working with a UN agency • The organisation has undertaken random advocacy activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation networks and shares resources with national and international NGOs. • The organisation works with more than one UN agency • The organisation plays a role in promoting coalitions/ networks. • The organisation participates in advocacy activities.
GO28	Government collaboration	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, staff. Interviews with relevant government agencies (national/provincial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation does not collaborate with government agencies working in the same sector or geographical area. • The organisation's relationship with government is adversarial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has identified common interests which it shares with government and relations are friendly. • The organisation collaborates with different government agencies or representatives on issues or activities in specific sectors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation's relationship with government is friendly and often informal. • The organisation is sometimes called upon by government to carry out specific projects or collaborate on sectoral issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has contacts with decision makers. • The organisation is able to engage in dialogue with policy makers. • The organisation and government exchange resources. • The organisation's activities and recommendations are integrated into government's development plans.

GO29	Public relations	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, PR/Information departments and staff. Interviews with stakeholder representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation is not well known outside the range of its activities or stakeholders. The organisation has no clear image which it articulates or presents to the public. The organisation has not prepared a document for dissemination that provides information about its objectives or activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation is known in its own community, but does little to promote its activities with the public or with key governmental decision makers. The organisation understands that public relations are important but has no ability to carry out PR activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has limited contact with key decision makers and has limited lines of communication with the public. The organisation has clear ideas on issues but has yet to develop them into a policy platform. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation engages in public relations and has a positive image among stakeholders. The organisation's objectives and goals are understood by stakeholders. Information is disseminated on the organisation's activities.
GO30	Local resources	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Fundraising/Finance departments and staff. Interviews with representatives of civil society representatives and private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation tends to view the private business sector with suspicion and distrust. The organisation does not work in cooperation with any part of the private sector to draw on resources, technical expertise or influence. The organisation's programmes are not based on local resource availability. The organisation is not an active participant in civil society activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has begun to identify local support in addition to that which it receives from stakeholders. The organisation seeks technical assistance from some private sector and government resources. The organisation purchases goods and services from the private sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation draws support from the local private sector and government agencies but projects still depend on continued support from external funders. The organisation has recruited individuals from the private business sector to serve on its board or as technical advisors. The organisation is actively engaged with other civil society organisations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has relations with the private sector for technical expertise, material and/or human resources. The organisation participates in community partnerships. The organisation has structures in place to facilitate working relations with civil society.
GO31	Media	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, PR/Information departments and staff. Interviews with representatives of relevant media organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has no relationship with the media, nor is its work known to them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation's activities are not known outside of its community. The organisation does not yet know how to access or use media to inform the public about its work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has contacts in the media which it uses when it wishes to inform the public about an important issue. The organisation has received some attention and has been consulted by the media on relevant issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a strategy to work with the media. The organisation has received positive media attention. The media consults with the organisation on relevant issues.
GO32	Programme/ benefit sustainability	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department and staff. Interviews with representatives of relevant media organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation stakeholders do not see or feel that they benefit from services or programmes. The organisation has no understanding or plan for continuity. The organisation is not working with local institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation stakeholders recognise the benefits from services and programmes, but do not yet have the means to continue them without assistance from the organisation. The organisation has yet to develop relationships with, and is not providing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation stakeholders recognise the benefits of, and are involved in, decision-making for services and programmes but continue to rely on assistance from the organisation. The organisation has developed relationships with local organisations, is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation's programmes are supported by those being served. There is a sense of ownership of benefits by the community. The organisation has developed systems for the continuation of its programme activities in

