



*Agricultural program for Rwandan widows and victims of genocide.*

## Assessing Organizational Capacity to Improve Food Security

March 2009

Publication of this manual was made possible by the generous support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance's Office of Food for Peace under the terms of Catholic Relief Services' Institutional Capacity Building Grant Award Number AFP-A-00-03-00015-00. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

## Assessing Organizational Capacity to Improve Food Security

Written by Sarah Ford, from original text by Gaye Burpee, Della McMillan, and Lucile Thomas

### Contributors

Moussa Bangre  
CADECOM Malawi  
Caritas Zimbabwe  
CRS Burkina Faso  
CRS Haiti  
CRS Malawi  
CRS Zimbabwe  
Linda Gamova  
Mary Hennigan  
Jim Hudock  
David Leege  
Will Lynch  
Driss Moumane  
Martin Mtika  
Stephen Nkoka  
Hippolyt Pul  
Daniel Selener  
Janine Scott Shines  
Guy Sharrock  
Anne Smith  
Dennis Warner  
Barbara Whitney



*A Zambian farmer with his casava plants*

### Editors

Leah Cohen  
Tracey Hawkins  
Joseph Schultz

Catholic Relief Services  
228 W. Lexington Street  
Baltimore, MD 21201-3413 USA

Since 1943, Catholic Relief Services has had the privilege of serving the poor and disadvantaged overseas. Without regard to race, creed, or nationality, CRS provides emergency relief in the wake of natural and manmade disasters. Through development projects in fields such as education, peace and justice, agriculture, microfinance, health, and HIV/AIDS, CRS works to uphold human dignity and promote better standards of living. CRS also works throughout the United States to expand the knowledge and action of Catholics and others interested in issues of international peace and justice. Our programs and resources respond to the U.S. bishops' call to live in solidarity—as one human family—across borders, over oceans, and through differences in language, culture and economic condition.

## Table of Contents

Acronyms

Introduction

Organizational Capacity Analysis

The Indices

Table 1 Capacity Assessment Indices

Facilitation of the Indices

Setting the Stage for the Indices

Steps in Using the Indices

Background: Core Organizational Development Index (CODI)

Using CODI

Background: Programming Capacity Index (PCI)

Using PCI

Background: The Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI)

Using LCCI

Action Planning

Sample Action Plan Format

Conclusion

Appendix A Core Organizational Development Index (CODI)

Appendix B Programming Capacity Index (PCI)

Appendix C Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI)

Additional LCCI Data

Appendix D References



*DRC: Returning displaced families resettle and regain their food security after five years of civil war.*

## Acronyms

AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ARC	American Red Cross
CADECOM	Catholic Development Commission of Malawi
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CODI	Core Organizational Development Index
COP	Chief of Party
CR	Country Representative
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DAP	Development Assistance Program
DIP	Detailed Implementation Plan
DMER	Design, Monitoring and Evaluation
FAM	Food Aid Management (Consortium of Title II Cooperating Sponsors)
FANTA	Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance
FIFO	First In, First Out
FFP	Food for Peace (Unit of USAID that administers Title II)
ICB	Institutional Capacity Building
IHD	Integral Human Development
IPTT	Indicator Performance Tracking Table
IR	Intermediate Result
LCB	Local Capacity Building
LCCI	Local Community Capacity Index
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MYAP	Multi Year Assistance Program
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OVC	Orphan and Vulnerable Children
PCI	Programming Capacity Index
POET	Participatory Organizational Evaluation Tool
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
SO	Strategic Objective
SOW	Scope of Work
STA	Senior Technical Advisor
TA	Technical assistance
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAID/FFP	United States Agency for International Development/Food for Peace
USAID/FFP/W	United States Agency for International Development /FFP Washington Office

## Introduction

All United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Food for Peace (FFP) Title II projects emphasize the need for capacity building to strengthen the abilities of individuals and institutions to sustain development interventions over time. One unique feature of the Catholic Relief Service (CRS) Title II project organization and management structure has been its historic commitment to working through local non-governmental organization (NGO) partners, Catholic Church and others, to achieve food security project outcomes. For CRS, building partner and local community capacity is essential to successful food security projects.

CRS's long-standing commitment to partnership reinforces the notion of mutual capacity building. Its partnership principles state, "The engagement of CRS and the local partner in local capacity development involves a long-term commitment to complete a mutually agreed upon process of organizational development." In its commitment to partnership, CRS promotes mutual transparency regarding capacities, constraints, and resources and, by building partnerships, CRS seeks to contribute to the strengthening of civil society.<sup>1</sup>

In fact, an early capacity assessment tool used by CRS, developed and used throughout West Africa in the early 1990s, was the CRS Institutional Building (IB) assessment tool. The IB tool was reinforced in 1999 by a chapter on capacity building in the CRS Project Proposal Guidance and a revised strategy for capacity building and community participation and checklist is included in, "Project Design and Proposal Guidance for CRS Project and Program Managers", or ProPack I<sup>2</sup>.



*Organic farmer talking to her ag-extension officer, Zambia*

Building on the principles of partnership and the history of organizational assessment and capacity building, CRS produced the organizational capacity assessment indices in this manual under a USAID FFP Title II Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) grant. The goal of the ICB is, "to reduce food insecurity in vulnerable populations through three Strategic Objectives (SOs) and eight Intermediate Results (IRs)." Strategic Objective One (SO1) addresses vulnerability, cross-sectoral approaches to risk management,

and the gap between emergency and development programs. SO2 focuses on HIV/AIDS and water insecurity, due to the gravity and scale of these problems in relation to food security and the complex responses required to address these problems. SO3 centers on building community and private voluntary organization (PVO) capacities to understand and influence critical decisions and factors affecting food insecurity.

---

<sup>1</sup> CRS Partnership Principles, 1999

<sup>2</sup> Pro Pack I: Project Design and Proposal Guidance for CRS Project and Program Managers. Valerie Stetson, Guy Sharrock and Susan Hahn, July 2004

The Indices respond to Intermediate Result (IR)-A: “capacity of local partners and communities to manage and implement programs is increased.” Although the intended focus of the Indices is CRS and its partner’s Title II-funded projects, the Indices have relevance for other Title II Cooperating Sponsors (CS) and CRS’s non-Title II portfolio.

CRS recognizes that existing partner capacity affects their ability to manage Title II programs, work effectively with communities, and sustain program activities at the end of Title II funding.

### **Organizational Capacity Analysis**

CRS defines capacity as the ability of individuals and organizational units to perform functions effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable manner<sup>3</sup>. This implies that capacity is not a passive state, but rather an evolutionary process, recognizing that no organization has achieved complete capacity, nor is fully effective, efficient, or sustainable.

Organizational capacity analysis is an important tool for improving food security programs, programs in other sectors, and for strengthening civil society. Capacity assessment tools improve an organization’s ability to address an identified need by implementing a particular sectoral strategy or intervention. Organizational capacity analysis help CRS country programs to determine whether they, their partners, and communities have the ability to respond effectively and efficiently to “unmet needs” identified in the problem and gap analyses.

CRS programs have always emphasized capacity building, including at the community level. Indeed the CRS’s strong emphasis on farmer training and building the organizational capacity of communities where CRS works has always been at the core of its development initiatives. In an attempt to develop a more standardized process for monitoring capacity building, CRS developed a list of sample indicators for capacity building as part of the “CRS Program Manual”<sup>4</sup>. This list identified variables for measuring capacity and indicators for assessing the capacity of community groups or community based organizations. The manual identified additional variables and indicators for measuring community group awareness. Since 1999, CRS’s Title II programs integrated a large number of these indicators into food security IPTTs.

CRS’s commitment to developing better systems for monitoring capacity building was also reflected in the active participation of its staff in and financial support for the Food Aid Management (FAM) consortium’s working group on Local Capacity Building.

### **The Indices**

The capacity analysis Indices in this manual allow CRS, partners, and communities to identify the technical and financial capacity areas of strength they wish to maintain while addressing weaker capacity areas. The Indices may be used at the point of project design, as a mid-point monitoring process, and during a final project evaluation to assess the ability of CRS, partners, and communities to implement food security projects and related activities. The results of the Indices provide users with the information needed to make decisions on what aspects of their programmatic, managerial, and financial capacity need strengthening.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, page 92.

<sup>4</sup> Catholic Relief Services, 1998: 163-171

The Indices may be used in conjunction with the, “Designing Title II Multi-Year Assistance Programs (MYAPs): A Resource Manual for CRS Country Programs” manual published by CRS in 2008.<sup>5</sup>

The ultimate goal of the indices is to assist CRS, partners, and communities:

- Identify the broad categories of skills they need to master in order to better support community capacity building through their Title II projects;
- Monitor progress toward mastery of these skills as a result of capacity strengthening as forecast in the resulting action plans, and;
- Provide a more systematic mechanism for assessing the impact of CRS, partner, and community a capacity building as both an input and output of Title II programming.

There are three Indices in this manual.

- The **CODI (Core Organizational Development Index)** assesses the core organizational development capacity that CRS or partners need to participate as full partners in food security programs. The primary users of CODI are CRS and partners;
- The **PCI (Program Capacity Index)** assesses the more specific technical skills that managers and technical supervisors in both CRS country programs and national NGO partners need to execute Title II programs, and;
- The **LCCI (Local Community Capacity Index)** assesses the core organizational capacity and the technical capacity that local communities need to create and manage food security initiatives, as well as national NGO partner and CRS program support to these community-based initiatives.



All three Indices have a similar format of category, variable, and indicators. The number of categories and variables changes from Index to Index, but each variable has no more than four indicators. The indicators use the same criteria for scores: (1) Very limited capacity, (2) Limited capacity, (3) Acceptable capacity, and (4) High capacity. The highest ratings suggest that a partner, CRS country program, or regional office is working to a high standard and, in the case of a partner, toward being able to maintain this capacity once project funding ends.

*An HIV-positive beneficiary picks up monthly rations of wheat, corn-soy blend and cooking oil, Ethiopia*

---

<sup>5</sup> Catholic Relief Services, 2008

**Table 1 Capacity Assessment Indices**

Indices	Capacities measured	Users		
		NGO partners	CRS country programs	Local communities
<b>Program-level tools</b>				
<b>CODI</b> (Core Organizational Development Index)	Core organizational capacity of partner organizations	X		
<b>PCI</b> (Program Capacity Index)	Title II-specific programming capacities that partners and CRS programs need to successfully design, implement, monitor and evaluation Title II food security programs	X	X	
<b>Community-level tools</b>				
<b>LCCI</b> (Local Community Capacity Index)	The organizational capacities that local community groups need in order to identify food security risks and to design and execute solutions collaboration with national NGO partners			X

**Facilitation of the Indices**

There are several ways to use the Indices and most NGOs have their own approach to conducting such analysis. CRS’s commitment to long-term, respectful partnerships based on subsidiarity and mutual autonomy, strongly suggests a highly participatory and positive approach to organizational capacity analysis.

There are two options for using the Indices: self-assessment, facilitated internally, or external assessment, bringing in a facilitator from outside the organization. The question of which approach to use will depend on the timing and resources available. Whether internal or externally facilitated, the emphasis must be on the promotion of meaningful dialogue during the process to guarantee their ownership of the process.

Whether done internally or with a consultant, capacity assessments require someone with excellent facilitation skills who can help the group discover strengths and capacities and reveal problems and gaps. The facilitator also must be prepared to navigate through potentially troublesome issues and dominating personalities to arrive at a picture of the organization that accurately reflects capacities and challenges and leads to productive plan of action.

CRS and partners may wish to complete the Indices together, in a spirit of mutuality and joint learning. As such, capacity-strengthening activities may be conducted together for the benefit of both organizations and their staff.



## Setting the Stage for the Indices

An organizational capacity assessment is most useful when conducted in a spirit of appreciative discovery, acknowledging that all organizations have strengths and challenges. CRS staff should prioritize the time and effort needed to work with partners and communities to establish a positive environment in which to conduct the assessment.

First, all must agree to the need for the assessment and on how they will use the data from the assessment. For needed improvements, are there resources available? Are there concerns that a rating demonstrates a need for increased capacity reflect poorly on the organization or community, potentially jeopardizing funding? Conversely, there may be fears that strong outcomes will justify ending funding or capacity building. Partners, communities, and CRS must discuss these concerns and others before using the Indices. A willingness to participate honestly in an assessment increases when expectations and potential outcomes are clear.

Before completing the Indices, CRS, partners, and communities must identify and prepare the individuals to be involved, including staff and board members (both program and financial staff) managers, and leaders. Formal and informal community leaders, including women, men, and youth, should be consulted, and included.

## Steps in Using the Indices

*CRS and partners meet with beneficiaries of a milk marketing project, Ethiopia.*

1. Together, CRS and partner organization leadership agree to the rationale for using the Indices and how the results will be used;
2. Partners select the team responsible for completing the Indices;
3. Determine whether a CRS staff member will be involved in the process and what role CRS will play in the Indices;
4. Review the sections in the Indices and the questions in each section. Edit the sections, deleting those questions which are not relevant and adding others as needed;
5. In a workshop or by interviews, answer each question in the Indices. Ask the participants to give specific examples and to be as candid as they can in assessing the strengths and challenges they face;
6. When there is disagreement, probe for causes and try to reach agreement on the ranking for each question;



7. Once all questions are answered, review the scores. Using the data, look for trends where the organization has high capacity. How did the organization achieve and maintain high capacity in certain areas? How can lessons learned from those experiences apply to improving areas of low capacity?
8. Discuss the organizational elements that received low scores. Determine through discussion and consensus the most important elements to strengthen. Pay particular attention to those aspects of an organization that are fundamental -- can an organization exist without strong programs? Without sound financial management systems?
9. Rank possible improvements in priority order. Using the action plan provided in Appendix E, or a tool familiar to the organization, determine which aspects of the organization's capacity will be strengthened, using what resources, by whom, in an appropriate timeframe, and to whom progress will be reported.
10. All participants should agree on the role that each will play in the capacity strengthening process.

### **Background: Core Organizational Development Index (CODI)**

CODI assesses the core organizational development capacity that CRS or partners need to participate as full partners in food security programs.

The primary audiences for CODI are NGO partners working with CRS on Title II programs. A secondary audience is CRS country programs, which can use this index to assess their own organizational capacity in order to illustrate and develop the NGO partners' capacity.

Conduct CODI during a Title II project design. These pre-design measures should be updated, however, once the project starts and then as determined by the partner and CRS thereafter. Re-administer CODI at the end of the project as part of the final project evaluation.

CODI measures five capacity categories: governance and vision, management resources, human resources, financial resources, and external resources. Each of these capacities is broken down into variables, which are composed of the critical sub-categories of capacity. The number of variables in each category varies, but each variable is assessed using indicators. Each indicator is ranked (1) Very limited capacity, (2) Limited capacity, (3) Acceptable capacity, and (4) High capacity. The highest ranking of "4" suggests that the national partner is both working to a higher standard and moving in the direction of being able to sustain the capacity once Title II funding ends.



*Participants in an agricultural extension project, Malawi*

### **Using CODI**

A preparatory meeting and one workshop are ideal for administering CODI. Ideally, the first meeting takes place a few days prior to conducting the CODI. This initial meeting should be attended by all of the technical supervisors and administrative and finance officers associated with the project. To facilitate their understanding of CODI, the leader should circulate a printed copy prior to the meeting. Staff should prepare for the meeting by reading CODI and beginning to think about how they would rank

the indicators. During a one-to-two hour staff meeting, the assessment leader should explain CODI and solicit ideas as to its potential utility with the staff. Finally, the leader should walk the staff through a trial ranking of one category of capacity and explain how and when the actual assessment will take place.

The workshop involves the participatory ranking of the CODI indicators, review of the results, and action planning. The process should take a day. During the first half of the day, the staff should read the rankings line by line and reach consensus on the rankings. A secretary nominated by the entire group should note the final rankings on a master copy of the form. Ideally, the project coordinator and at least one other technical specialist from the CRS project staff (the project coordination unit) should participate as the partner completes CODI. Conversely, if CRS is using CODI, key partner staff should participate as well.

The third of CODI involves data entry. Once the rankings are established through consensus, the staff-elected secretary enters the responses in CODI's form while the remainder of staff takes a lunch break. Once the responses are tabulated, the secretary prints copies of the final scores for each participant. When the staff returns, they review and discuss the results of the assessment. The group then identifies areas of strength, challenges facing the organization, and identifies the most important areas of capacity building needed and the resources (human, financial, material) needed for the strengthening effort.

Based on the group's analysis, the leadership of the partner organization, including the food security project manager, works with CRS to develop a capacity building action plan.