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation is not involved in skills-transfer activities. 	capacity building assistance to, local organisations.	providing training and technical assistance to build capacity, but as yet has no phasing-out strategies.	<p>accordance with changes in the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has developed systems for continuation of its programme in the medium and long-term. The organisation has developed programmatic phasing-out strategies. The organisation ensures that local-level skills transfer takes place.
GO33	Organisational sustainability	<p>Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department and staff.</p> <p>Interviews with representatives of relevant stakeholder's government agencies and other NGOs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation lacks a shared vision and skills to interact with other development partners in civil society The organisation has no understanding of its role as a partner in development. The organisation is not involved in coalitions and networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a shared vision but as yet lacks the understanding and skills to interact with other development partners. The organisation is a member of coalitions and networks but is not yet able to provide leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a clear vision of its role and the skills necessary to participate in development activities. The organisation participates in organisation networks and coalitions, but is not yet playing a leadership role in the organisation community. The organisation is acknowledged to have expertise in a sector, but is not recognised as a leader nor consulted by funders or government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has a shared vision of its role in society. The organisation is a member of key organisation networks. The organisation shares information in a proactive manner. The organisation is a participant in a dynamic development arena. The organisation has linkages with international organisations, education institutions, government entities, research institutes, civic institutions, and the private sector. The organisation has capacity to review its structures in response to organisational development needs. The organisation is aware of legislation affecting the NGO sector.

Notes

TABLE 4: Accountability, Motivation and Learning Capacities

The purpose of this table is for members to assess their capacities in relation to accountability, motivation and learning. These are not a formal requirement of being an ACT member but expectations of good practice by ACT members do exist. Organisational motivation to develop capacity and a commitment to learning are important requirements of the Capacity Development Initiative. Completion of this table is therefore obligatory.

Ref.	Capacity Element	Sources of information	Level of Capacity			
			1 'Nascent'	2 'Developing'	3 'Maturing'	4 'Mature'
AML1	Transparency in relation to disaster affected populations	Reflection/review by management and programme staff Interviews with disaster affected populations and their representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation does not provide information on plans, entitlements and selection procedures to disaster affected populations that it serves or plans to serve The organisation has no established complaints procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation sometimes provides information on plans, entitlements and selection procedures to disaster affected populations that it serves or plans to serve The organisation has begun to set up complaints procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation often provides information on plans, entitlements and selection procedures to disaster affected populations that it serves or plans to serve The organisation has set up complaints procedures in many, but not all of its programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation always provides information on plans, entitlements and selection procedures to disaster affected populations that it serves or plans to serve The organisation has well established complaints procedures in all of its programmes
AML2	Participation of disaster affected populations and their representatives in programme decisions and in giving their informed consent	Reflection/review by management and programme staff Interviews with disaster affected populations and their representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation never involves disaster affected populations and their representatives to participate in programme decisions The organisation never seeks the informed consent of disaster affected populations and their representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation sometimes involves disaster affected populations and their representatives in programme decisions The organisation sometimes seeks the informed consent of disaster affected populations and their representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation often involves disaster affected populations and their representatives in programme decisions The organisation often seeks the informed consent of disaster affected populations and their representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation always involves disaster affected populations and their representatives in programme decisions The organisation always seeks the informed consent of disaster affected populations and their representatives
AML3	Assessment of programme and performance	Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, staff and by individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation does not have a system to monitor and evaluate its programme/project achievements. The organisation has no mechanism with which to determine impact indicators, establish baseline measures or assess the impact of its activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation is able to assess individual projects to determine if projected activities took place as planned, and if specific project objectives were achieved, but the results are not used for programme adjustment. The organisation has no baseline data or system to monitor its activities. Results and indicators were developed at the request of funders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation has identified indicators without stakeholder involvement, It collects baseline data with which to monitor project activities, but is not using the collected data for project modification. It is aware of the need to develop assessment capacity to measure impact, but has not established a system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation develops indicators collaboratively together with stakeholders Indicators have been identified for each programme objective. Baseline and impact data are analysed regularly. Results of evaluations are used to make adjustments to the programme. Results of evaluations are disseminated as appropriate/relevant.