**CODI is found in Appendix A.**



*CRS and partner staff meet with beneficiaries of a unique milk marketing project in southern Ethiopia.*

## **Background: Programming Capacity Index (PCI)**

After using CODI to identify areas for improvement in the general organizational infrastructure of partners or CRS, the Programming Capacity Index (PCI) identifies specific Title II areas that may need improvement within CRS and/or NGO partners. Specifically, the PCI assesses the ability to implement Title II projects and to make improvement in identified areas of weakness.

The primary users PCI are NGO partners through which CRS executes most of its Title II projects, CRS country programs that manage the Title II projects and CRS regional offices that provide training and technical assistance to national CRS programs. The PCI can also help with orienting new partners and CRS staff working in Title II programs.

The PCI focuses on the specific skills and capacities that organizations need to design and implement Title II food security programs. PCI is designed as participatory process in which NGO partners -- with assistance from their CRS partners -- assess their basic knowledge of USAID guidance, rules, and regulations for Title II programs, CRS's guidance for Title II and other programs; and demonstrated ability to use their capacity for program design, execution, monitoring, and evaluation.

The PCI uses a template of indicators and indicator rankings, similar to CODI, to assess partner, CRS country program, and regional office staff's capacity in five areas.

- PCI category 1: Global Context and Documentation Systems
- PCI category 2: Title II Proposal Development
- PCI category 3: Commodity Management
- PCI category 4: Management
- PCI category 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER)
- PCI category 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities

Each capacity category has variables, which refer to types of capacity. Indicators measure each variable. Each indicator uses the same rankings as CODI: (1) Very limited capacity, (2) Limited capacity, (3) Acceptable capacity, and (4) High capacity. The highest ratings suggest that a partner, CRS country program, or regional office is working to a high standard and, in the case of a partner, toward being able to maintain this capacity once project funding ends.

### **Using PCI**

CRS and partners should follow the process described under CODI. Conduct PCI during a Title II project design and update them once the project starts and then as determined by the partner

*Ethiopia, young men and women pick soybeans.*



and CRS thereafter. At a minimum, use the PCI as a baseline, mid-point monitory tool, and at the end of the project as part of the final project evaluation.

All participants, senior staff, project management, and others should read the PCI before the first meeting. During the first meeting, the group may wish to add or delete indicators so that the assessment reflects the reality of the country and program. For example, there may not be water security programming, but there may be an extensive health component to the Title II program. Adjust the PCI accordingly. Once the group has discussed the PCI and reached agreement on any changes, the leader should walk the staff through a trial ranking of one category of the PCI and explain how and when the actual assessment will take place.

As with CODI, the workshop involves the participatory ranking of the PCI indicators, review of the results, and action planning. The process should take a day. Refer to the CODI instructions for details.

While it is important to create an environment of active exchange and debate during the workshop, the consensus of the entire group determines the actual rankings, however. More important than the actual ranking is the learning process that occurs from reading and discussing the various indicators.



It is critical to have a “guided discussion” regarding the ranking of the indicators. Ideally, the leader will have extensive experience as a facilitator and in Title II projects. If one person does not have all the necessary skills, a facilitator and content specialist can work together during the workshop. Other partner or CSR staff may be invited to attend the assessment workshop as resource people.

*Crop diversification project, Indonesia*

Once the group has filled in their responses on a printed copy of the PCI, they should discuss and reach consensus. Remember, the discussion is more important than the numerical scores. The scores are not intrinsically important, but rather serve as evidence of improvement over the life of the Title II project.

Three major outcomes are expected with the routine use of the PCI to monitor the design, implementation, and M&E aspects of Title II food security programs.

- First, use of the PCI should strengthen CRS’s long-term partnerships with its partners by providing a more accurate tool for informed communication about their needs in terms of training and technical assistance to manage Title II food security initiatives.
- Second, it should increase the impact of the Title II programs on local food security and risk management by reducing the amount of time that staff have to devote to routine administration, which in turn increases the amount of time that they can devote to community-level activities and advocacy.
- Finally, the PCI should strengthen CRS’s ability to link its Title II supported activities to the types of long-term organizational development that partners need to sustain these initiatives over time.

## PCI is found in Appendix B.

### Background: The Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI)

The LCCI capacity index measures the capacity of local community to organize them to address food insecurity in their communities. It assists partners to determine the type of capacity building support they offer to communities, and assists CRS to do the same with its partners.

The primary users of the LCCI include the local communities that benefit from CRS's Title II projects, CRS's partners, through which CRS executes most of its Title II projects, and the CRS country programs that manage the Title II projects.

The LCCI builds on a pre-existing base of Title II funded expertise in measuring local capacity building by incorporating the core strengths of the Africare FSCCI<sup>6</sup> and the FAM/LCB<sup>7</sup> working group indicator inventories.

Following the LCCI is a list of additional data sources for food security from the CRS "Designing Title II Multi-Year Assistance Programs (MYAPs): A Resource Manual for CRS Country Programs" manual published by CRS in 2008.<sup>8</sup>



*Farmers receive seed vouchers, Uganda*

Each Title II project should review the list with partners and communities to develop a list of additional food security assessment indicators, based on the activities and needs of the community. The LCCI provides initial questions in the Production, HIV/AIDS, and Health capacity variables, which can serve as the basis for the assessment. Alternatively, the community, partners, and CRS may wish to use the steps outline in "Designing Title II Multi-Year Assistance Programs (MYAPs): A Resource Manual for CRS Country Programs" manual for food security assessments and use the LCCI to assess community organizational capacity.

The technical indicators for one project will not be the same technical indicators for another project. It is important, however, that each project reach consensus with community leaders on indicators they will use to monitor their technical capacity in food security.

---

<sup>6</sup> Food Security Community Capacity Index (FSCCI), developed under Africare's Title II funded Institutional Support Grant, FY93-98

<sup>7</sup> Food Aid Management (FAM) consortium, working group on Local Capacity Building (LCB)

<sup>8</sup> Catholic Relief Services, 2008

## Using LCCI

The LCCI follows the same format as the CODI and PCI. Each capacity category has variables, which refer to types of capacity. Indicators measure each variable and each indicator uses the same rankings as CODI and PCI: (1) Very limited capacity, (2) Limited capacity, (3) Acceptable capacity, and (4) High capacity. The highest ratings suggest that a community, a partner, or CRS is working to a high standard.

The LCCI measures the follow capacity variables: Capacity of Community Organizations, Level of Participation, Degree of Management Transparency, Capacity in Resource Acquisition, Capacity to Analyze and Plan, Capacity to Manage Risk and Vulnerabilities, Capacity to Manage Risks associated with Production, Capacity to Manage Risks associated with HIV/AIDS, and the Capacity to Manage Risks associated with Health.

CRS and partners should conduct the LCCI with communities during a Title II project design and update the LCCI once the project starts and then as determined by the community, partner, and CRS thereafter. At a minimum, use the LCCI as a baseline, mid-point monitory tool, and at the end of the project as part of the final project evaluation.

CRS and partners should conduct the LCCI with communities during a Title II project design and update the LCCI once the project starts and then as determined by the community, partner, and CRS thereafter. At a minimum, use the LCCI as a baseline, mid-point monitory tool, and at the end of the project as part of the final project evaluation.

CRS and partners should request a number of preparatory meetings in the community, at different time and places in order to involve the largest possible number of community groups.

Together, the partner, and CRS LCCI and potential Special care should those members of unable to read.



community groups, should review the technical indicators. be taken to include the community

*Community leaders, Malawi*

During the first may wish to add or that the assessment of the community example, there may

with health, but the group may feel a need to address issues of governance. Adjust the LCCI accordingly. Once the group has discussed the LCCI and reached agreement on any changes, participation, and timing, the process leader should walk participants through a trial ranking of one category of the LCCI and explain how and when the actual assessment will take place.

meetings, the group delete indicators so reflects the reality and program. For not be problems

Unlike the other Indices, the LCCI may take several meetings and more time, in order to ensure the full participation of all community members, including youth and the elderly, women and girls, and other groups.

While it is important to create an environment of active exchange and debate during the meetings, as always, the consensus of the entire group determines the actual rankings. More important than the actual ranking is the learning process that occurs from discussing the various indicators.

During the meetings, the community responses should be noted on a large sheet of paper or black board in front of the entire group. They should then be recorded on a printed copy of the LCCI data entry form. One copy of the index should remain in the community archive. Copies should be shared with the partners and CRS as well.