<p>AML4</p>	<p>Motivation to develop capacity</p>	<p>Reflection/review by Board, senior management, Programme department, and staff Reflection/review by individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither the Board or senior management are committed to developing the capacity of the organisation to better fulfil its mission/goal • The organisation has undertaken 'capacity development' activities in the past but they have not had a discernible impact on organisational effectiveness • There have been no serious effort to learn from previous experiences in relation to capacity development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some members of the Board and senior management are interested in developing the capacity of the organisation to better fulfil its mission/goal • The organisation's efforts to develop capacity are patchy and uncoordinated • The organisation does not have a capacity development strategy or plan • There have been some attempts to learn from previous experiences in relation to capacity development but these have not been followed-up or translated into clear policies and plans • The organisation is wholly dependent on external resources to fund its capacity development activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most members of the Board and senior management are committed to developing the capacity of the organisation to better fulfil its mission/goal • The organisation has developed a strategy for capacity development but these have yet to be properly linked to the overall Strategic Plan and so far have not been adequately resourced • Many but not all capacity development activities are documented and reflected upon and many of these are followed-up. • The organisation remains largely dependent on external resources to fund its capacity development activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board and senior management are fully committed to developing the capacity of the organisation to better fulfil its mission/goal • Capacity development is a clear commitment in the Strategic Plan of the organisation and this links to a comprehensive capacity development plan • All capacity development activities are documented and regularly reflected upon to identify lessons and areas where improvements can be made • The organisation uses its own resources to fund many of its capacity development activities
<p>AML5</p>	<p>Space for Learning</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation does not create space for learning at the project or organisational level • The culture of the organisation discourages reflection on experience, experimentation, and learning • The organisation does not have a staff development policy or a budget for training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation sometimes holds reviews of its work at the project and organisational level but these are sporadic and often not followed up • The culture of the organisation does not encourage reflection on experience, experimentation, or learning • The organisation is developing a staff development policy but the budget for training is inadequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation often holds reviews of its work at the project and organisational level • The culture of the organisation encourages reflection on experience, experimentation, and learning • The organisation has a staff development policy and the budget for training is adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation has successfully built space for learning into project level and organisational level processes • The culture of the organisation actively encourages and supports reflection on experience, experimentation, and learning • The organisation has a clear staff development policy and well-resourced training budget

TABLE 5: Good Donorship in support of operational partners within ACT

ACT members providing resources in support of operational partners play a critically important role within the Alliance. However, to perform this role effectively requires a particular set of capacities and qualities that are not fully covered in the other tables comprising the ACT OCA Tool. This table is therefore intended to help those ACT members (particularly those with field offices in disaster-prone countries) providing resources in support of operational partners, to assess and reflect on their capacities in relation to this role. For some ACT members mobilising resources and providing them to partner organisations is their primary role, whilst for others this role may be undertaken alongside a direct implementation role. The table is intended for use by ACT members in either of these situations.

With the exception of RP9 the table makes no differentiation between operational partners that are members of ACT and those that are not.

Ref.	Capacity Element	Sources of information	Level of Capacity			
			1 'Nascent'	2 'Developing'	3 'Maturing'	4 'Mature'
GD1	Selection of new operational partners	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New operational partners are selected with no prior systematic assessment of their capacities, values and organisational strengths and weaknesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New operational partners are often selected with no prior systematic assessment of their capacities, values and organisational strengths and weaknesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New operational partners are sometimes selected following a systematic assessment of their capacities, values and organisational strengths and weaknesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New operational partners are always selected following a systematic assessment of their capacities, values and organisational strengths and weaknesses
GD2	Range of support provided	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to operational partners is provided on a 'one-off' basis and limited to disaster response programmes only Type of support available is limited to one form only (finance resources; in-kind resources or human resources) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to operational partners is extending beyond disaster response programmes to include disaster preparedness and/or disaster recovery and rehabilitation Type of support available is limited to two of the following (finance resources; in-kind resources or human resources) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to operational partners is extending beyond disaster response and recovery to include capacity development and organisation development Type of support available includes finance resources; in-kind resources and human resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to operational partners potentially covers all aspects of their work and operation Range of support includes the funding of 3rd party support providers Operational partners feel they are not limited in the type and form of support that they can request from the resource providing member
GD3	Basis of the relationship	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal agreements covering the principles, roles and responsibilities of the relationship do not exist with any of the operational partners Engagement with operational partners is sporadic and related to the agenda of the resource mobilising member 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal agreements covering the principles, roles and responsibilities of the relationship exist with some but not all operational partners Staff of the operational partners are unfamiliar with the provisions of the formal agreements Engagement with operational partners is continuous but is dominated by the agenda of the resource mobilising member 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal agreements covering the principles, roles and responsibilities of the relationship exist with all operational partners but adherence to their provisions are not reviewed on a regular basis Some staff of the operational partners are unfamiliar with the provisions of the formal agreements Engagement with operational partners is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal agreements covering the principles, roles and responsibilities of the relationship exist with all operational partners and adherence to their provisions are reviewed on a regular basis Staff of the operational partners are familiar with the provisions of the formal agreements Engagement with operational partners is continuous and