The LCCI scores allow CRS, partners, and communities to determine next steps for capacity strengthening and Title II project activities. The anticipated benefits of conducting an annual assessment using the LCCI are at several levels. In the short-term, the indicator should provide national partners and the CRS country programs that host Title II projects with a better mechanism for identifying: their impact on local community capacity and tracking staff accountability for building these capacities over the project life cycle.

Having a common index for capacity assessment makes it easier to compare and contrast local capacity building strategies between CRS's partner sites. It also makes it possible to identify communities that appear to have stronger project management and implementation capacities than others.



*Ugandan farmer in his field*

By helping local communities be more explicit about what types of capacity they feel they need from partners, the LCCI helps clarify different partner's expectations. This in turn can clarify what types of support partners need from CRS to meet these expectations. It can also set up a mechanism for a periodic review of these expectations.

### **The LCCI is found in Appendix C.**

#### **Action Planning**

CRS, partners, and communities will analyze the data from the CODI, PCI, and LCCI to determine how to improve their food security programming. Action planning is often overlooked in the rush to action. An action plan allows specific activities to address organizational weaknesses. Actions plans identify the activities, or tasks, to address each of the most pressing organizational issues. Action plans identify tasks, resources, and the timeline needed to for the changes.



The format of the action plan depends on the results of the Indices and the interests of the organizations. CRS, partners, and communities might wish to organize a retreat or series of meeting to finalize the action plan(s). According to CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation<sup>9</sup>, an action planning meeting

1. Clarify the result areas on which you will be working.
2. For each result area, list the steps necessary to achieve it.
3. Sequence the steps in a logical order using a tool such as the Gantt Chart<sup>10</sup>
4. Do a summary of the outputs.
5. Assign responsibility for each of the activities involved.
6. Do a summary of the human resourcing needs.
7. Do a summary of likely costs.
8. Put it all together in a work plan schedule.

Additionally, many action plans specify:

- A problem statement (derived from the Indices)
- The objective for the change (stated SMART-ly: S- specific, M- measurable, A- achievable, R- realistic, and T- time bound)
- Material resources needed for the activities (in addition to the human and financial noted above)
- Indicators of success



*Ugandan farmers at a community meeting.*

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.civicus.org/new/media/Action%20Planning.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> <http://office.microsoft.com/en-us/excel/HA010346051033.aspx>

## Sample Action Plan Format

**Problem Statement:**

Objectives	Tasks	Human, Financial, and Material Resource Needs	Timeline	Responsible parties	Indicators	Additional information
<b>Objective 1</b>	<b>Task 1.1</b>					
	<b>Task 1.2</b>					
	<b>Task 1.3</b>					
<b>Objective 2</b>	<b>Task 2.1</b>					
	<b>Task 2.2</b>					
	<b>Task 2.3</b>					

### Conclusion

CRS, partners, and communities face increasing complexity and an increasing number of needs while resources become scarcer. There is a need to do more with limited human and material resources, along with the pressure for measurable results, accountability, and increasing

efficiency and effectiveness of project interventions.

These trends have challenged CRS, partners, and communities to make a conscious effort to improve their performance, in order to have the desired impact on project beneficiaries, both in qualitative and quantitative terms. The three capacity assessment Indices in this manual intend to help NGOs and communities work together in strong and sustainable organizations to serve the poor. Thanks go to USAID's Office of Food for Peace for their generous support.



*Indonesian community member's meeting.*

**Appendix A Core Organizational Development Index (CODI)**

**CODI CATEGORY 1: Governance and Vision**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Board of Directors</b>	Board partially identified.	Board identified but non-operational.	Board membership stable and well targeted.	Board comprised of recognized leaders.	
	Roles of members and of Executive Director are unclear.	Board understands its role and how to relate to the Executive Director.	Board assists project through access to key people.	Board provides hands-on policy direction for political action.	
	Board not yet active.	Board becoming active, contributes, and pursues resources.	Board provides some leadership. Committees formed, with limited active members.	Significant funds raised by board. Many members of the board play an active role.	
	Board does not help the organization.	Board provides minimal help to the organization.	Board helps advance organization. The Chair not yet able to help advance the organization.	Active, strong Chair and board in place, helping advance the organization.	
<b>Mission</b>	No formal mission and vision statement. Projects are donor-driven.	Mission and vision statements exist, but are unclear. Diverse portfolio of projects and proposals are not consistent with mission and vision.	Mission and vision statements clear and in general consistent with portfolio. Projects align with mission and vision.	Board and staff articulate mission and vision statements. Projects consistent with mission. Outsiders identify the mission with the organization.	
<b>Autonomy</b>	Organization is the implementing agent of one donor.	Organization is able to respond to the interests of more than one donor and its board.	Organization is able to obtain funding to support its programs, in consultation with the board.	Organization has managerial and financial security, advocates to government and private sector.	

**CODI CATEGORY 2: Management Resources**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Leadership Style</b>	All leadership comes from the founder or Executive Director.	Leadership comes from founder or Executive Director and one or two board members.	Vision comes from the board with input from staff.	All employees participate to some degree in management and leadership.	
	Staff provides technical input only. Organization is dependent on the founder, Executive Director, or board.	One or two staff provides organizational impetus in addition to the founder or Executive Director.	Leadership provides the space and opportunity for staff to provide a range of input to organization.	Staff is encouraged in situational leadership. Organization would survive a transition from the current board President and Executive Director.	
<b>Management</b>	Decisions handed down to organization from Executive Director with little or no input from staff.	Most decisions taken by Executive Director and board. Some input from one or two staff members.	Management decisions increasingly delegated to line managers.	Management decisions delegated to appropriate level.	
	Criteria for decisions are unclear.	Management decision criteria generally shared with the board.	Decision-making is normally transparent to staff.	Decision-making is consistently transparent to staff.	
	Staff roles are responsibilities unclear and changeable.	Staff roles understood, but fragmented.	Staff roles are clear and understand throughout the organization.	Staff help shape the way their roles and participation in the organization.	
	Poor intra-staff communications.	Infrequent or ineffective staff communication.	Communications are open and inter-hierarchical.	Organization periodically reviews communication flow to ensure free flow of information.	

**CODI CATEGORY 2: Management Resources (continued)**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Planning</b>	Planning is non-existent or ad hoc, incremental and reactive to circumstances.	Planning is structured around the mission and is forward oriented. Annual organizational work plans are developed, but not tracked during the year. Planning is hierarchically imposed.	Annual staff and organizational plans are developed and reviewed during the course of the year. Mid-term strategic plan is developed. Wide participation in planning among staff. Plans are result of cooperative board and staff effort. Plans relate specific resources needed to accomplish objectives.	Annual plans are supplemented by updated long-term plans. Data is gathered and analyzed to track progress against plans. Flexible annual and strategic plans permit accurate budgeting. Community members participate in planning.	
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>	No systematic monitoring or formal evaluation mechanisms system exist. Projects are determined successes or failures based on perceptions.	Occasional evaluations are undertaken, usually at request of donors and implemented by outsiders.	Staff initiates evaluations; staff is involved in their execution; some management decisions are taken based on data; ongoing M&E system is in place. M&E still an isolated management function.	M&E data and analysis are integrated into organization's decision-making. Staff and community members are trained in M&E.	
	No feedback from community members or clients.	Informal feedback channels for community member and client feedback.	Formal mechanisms exist for community member and client feedback.	Continuous feedback from community members and clients is used in planning and decision-making.	

**CODI CATEGORY 2: Management Resources (continued)**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Management Systems</b>	No formal file system exists.	Files are maintained, but are not comprehensive or systematic.	Files are systematic and accessible, but significant gaps remain.	Files are comprehensive, systematic, and accessible.	
	Limited administrative procedures. No documentation of operating procedures.	Administrative procedures formalized. No operating manual.	Administrative procedures in place. Operational manual updated and used.	Administrative procedures and Operations manual adhered to consistently by leadership and staff, updated regularly.	

**CODI CATEGORY 3: Human Resources**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Human Resource Systems</b>	No formal personnel systems, job descriptions, recruitment, or evaluation procedures.	Some, but not all, necessary personnel systems exist. Informal employment practices persist.	Virtually all necessary personnel systems are institutionalized; occasionally informal mechanisms are used.	Formal personnel systems, including redress, are institutionalized and understood by employees.	
<b>Staff Skills</b>	Few people fill a broad range of technical skills.	Specialists are contracted for key skill areas. Gaps remain.	All core skill areas are covered with well-qualified staff or contractors.	Staff covers all essential skill areas with lesser-needed skills by contractors.	
	Staff not fully capable of providing skills required of their positions.	Staff capable of providing technical skills of their positions.	Staff often recognized for technical or financial competence. Staff regarded as qualified by peer organizations.	Staff recognized for excellence outside the organization. Papers and speeches solicited from staff.	