					continuous but most operational partners feel that the relationship is not one based on mutual respect	operational partners feel that the relationship is one based on mutual respect
GD4	Transparency of the relationship	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasons for decisions relating to operational partners are not formally communicated Strategic documents and workplans are not shared with operational partners Operational partners generally feel excluded from information and discussions which are of direct relevance to them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasons for decisions relating to operational partners are formally communicated to some but not all operational partners Strategic documents and workplans are shared with some but not all operational partners Some operational partners feel excluded from information and discussions which are of direct relevance to them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasons for decisions in relation to operational partners are formally communicated to all operational partners Strategic documents and workplans are shared with all operational partners Operational partners do not feel excluded from information and discussions which are of direct relevance to them but they would like more opportunities for the discussion on areas of mutual interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic documents and annual workplans are shared with all operational partners Regular meetings held to review supported activities collaborative programmes and plan future Operational partners feel fully consulted on issues and feel able to raise any issues
GD5	Reliability in the relationship	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are many instances of undertakings and agreements with operational partners not being honoured Operational partners are very uncertain whether a request for support will result in the prompt provision either of the support requested or a clear justification why it will not be provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are few instances of undertakings and agreements with operational partners not being honoured Operational partners are uncertain whether a request for support will result in the prompt provision either of the support requested or a clear justification why it will not be provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no instances of undertakings and agreements with operational partners not being honoured Operational partners know that a request for support will result in the provision of the support requested or a clear justification why it will not be provided. However, the provision of such responses may not be prompt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational partners have full confidence that undertakings and agreements with the support providing partner will be honoured Operational partners know that a request for support will result in the prompt provision of the support requested or a clear justification why it will not be provided.
GD6	Flexibility in the relationship	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once an agreement to provide support has been reached, it is not possible for operational partners to make alterations to any aspect of the agreement Operational partners regard the support provider as highly rigid and inflexible and closed to considering new initiatives or proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once an agreement to provide support has been reached, it is difficult and cumbersome for operational partners to make alterations to any aspect of the agreement Operational partners regard the support provider as rather inflexible and generally unwilling to consider new initiatives or proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once an agreement to provide support has been reached, it is straightforward and relatively easy for operational partners to make alterations to some aspects of the agreement Operational partners regard the support provider as generally flexible and willing to consider new initiatives or proposals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once an agreement to provide support has been reached, it is straightforward and relatively easy for operational partners to make alterations to any aspect of the agreement Operational partners regard the support provider as highly flexible and always willing to consider new initiatives and proposals

GD7	Respect for the autonomy of operational partners	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No effort is made to accommodate the agenda and established procedures of the operational partners In their dealings with the resource providing member, operational partners feel that they are merely contractors implementing programmes set by the resource provider using its procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some effort is made to accommodate the agenda and established procedures of the operational partners In their dealings with the resource providing member, operational partners feel that they are rarely regarded as autonomous organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant efforts are made to accommodate the agenda and established procedures of the operational partners In their dealings with the resource providing member, operational partners feel that they are generally regarded as autonomous organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agenda and established procedures of the operational partners are fully accommodated In their dealings with the resource providing member, operational partners feel that they are always regarded as autonomous organisations
GD8	Strategic basis for the relationship	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member and its operational partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship with all operational partners is short-term and future relationships cannot be objectively predicted No attempt is made to jointly plan or set strategy with operational partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship with many operational partners is short-term but with some operational partners it has moved on to a longer-term basis (3-5 years ahead) Efforts are made to jointly plan or set strategy with some operational partners but joint planning and strategy setting are not taking place with the majority of operational partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship with many operational partners has a longer-term basis (3-5 years ahead) Joint planning and strategy setting with operational partners is the norm but the alignment between the strategic plans of the operational partners and the resource providing member is sometimes weak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship with all operational partners has a planning horizon of at least five years Joint planning and strategy-setting has produced a strong alignment between the strategic plans of the operational partners and the resource providing member
GD9	Commitment to working with operational partners.	Questionnaire or interviews with managers and sample of staff in resource providing member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there is dissatisfaction with the performance of an operational partner, no effort is made to address the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there is dissatisfaction with the performance of an operational partner, some effort is made to address the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there is dissatisfaction with the performance of an operational partner, significant effort is made to address the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there is dissatisfaction with the performance of an operational partner, every effort is made to address the issue.