**CODI CATEGORY 3: Human Resources (continued)**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Staff Development</b>	No systematic human resource development strategy or practice.	Ad hoc or uneven human resource development activities.	Process and procedures for staff development exist, are equally applied to all staff.	Professional development considered as part of job performance for all staff.	
	Little coaching, counseling, or training provided.	Some coaching, counseling, and training provided.	Staff receives coaching counseling, and training.	Intra-office mentoring and guidance considered part of the job. Staff receives coaching, counseling, and training.	
	Little or no formal recognition of employee performance.	Performance recognized informally, but no formal mechanism exists.	Formal performance appraisal system established, but skill development not included in appraisals.	Employees participate in objective setting and know what is expected of them. Skills development is included in performance appraisals.	
<b>Organizational Diversity</b>	Organization has little consciousness of importance of, or interest in, diversity.	Consciousness and interest increased, but still no policy regarding diversity.	Organization expresses commitment to diversity via formal policy.	Organization actively solicits diverse opinions and perspectives, portrays its diversity as strength.	
	Staff is under-represented by women and traditionally disadvantaged groups.	Some women and traditionally disadvantaged groups are on staff.	Significant representation of women and traditionally disadvantaged groups among staff.	Women and members of traditionally disadvantaged groups are active and honored staff members.	
	Board is under-represent by women and traditionally disadvantaged groups.	Some women and traditionally disadvantaged groups on board.	Significant representation of women and traditionally disadvantaged groups on board.	Women and members of traditionally disadvantaged groups are active and honored board members.	

**CODI CATEGORY 4: Financial Resources**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Financial Management</b>	Financial records are incomplete and difficult to understand. Reports are often late.	Financial reports are produced with errors and delays.	Financial reports are clear and complete, even as portfolio becomes more complex. Reports are usually on time.	Reports and data systems can quickly provide a sense of financial health. Reports are always timely and trusted.	
	Budgets are not used or are not seen as management tools.	Budgets are developed for project activities, but are over or under-spent by more than 20%.	Total expenditure is usually within 20% of budget, but actual activities often diverge from budget predictions.	Budgets are an integral part of project management and are adjusted as project implementation warrants.	
	No clear procedures exist for handling payables and receivables.	Financial controls exist, but lack a systematic office procedure. Bookkeeper is not a trained accountant.	Improved financial control systems. Trained accountant is in charge of books.	Excellent cash controls for payables and receivables, and established budget procedures.	
	Audits are not performed.	External audits are only rarely performed.	External audits are performed frequently, but not on a regular schedule.	External audits are performed with regular and appropriate frequency.	
	Project funds are not separated.	Project funds are separated, but some temporary cross-project financing may occur.	Standard procedure is to avoid cross-project financing and most funds are separated.	All project funds are separated and adequate controls exist to avoid cross-project financing.	



**CODI CATEGORY 4: Financial Resources (continued)**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Financial Security</b>	Financing comes from only one source.	Financing comes from multiple sources, but 90% or more is from one source.	No single source of funding provides more than 60% of total.	No single source provides more than 25% of funding.	
	Local fundraising (including in-kind assistance) for operational income is untried or unsuccessful.	Up to 5% of unrestricted operating expenses are from fees and indirect costs charged by the organization, earned interest, revenues, trust funds, unrestricted gifts, and membership fees.	30% of unrestricted operating expenses are from such fees charged by the organization.	50% of unrestricted operating expenses are from such fees charged by the organization. Some funds for capital or project expenditures also raised locally.	
<b>Financial Solvency</b>	Project funding is insufficient to meet project management goals.	Funding is available to cover short-term project costs.	Funding is available for short-term costs and a medium-term funding strategy exists.	All projects have long-term funding plans and current funds are adequate to meet management plan needs.	

**CODI CATEGORY 5: External Resources**

Variables	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Recognition</b>	Organization little known outside the range of its direct collaborators.	Organization is known among technical peers, but does little to promote its activities or broader issues to public and key decision-makers.	Organization has contact with key decision-makers and has lines of communication with the public.	Organization and its work are well known to public and policy-makers and is able to engage decision-makers in dialogue on policy. Has a loyal constituency and commands respect outside that constituency.	
<b>Community</b>	Work is centered in the office or is based on top-down structure.	Work is focused on the community and organization is viewed as an ally of communities.	Community input is solicited for key decisions. Organization viewed as a community resource	Community input integrated into management considerations. Community members feel they own the organization.	
<b>Government</b>	Government is ignored or tension is frequent between government and the organization.	Relations are friendly. Collaboration occasionally occurs on specific tasks and projects.	Collaboration is frequent, usually on an informal level. Relations are friendly, but narrowly focused on a few institutions or individuals.	Formal mechanisms exist for collaboration and are often used. Relations are a full partnership.	
<b>Civil Society</b>	Organization does not have experience working with other civil society actors. Not known or trusted by civil society.	Organization increasingly known and trusted by civil society, but little experience with collaboration.	Organization works with international and/or local NGOs and participates in civil society networks, but has not played a leadership role in promoting coalitions and projects.	Organization plays a leadership role in promoting civil society coalitions or projects and supports other NGOs, and can help resolve inter-NGO or NGO-government conflicts.	

**Appendix B Programming Capacity Index (PCI)**

**PCI CATEGORY 1: Global Context and Documentation Systems Situate Project within a Global Context**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Ability to explain the project and activities on the project</b>	Only the project coordinator has a copy of the project proposal and final IPTT <sup>11</sup> .	Administrators and managers have copies of the project proposal and IPTT, but are not accustomed to using it as a management tool.	Administrators and managers have copies of the project proposal and IPTT and refer to them when writing reports.	Administrators and managers use the proposal and IPTT to explain the project, its objectives, and reporting systems to government partners and church officials.	
<b>Ability to explain the project's linkages with CRS and USAID</b>	Senior Staff know that the project is funded by the U.S. government	Senior staff understands the project's source of funding, but cannot comfortably explain this to community leaders or diocesan officials.	Senior staff understands the project's funding and have experience explaining it to partners and community leaders.	In addition to #3, staff has developed a diagram that clarifies these relationships for extension staff, partners, and community leaders.	

<sup>11</sup> Indicator Performance Tracking Table

**PCI CATEGORY 1 Global Context and Documentation Systems Develop and Manage t Documentation and Retrieval Systems**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Title II Bibliographic background</b>	Partial list of project documents exists. Senior staff has limited experience with developing project bibliographies, none with standard bibliography formats.	Senior staff has experience with project bibliographies following standard format. Complete bibliography of core project documents exists, but does not follow any standard bibliographic format.	In addition to #2, staff has experience with researching topics on internet and through international and national research centers. Complete bibliography of core and technical project documents exists and is used by staff. It follows the standard international format.	In addition to #3, staff has a collection of documents on technical areas and bibliographies on subject areas that can be used many projects. Bibliographies are widely known regularly updated and sent to CRS regional and headquarters-based staff as part of organizational learning.	
<b>Title II project documentation system</b>	A central documentation center exists, but is poorly monitored and not cross-referenced to the project bibliography.	A central documentation center (hard copy) exists and is overseen by the project coordinator and/or the project M&E specialists (not support staff).	In addition to #2, the coordinator or specialists regularly update the bibliography and the collection system and the project has created a CD or hard drive backup of these documents.	In addition to #3, any request for a project document or Title II guidance document is responded to within an agreed-to timeframe. Written instructions explain the documentation system so that a successor can maintain and expand it.	
<b>Distribution of Title II project documents to government and partners</b>	Partners only receive an annual report when they request one.	Key partners receive an annual report that is intended for partners (different from the official report to USAID) and are informed about other documents that the project has produced.	Key partners receive at least part of the official version of the report (including the official IPTT) that goes to USAID and are informed about other documents that the project has produced.	In addition to #3, to minimize the impact of turnover in the administration of key partners, the project has a system for ensuring that the partners' basic stock of project documents is maintained and updated.	