Notes

Table 6. ACT Forum Organisational Capacity Assessment Table

This table is intended to help ACT Forums assess their capacity to perform their role in coordinating the emergency-related activities of ACT members. (The table is based upon the Policy and Guidelines for National and Regional ACT Forums as approved by the Emergency Committee in April 2007.) Such an assessment is intended to complement the organisational capacity assessments being undertaken by individual ACT members as part of Phase I of the ACT Capacity Development Initiative (CDI). Completion of this process is obligatory for any ACT Forum intending to request access to CDI funds. This table is not relevant to ACT members operating in countries where an ACT Forum does not exist/has not been established.

Forums undertaking this process should adapt the ACT OCA process with its OCA Team and use of an external facilitator to their situation. The OCA Team for a self-assessment by a Forum should comprise representatives of different members and selected stakeholders. The process for selecting the external facilitator should involve all members of the Forum.

Ref.	Capacity Element	Sources of information	Level of Capacity			
			1 'Nascent'	2 'Developing'	3 'Maturing'	4 'Mature'
FA1	MoU	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An MoU does not exist And no efforts are underway to prepare one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An MoU is being prepared or is awaiting approval by all members and/or the ACT CO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An MoU has been approved by members and the ACT CO and is in place Mechanisms to review and adapt the MoU respond to changing contexts and needs have not been developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An approved MoU is in place Mechanisms are in place to regularly review and adapt the MoU to respond to changing context and needs
FA2	Membership and Participation	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members Interviews with selected individuals of principal external organisations (international NGOs, UN, Government agencies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria for membership have not been agreed Not all ACT members present in the country consider themselves as members of the Forum and/or participate in meetings Forum contains organisations that are not members of ACT International and their observer status is unclear to other Forum members and outside organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria for membership are being developed and have not yet been approved All ACT members present in the country consider themselves as members of the Forum but some regularly do not participate in meetings Forum contains organisations that are not members of ACT International but their observer status is clear to members but possibly not to outside organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria for membership have been fully approved All ACT members present in the country consider themselves as members of the Forum and participate regularly in most meetings, though balanced participation of both men and women is not attained Forum contains organisations that are not members of ACT International but their observer status is clear to members and outside organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum has clear criteria for membership The Forum includes all ACT members present in the country who play an active role in the work of the Forum and the activities it undertakes on behalf of its members A good gender balance exists among Forum participants