**PCI CATEGORY 1 Global Context and Documentation Systems      Develop and Manage t Documentation and Retrieval Systems**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Access to internet and use of the internet as a research and planning tool</b>	Access to the internet is limited due to either unreliable phone lines or expensive connection fees.	Reliable access to internet, but primarily used by the project coordinator.	Staff other than the project or site coordinator has relatively unrestricted access to the internet for email, but not for research.	A written policy describes how staff may use the internet for official communication and research; many staff takes advantage of the access.	
<b>Use of documentation to orient Title II funded staff reduces the impact of staff turnover on project execution and impact</b>	Staff receives a verbal orientation that references some written material in the project coordinator or supervisor’s files.	A written description of most key project materials is provided to staff, which includes a description of critical guidance (and where to find it) for the project.	In addition to #2, instructions for updating the bibliography and documentation filing system are included in the material notes.	In addition to #3, instructions on the analysis of the monitoring and impact indicators for that component of the project are included in the material notes.	

**PCI CATEGORY 2:      Title II Proposal Development      Title II Proposal Development**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Knowledge of internal CRS DAP/MYAP Guidance</b>	Administrators are aware that CRS has its own internal guidance for writing proposals, but are not aware of the special internal guidance for Title II proposals.	Most administrators and staff know that CRS has internal guidance for Title II proposals, but they do not have a copy in the project documentation center.	Administrators and staff know that CRS has internal guidance for Title II proposals, which are available in the project documentation center.	In addition to #3, administrators and staff have experience (or special training) in using these materials to develop a proposal.	

**PCI CATEGORY 2: Title II Proposal Development Title II Proposal Development**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>USAID DAP/MYAP guidance</b>	Title II project managers are unaware that Title II has special guidance.	Title II project managers are aware that Title II has special guidance, but do not know where to find a copy.	In addition to #2, they can describe what Title II guidance obligates them to do in terms of design features and M&E.	In addition to #3, they have experience locating the guidance and guidance updates on the internet AND in locating other web-based Title II resources that might supplement the guidance.	
<b>Title II strategy documents</b>	Senior Title II staff has heard of the Title II FFP policy papers, but they have never been briefed on them nor have they been given copies to read.	Senior Title II staff has been briefed, but do not have a copy of either the 1995 or 2003 papers in their local offices.	Senior Title II staff has copies of the two policy documents, but cannot describe the major thematic differences between the 1995 and 2003 papers.	Staff has copies, understand the thematic differences, list the papers in their project bibliography, and know where to locate the documents on the web.	
<b>Experience with developing Title II proposals</b>	A limited number of technical and program staff participated in the design, but the leadership for writing came from outside the local office.	Most technical and program staff participated in the design, but the leadership for writing came from outside the local office.	Most staff produced written sections of the proposal under leadership of the project coordinator and/or local NGO partner coordinator.	In addition to #3, some staff has experience in developing the financial sections of the proposal budget.	

**PCI CATEGORY 2: Title II Proposal Development General Proposal Development**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Knowledge of CRS internal tools for general proposal development</b>	Staff briefed on ProPack, but is trained and has never used it.	Staff trained in ProPack, but has limited experience using it.	Staff trained in ProPack and has used it to develop a proposal that is not yet funded.	Staff trained in ProPack and has used it to develop at least one proposal that has been funded.	

**PCI CATEGORY 2: Title II Proposal Development                      General Proposal Development**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Staff experience with developing other types of proposals</b>	Staff has no experience writing grant proposals.	Staff has limited experience writing grant proposals.	Staff has experience writing proposals and has a strategy for developing grants that can fund some of the follow-on activities needed to sustain Title II achievements.	In addition to #3, certain elements of this strategy have been funded.	
<b>Staff awareness of alternative (non-USAID Title II) funding sources</b>	Staff is aware of other funding sources, but has never applied to other charities or donors for support.	Staff has submitted numerous proposals to other funding sources, but to date only CRS-facilitated grants to these sources have been funded.	With CRS help, staff has submitted at least one winning proposal to an alternative funding source.	Without CRS help, staff have submitted numerous proposals to alternative funding sources and have been funded.	

**PCI CATEGORY 3: Commodity Management                      Staff Knowledge of Basic Guidance**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Staff familiarity with commodity management guidance</b>	Staff is aware of guidance, but is unable to recall it or locate a copy.	Staff is aware of guidance and is able to locate a copy, but cannot apply it.	Staff is aware of guidance, is able to locate a copy, and can apply the guidance.	In addition to #3, staff is able to apply CRS commodity management principles.	

**PCI CATEGORY 3: Commodity Management Capacity of Basic Commodity Systems**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>General commodity reporting capacity</b>	Records of commodities exist but are incomplete.	Records of commodities exist and are accurate and reports can be produced upon request.	Records of commodities exist, are accurate, and reports are regularly produced.	In addition to #3, routinely produced accurate reports are fed into annual results and loss reports in a timely manner.	
<b>General commodity management capacity</b>	Staff has access to, but no control of, warehouse. Warehouse may not be secure or weather tight.	Staff has access to and control of warehouse. Warehouse is weather tight. A stacking system and rudimentary ledgers are in place. Limited theft prevention strategies are in place.	Staff has access to and control of warehouse. The warehouse is weather tight and has stacking cards, waybills, and ledgers. Effective theft prevention strategies are in place.	In addition to #3, ledgers reflect stock movement and inventory.	
<b>General commodity tracking capacity</b>	Basic ledgers exist and monthly reports are possible, but are not completely accurate.	There are accurate and up-to-date ledgers and basic waybill system and project is able to produce weekly reports.	In addition to #2, stacking cards are linked to basic waybill system. Ledgers are basis of regular reporting	In addition to #3, systems are linked to the basic waybill system. A preprinted and pre-numbered waybill system is linked to stacking cards. Ledger and stacking cards feed into ledger balances and can produce daily reports.	
<b>Physical placement of commodities</b>	Commodities are stacked on floor and countable but with poor spacing.	Commodities are stacked on pallets and are countable but with poor spacing.	Commodities are stacked on pallets, are countable, and are spaced away from walls and ceiling.	In addition to #3, FIFO <sup>12</sup> can be applied.	

<sup>12</sup> First In, First Out



**PCI CATEGORY 4: Management**

**Human Resource Capacity to Organize Commodity Management**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Experienced commodity management specialists</b>	Those working with commodities have experience working within a management structure, but not as managers.	The individuals managing the commodities have previous general management experience.	In addition to #2, staff has knowledge of commodities and logistics.	The individuals managing the commodities are experienced commodity management specialists.	
<b>Role of leadership in the administration</b>	Most activity flows to and from a single person with limited delegation.	Strong leadership, but unclear reporting and decision-making structures.	Strong leadership, a clear chain of command with top down decision-making.	Strong leadership, a clear chain of command, with decisions made at the appropriate levels of the hierarchy.	
<b>Ethical sensitivity</b>	Staff and administrators are unaware of the ethical framework of organization. Staff and administrators are ambivalent to the need for ethical and accountable behavior.	An ethical framework is in place and known to management. Management models a culture of accountability and ethical behavior.	An ethical framework is a familiar part of organization culture. Ethical behavior is promoted.	In addition to #3, systems are in place that promote and reward ethical and accountable behavior	
<b>Ethics and Management controls</b>	Staff and administrators do not recognize the need for a system of records to track accountability. Few records are kept. Unable to audit due to incomplete records and lack of controls.	Staff and administrators recognize the need for a system of records to track accountability, but assets are co-mingled. Incomplete records are kept few controls are in place.	There is a separation of resources and record keeping is up-to-date. Able to follow an audit trail, but controls are weak and could pose material weaknesses.	Fully auditable and controls in place and no obvious material weaknesses.	

**PCI CATEGORY 4: Management**

**Diversity and Gender**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Balance in management</b>	Women and members of traditionally disadvantaged groups are only in clerical and pre-professional positions, such as village-based extension workers or aids.	Women and members of traditionally disadvantaged groups are employed in professional capacity, such as project officer or technical positions.	Women and members of traditionally disadvantaged groups are in management positions.	Women and members of traditionally disadvantaged groups are in the top two tiers of management and have positions on or influence with the board of directors.	
<b>Balance in hiring extension staff</b>	20% or less of extension staff are women and/or members of traditionally disadvantaged groups.	More than 20% and less than 50% of extension staff are women and/or members of traditionally disadvantaged groups.	In addition to #2, staff has been trained in gender sensitivity.	All staff has received training in working in diverse groups, including across gender, and in working with women clients.	
<b>Training of field staff</b>	Extension staff is ambivalent and see no need for training on working across gender or with traditionally disadvantaged groups.	Extension staff is trained on gender sensitivity and working with traditionally disadvantaged groups, but is unclear on how to apply the training due to “cultural factors”.	Extension staff is trained on gender sensitivity and working with traditionally disadvantaged groups and applies some of what they have learned.	Extension staff have ongoing training on gender sensitivity and working with traditionally disadvantaged groups and share lessons learned with other staff.	
<b>Gender and diversity sensitivity in commodity management structures</b>	Management is ambivalent and puts no effort into promoting gender balance or diversity in the organization.	Gender balance and diversity are not management priorities, but there is some awareness of importance of training for extension staff.	Gender balance and diversity are management priorities and there training for extension staff.	Management gives gender balance and diversity training high priority and there are affirmative action program under way to promote gender balance.	

**PCI CATEGORY 4: Management**

**Partner Communication and Capacity Building**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Frequency of communication CRS-partner, partner-CRS</b>	Irregular from either partner or one partner is consistently absent. No regular schedule.	Communication only on a prescribed schedule, no spontaneous communication.	Regular communication, with breaks if one partner is on leave or official travel. Limited spontaneous communication.	Regular with surrogates assuming responsibility for communication, if one partner is absent. Frequent spontaneous communication.	
<b>CRS technical assistance to partners</b>	Defined, scheduled, and evaluated by CRS.	Defined, scheduled, and evaluated by CRS after conducting a needs assessment with partners.	Defined, scheduled, and evaluated by CRS and partners together.	Defined, scheduled, and evaluated by partners, with support from CRS on the partner's terms.	
<b>Building capacity</b>	Capacity building is confined to building individual skills.	Capacity building includes individual skill building and organizational strengthening without a concrete plan.	CRS assists partners to assess their organizational capacity and provides resources for improvements.	The project, and partnership, is designed from the beginning to build the capacity of staff and strengthen the institution to guarantee project and organizational sustainability.	

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER)**

**Human Resources**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>M&amp;E specialist (position)</b>	Someone is tasked with Title II M&E, but they have little knowledge, responsibility and/or resources (equipment, guidance, financial resources).	Someone with introductory knowledge, responsibility and/or resources (equipment, guidance, financial resources) is tasked with Title II M&E.	Someone with good knowledge, responsibility and/or resources (equipment, guidance, financial resources) is tasked with Title II M&E.	In addition to #3, the person with the designated responsibility for M&E trains other advisors.	

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER) Human Resources**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>M&amp;E specialist (technical capacity of the M&amp;E specialist)</b>	The M&E specialist is informed about the Title II rules and regulations and collects and transmits data to managers in response to requests but has no resources.	The M&E specialist is informed about the Title II rules and regulations and collects and transmits data to managers in response to requests, has modest resources.	The M&E specialist is informed, has the necessary resources to do the job, and is working independently with M&E specialists at other Title project sites in country to interpret and report on the data for the entire project.	In addition to #3, provides feedback to CRS country program, CRS regional and headquarters staff about the efficiency of certain Title II indicators and training modules.	

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER) Indicators and IPTT<sup>13</sup>**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Knowledge and use of indicators</b>	Minimal understanding of the principle of using “monitoring” and “impact” Indicators.	Staff understands the basic principles of why and how indicators are used and collect data and analyze data on standard M&E forms.	In addition to #2, staff works in partnership with the other NGO partners on the grant to improve the data forms, the indicators, and project M&E processes.	In addition to #3, staff provides active feedback to regional staff and HQ M&E staff about the efficacy of certain indicators and M&E training modules.	
<b>Knowledge and use of the IPTT/PITT in routine monitoring and reporting</b>	Staff is familiar with the indicators for their specific site and in the IPTT.	Staff is familiar with the IPTT for their specific site and they understand how their site relates to other project sites in a combined project IPTT.	In addition to #2, staff routinely uses the IPTT as a tool for strategy planning and monitoring meetings with partners and/or staff.	In addition to #3, staff routinely include and/or refer to the IPTT in reports.	

<sup>13</sup> Indicator Performance Tracking Table, sometimes known as the “Performance Indicator Tracking Table”, or PITT

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER) Indicators and IPTT<sup>14</sup>**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Government involvement in the design and implementation of Title II M&amp;E systems</b>	Government partners are aware that the project has an M&E system, but merely respond to questions when asked.	Government partners participate by volunteering certain information to the project M&E system and/or rely on project generated data in their work.	In addition to #2, government partners have a working knowledge of the system and the basic M&E principles that support it.	Government partners are actively involved in the elaboration of the M&E system using select indicators and data collection techniques and analyses. Government agents have participated in project M&E training sessions, baseline surveys and evaluations.	

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER) Surveys**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Design, execution and analysis of baseline and final surveys</b>	Outside consultants conduct baseline or final surveys; staff helps with data collection, but not analysis or design.	Outside consultants have trained staff to assist with key elements of a baseline or final survey.	Staff is familiar with donor and FANTA expectations for surveys and sampling and develops approved SOWs for a baseline or final survey.	In addition to #3, two or more members of the staff participate in the analysis and documentation, including editing and review, of a Title II baseline or final survey.	

<sup>14</sup> Indicator Performance Tracking Table, sometimes known as the “Performance Indicator Tracking Table”, or PITT

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER) Surveys**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Anthropometric measurements and their role in DMER</b>	Staff is not aware of guidance or justification for guidance, but work with outside consultants doing measurements.	Staff understands the reason that USAID has set a priority on anthropometric measurement AND are trained to assist in measurements.	In addition to #2, staff participates in the weighting part a survey.	In addition to #3, staff knows the guidance on sampling and actively participates in the data collection, analysis, and writes up of at least one baseline or final surveys' anthropometric measurements.	

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER) Evaluation**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Background understanding of the Title II evaluation and pre-evaluation guidance</b>	Administrators share the MYAP/DAP guidance on midterm and final evaluations with staff.	In addition to #1, administrators share the FANTA guidance on writing Title II evaluation SOWs and the justification for a clear evaluation SOW.	In addition to #2, administrators share the ARC/CRS <sup>15</sup> module on pre-evaluation planning to facilitate evaluations and have used this knowledge to develop a SOW.	In addition to #3, establish a system for monitoring local partner and CRS program follow-up on recommendations stemming from evaluations in the annual report for USAID.	

<sup>15</sup> McMillan, Della, and Alice Willard. Evaluation Planning Tool for Project Managers. 2005 American Red Cross and Catholic Relief Services.

**PCI CATEGORY 5: Design, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (DMER) Evaluation**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Reporting promising practices</b>	Staff, upon request, submits information to CRS CR on examples of promising practices from Title II field projects.	Staff takes the initiative to submit information on Title II field project promising practices to the CRS CP and/or regional CRS offices.	Staff routinely submit (in text box form) information to CRS CR or CRS regional staff on Title II promising practices.	In addition to #3, staff receives information from other countries, which has been distributed to staff to promote capacity building.	

**PCI CATEGORY 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities Environmental Assessments**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Familiarity with and use of USAID/Title II environmental regulations</b>	Relevant staff is aware that an environmental review is required in Title II food aid proposals.	Relevant staff is familiar with the USAID-FAM Environmental Documentation Manual and the field guide to Reg. 2165 and can locate the guidance, but have never conducted a Title II IEE <sup>16</sup> without the support of CRS regional or HQ offices.	Staff has completed at least one IEE on their own, approved by USAID's environmental compliance officer in Washington, DC.	In addition to #3, staff trained one or more CRS staff from another country program in how to conduct an IEE and have trained relevant partners in appropriate mitigation and monitoring activities outlined in the IEE.	

<sup>16</sup> Initial Environmental Examination

**PCI CATEGORY 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities      Integral Human Development**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Institutionalizing the IHD (Integral Human Development) framework</b>	The CR and head of programming received IHD materials from HQ, but no one has been tasked with reviewing the materials.	At least one member of the Title II funded staff has received formal training or technical assistance in the IHD methodology.	Every member of the Title II country program is trained in IHD and the team investigates ways that the IHD framework can be used to support program design, implementation, and M&E.	In addition to #3, the team uses the IHD framework to guide a design, ongoing programming, monitoring, or evaluation.	