FA3	Roles and Responsibilities of Members	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members (Refer to list of roles of responsibilities of ACT Forum Members and ACT Forum Convenor Agency on page 8 of the Revised Policy and Guidelines for National and Regional ACT Forums (as approved by ACT EmCom April 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities of members are generally unclear • A convenor agency has not been agreed • No efforts are underway to prepare a document intended to set out roles and responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities of members are unclear in relation to certain areas • Efforts are underway to prepare a document (possibly as part of the MoU) intended to set out roles and responsibilities but have not been finalised/approved • A convenor agency has been agreed but is not performing satisfactorily in the role 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities of members are clearly articulated but are not always followed by some members • A convenor agency is in place and is performing satisfactorily 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities of members are clearly articulated and are consistently followed by all members • A convenor agency is in place and is performing well • Plans are in place for a smooth rotation of the convenor agency role
FA4	Coordination mechanisms	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum does not attempt to coordinate the activities of its members or facilitate their cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts by the Forum to coordinate the activities of its members and facilitate their cooperation are limited • Members are unwilling to lead efforts on behalf of the Forum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum is performing a useful role in coordinating the activities of its members and facilitating their cooperation but this is limited to only part of potential range of activities • Some members are willing to lead efforts on behalf of the Forum • Some members feel that the Forum is competing with them rather than complementing them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum is performing a valuable role in coordinating a wide range of the activities of its members and facilitates their cooperation in many areas • Many members are willing to provide leadership on behalf of the Forum • The Forum complements rather than competes with its members • The Forum is able to speak as a collective voice on behalf of its members
FA5	Structure	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure is loose and members differ in their understanding of the structure • Efforts to develop and clarify the structure have not commenced or have stalled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure is loose but members are working together to reach agreement on the structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure is agreed and reflects the coordination function of the Forum. However, it is limited by virtue of the fact that: • not all members of staff in all the members of the Forum are clear as to the structure and operation of the Forum • the structure is dependent upon external support • the structure is relatively inflexible and no mechanisms are in place to regularly review and adapt the structure in line with context and needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure is agreed and reflects the coordination function of the Forum. • All members of staff in all the members of the Forum are clear as to the structure and operation of the Forum • The structure is funded from within the resources of its members • Mechanisms are in place to regularly review and adapt the structure in line with context and needs The structure is relatively flexible

FA6	Meetings	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for calling and chairing meetings is often unclear • Minutes are not always kept of meetings and/or shared after the meetings • Meetings are irregular and long periods can elapse between meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for calling and chairing meetings is not always clear • Minutes are kept of meetings but action points are unclear and dissemination is not always satisfactory • Meetings are generally held at regular intervals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for calling and chairing meetings is usually clear • Meetings are held at regular interval in line with a schedule agreed by members • Minutes are kept with clear action points and are properly disseminated after the meetings • The meetings could be better run and could take up less time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility for calling and chairing meetings is usually clear • Meetings are held at regular interval in line with a schedule agreed by members • Minutes are kept with clear action points and are properly disseminated after the meetings • The meetings are well run and take no more time than necessary
FA7	Information Sharing and Transparency	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt has been made to develop agreement between members about what types of information should be shared among members • Details about forthcoming meetings and activities are frequently not shared in advance with all members of the Forum or with appropriate staff within the members • Decisions about the Forum or of direct relevance to it are often taken by non-inclusive groups • Decisions are not communicated fully to all members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efforts are underway to develop agreement between members about what types of information should be shared among members • Details about forthcoming meetings and activities are generally shared in advance with members but imperfections in dissemination remain • Decisions about the Forum or of direct relevance to it are sometimes taken by non-inclusive groups • Decisions about the Forum or of direct relevance to it and are not communicated fully to all members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement has been reached between members about what types of information should be shared among members • Details about forthcoming meetings and activities are always shared in advance with members but staff in some members imperfections remain • Decisions about the Forum or of direct relevance to it are taken by non-inclusive groups and are not communicated fully to all members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details about forthcoming meetings and activities are generally shared in advance with members but imperfections remain • Decisions about the Forum or of direct relevance to it are taken by non-inclusive groups and are not communicated fully to all members
FA8	Joint Activities: Preparedness and Response Plans	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum does not have a joint Preparedness and Response Plan and has no plans to prepare one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum is preparing a joint Preparedness and Response Plan but it has not yet been finalised and/or approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum has prepared and approved a joint Preparedness and Response Plan • Mechanisms for regularly updating the Plan are not in place and the current plan may need updating • Joint exercises to rehearse the plan are not undertaken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forum has prepared and approved a joint Preparedness and Response Plan • Mechanisms for regularly updating the Plan are in place and the current plan is up to date • Joint exercises to rehearse the plan are held regularly

FA9	Joint Activities: Emergency Assessments	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum has not developed the arrangements and capacities necessary to jointly undertake the initial emergency assessments and subsequent detailed emergency assessments and has no plans for developing such a capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum is developing the arrangements and capacities necessary to jointly undertake the initial emergency assessments and subsequent detailed emergency assessments but these have yet to be finalised and/or approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum has developed and approved the arrangements and capacities necessary to jointly undertake the initial emergency assessments and subsequent detailed emergency assessments Mechanisms for regularly updating the arrangements are not in place and current arrangements may need updating Joint exercises to rehearse the emergency assessment arrangements are not undertaken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum has developed and approved the arrangements and capacities necessary to jointly undertake the initial emergency assessments and subsequent detailed emergency assessments Mechanisms for regularly updating the arrangements are in place and current arrangements are up to date Joint exercises to rehearse the emergency assessment arrangements are held regularly
FA10	Joint Activities: Appeal Preparation	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays no role in coordinating the preparation of ACT Appeals other than collating unrelated proposals from different members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a minor role in coordinating the preparation of ACT Appeals The Forum ensures use of similar unit costs by different members The Forum questions members where proposed areas of operation appear to overlap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a significant role in coordinating the preparation of ACT Appeals The Forum ensures use of similar unit costs by different members and questions members where proposed areas of operation appear to overlap The Forum holds meetings during the Appeal preparation process to ensure members are aware of each other plans and are able to discuss amendments to their Appeals to achieve a more effective ACT response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a central role in coordinating the preparation of ACT Appeals The Forum facilitates the joint preparation of Appeals by members The Appeal comprises a joint response by ACT members working closely together and complementing each others programmes
FA11	Joint Activities: Training on Policies and Procedures	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays no role in providing training for members on ACT's policies and procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a minor role in providing training for members on ACT's policies and procedures The training is primarily provided by a Forum member but the Forum ensures that staff of other members are able to participate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a significant role in providing training for members on ACT's policies and procedures The Forum organises and provides training on behalf of all members of the Forum However, the trainings are not regular and do not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a central role in providing training for members on ACT's policies and procedures The training is provided on a regular basis and covers polices and procedures adopted within the last 12 months

					cover policies and procedures adopted within the last 12 months	
FA12	Joint Activities: Capacity Development	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays no role in supporting or coordinating the capacity development of members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a minor role in supporting and coordinating the capacity development of members The Forum has had some success in encouraging members to share their experiences in relation to capacity development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a significant role in supporting and coordinating the capacity development of members The Forum facilitates the regular sharing of experiences in relation to capacity development between members However, members of the Forum do not share their capacity development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum plays a central role in supporting and coordinating the capacity development of its members Capacity development plans of members are regularly shared within the Forum Members undertake joint capacity development projects
FA13	Linkage with disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members Interviews with selected representatives of national disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies (international NGOs, UN, Government agencies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness of the existence and role of the ACT Forum among disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies is minimal The Forum makes no effort to raise awareness of its role outside ACT circles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies are aware of the existence and role of the ACT Forum but their working relationships are only with certain members of the Forum The Forum is attempting to raise awareness of its role outside ACT circles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies are well aware of the existence and role of the ACT Forum but their working relationships are predominantly with certain members of the Forum Representative of the Forum participate in humanitarian coordination meetings but primarily for the purpose of gathering information for smaller members of the Forum that are unable to send their own representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The disaster preparedness and response forums and agencies regard the ACT Forum as a coherent and significant actor with different members working closely together with a common purpose Representatives of the Forum participate actively in humanitarian coordination meetings and are trusted to speak on behalf of all members of the Forum
FA14	Strategic Plan	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum does not have a Strategic Plan and there are no plans to prepare one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum is considering how to prepare a Strategic Plan but has not yet commenced the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum is preparing a Strategic Plan but it has yet to be finalised and/or approved by members and endorsed by the ACT CO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Forum has a Strategic Plan that has been approved by members and endorsed by the ACT CO The work plan and activities of the Forum are in line with the Strategic Plan
FA15	Sustainability	Questionnaire/ interviews with representatives of the management and staff of members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basic operation of the Forum is wholly dependent upon resources which are not sustainable (e.g. finite project funds, the goodwill and resources of one member) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basic operation of the Forum is significantly dependent upon resources which are not sustainable Other activities of the Forum are wholly dependent upon resources which are not sustainable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basic operation of the Forum is resourced from a mix of resources which are sustainable Other activities of the Forum are wholly dependent upon resources which are not sustainable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basic operation of the Forum and its other activities are resourced from a mix of resources which are sustainable and include willing contributions from all members