**PCI CATEGORY 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities      Emergency and Transitional Food**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Developmental relief</b>	Senior leadership of CRS at the regional or CP level have CRS guidance on current practices in emergency and transitional food programming, but no one in the Title II programming office has reviewed the materials or built them into activities that support new or ongoing programming.	Materials are available and some staff is trained, and the need for strategy discussed, but nothing has been implemented to date.	Every member of the Title II country program participated in training on emergency and transitional food programming.	In addition to #3, based on an assessment, a CRS team facilitated a local NGO partner's developing emergency-development bridge activities.	



**PCI CATEGORY 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities HIV/AIDS**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>HIV/AIDS mitigation,</b>	Senior CRS CP and regional staff received the food security and HIV/AIDS CD and booklet, but no one within the CRS office has been tasked with operationalizing the new approach into the country program’s Title II programming.	The Title II project has received materials and/or staff has attended a training course, but the perspective has not been incorporated into programming.	The local NGO partner and/or CRS country program is implementing an HIV/AIDS mitigation strategy.	In addition to #3, activities in the strategy have been successful.	

**PCI CATEGORY 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities Water and Security**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Water security programming</b>	Senior CRS CP and regional staff received ICB-supported training or materials on water security, but no one has been tasked with operationalizing the new approach in CRS’s Title II programming.	At least one member of the CRS country program is trained on the CRS’s approach to water security, but the program’s water programming hasn’t changed. <sup>8</sup>	Every member of the Title II country program team articulates the need for a more integrated approach to water security and conducted a “water security” assessment exercise.	The assessment in #3 affected project design, programming, and evaluation.	

**PCI CATEGORY 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities      Structural Analysis and Peace**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Peace building programming</b>	Senior CRS CP and regional staff received the training materials on structural analysis and peace building developed under ICB, but no one has been tasked with operationalizing the approach in CRS's Title II programming.	Staff training has not yet been translated into Title II supported programming or advocacy.	Structural analysis and peace building are including programming analysis tools.	Staff is trained and has introduced a peace building perspective into new or existing programs.	

**PCI CATEGORY 6: Environmental Guidance and Sectoral Capacities      Organizational Learning**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Exchange of expertise and promising practices among CRS Title II projects</b>	Senior staff has access to CRS documents in the project's administrative archive that are considered recent examples of promising practices.	At least one person on staff has participated in a DAP or MYAP design, baseline survey, mid-term, or final survey in another country or with a different sector.	Staff members who attend training or who gain new skills offer seminars on what they learned to other staff and partners. Documents are shared with all interested parties.	Staff and leadership are active members of in country and global communities of practice, documenting and sharing lessons learned and promising practices.	

**Appendix C Local Community Capacity Index (LCCI)**

**LCCI Category 1: Core Capacity of Local Communities Capacity of Community Organizations**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Capacity of community groups or organizations</b>	Small, loosely organized groups or organizations have limited activities in the community.	Small, informally organized groups or organizations have activities in the community.	Well attended, formally organized groups or organizations offer a range of services or activities in the community.	Legally registered community based organizations provide services to the community based on the community's expressed needs and interests.	
<b>Meeting frequency and proceedings document activities</b>	Few formal meetings. Proceedings and activities verbally disseminated in an informal manner.	Very infrequent meetings or meetings with spotty attendance. Proceedings and activities sporadically recorded in written form but not well maintained or disseminated.	Scheduled meetings members with regularly attending. Proceedings and activities routinely recorded with limited retrieval capacity.	All scheduled meetings are held. All members and appropriate community members are informed of the meeting schedule. Excellent written and archived records of proceedings and activities.	

**LCCI Category 2: Core Capacity of Local Communities Level of Participation**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Participation in decision-making</b>	One person or a few people make decisions without involving or informing the group or organization.	The person or small group making decisions consults with the group or organization.	There is broad participation of members in meetings but influential members sometimes influence decisions.	All members fully and democratically participate in decision-making concerning the group or organization.	

**LCCI Category 3: Core Capacity of Local Communities Level of Participation (continued)**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Leadership</b>	Leadership has never changed and elections have never been held. Leadership is the same since inception with group or organization's consent.	Leadership has changed by elections with limited or forgone candidates.	Leadership emerges from the group or organization and is supported by the membership. Term limits exist.	The group or organization nurtures and promotes new leaders, including women, traditionally disadvantaged group members, and youth.	
<b>Diversity</b>	Women and traditionally disadvantaged groups are under-represented in the group or organization.	Some women and traditionally disadvantaged groups are active in the group or organization.	Significant representation of women and traditionally disadvantaged groups in the group or organization.	Women and members of traditionally disadvantaged groups are active and honored members of the group or organization.	

**LCCI Category 4: Core Capacity of Local Communities Degree of Management Transparency**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>How business is conducted</b>	Only individuals or a very small group carries out the group or organization's business. Members have no knowledge of how business is conducted.	A small group carries out the group or organization's business. Members, by request, receive limited information of how business is conducted.	The group or organization's business is approved by the large group and implemented by a small group. Members receive reports on how business is conducted at regular meetings.	Most members and those who live in the community know how the group's business is planned and conducted through scheduled meetings. Documents and information are accessible to anyone.	

**LCCI Category 5: Core Capacity of Local Communities Degree of Management Transparency (continued)**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Project Executive Committees Roles</b>	No defined roles. No one knows his/her role or the roles of others.	Roles exist but are not very clear to either committee members or the other members of the group, organization, or community	Roles are defined and clear to the group or organization's members. The majority of committee members understands and executes their roles properly.	Roles are defined and clear to the group or organization's members and to the community at large. All committee members understand and execute their roles properly.	
<b>Rules and by-laws</b>	Rules and/or by-laws exist but not adhered to or respected.	Rules and/or by-laws exist but not all are adhered to or respected.	Rules and/or by-laws exist and the majority of members adhere to them.	In addition to #2, the majority of members can explain the function the rules and by-laws play in the organization.	
<b>Formal organizational structures</b>	No formal structure for the group or organization. It exists in name only.	A formal structure for the group or organization exists, but is not described in any statutes or by-laws.	A formal structure for the group or organization exists and is described in any statutes or by-laws.	Well organized, formalized, and functioning organizational structure recognized by local authorities and community members.	
<b>Conflict management</b>	The group does not address or acknowledge conflict openly or constructively. Members avoid conflict or leave the group when solutions are not found.	Leaders can or have resolved emerging or open conflicts. The group members resolve some conflicts but others are pending or deferred indefinitely.	Conflicts are resolved in general assembly or through external mediators (traditional or legal).	In addition to #3, group members view conflict as a source of potential ideas and energy. Conflicts are addressed in a timely fashion and in a culturally appropriate manner.	
<b>Debt payments</b>	Debts are unpaid and threaten the survival of the group or organization.	Debts paid back after harsh external enforcement or paid back in small, staggered, and irregular amounts.	Debts paid on time at least 75% of the time without external pressure. Debt load is acceptable.	Debts are taken on only when the group or organization has the ability to repay. Debts are handled according to the terms of the agreement.	

**LCCI Category 6: Core Capacity of Local Communities Capacity in Resource Acquisition**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Capacity to negotiate for external resource</b>	Limited or no knowledge of how to identify and secure outside resources.	The group or organization has developed an idea for seeking external resources but has not developed an action plan.	Group has developed an action and project plan and has approached outside partners for resources.	Good links with diverse sources of external resources. The group has developed 2 projects from the plan of action and funding obtained for at least one.	

**LCCI Category 7: Core Capacity of Local Communities Capacity to Analyze and Plan**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Capacity to analyze situations, prioritize problems and develop solutions</b>	Group is aware of this type of exercise, but cannot analyze situations, prioritize problems, or develop solutions.	The group can assess their present situation but finds it difficult to prioritize problems and develop solutions.	The group can assess their present situation, prioritize problems, and develop some solutions.	The group can analyze their present situation, prioritizing problems and develops numerous solutions.	
<b>Ability to prepare, implement, and evaluate action plans</b>	The group or organization has no capacity or experience in developing action plans.	With external assistance, the group could develop and implement an action plan	The group or organization can develop and implement an action plan and adjust it as circumstances change. The group may need external evaluation assistance.	The group or organization can develop, implement, and evaluate an action plan and adjust it as circumstances or resources change.	

**LCCI Category 8: Core Capacity of Local Communities Capacity to Manage Risk and Vulnerabilities**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Risks and vulnerability assessment based on a functioning information system</b>	The group or organization lacks knowledge or understanding or risks and vulnerabilities. Unstructured assessments on an irregular basis do not permit analysis or action.	The group or organization understands the need to assess food security, risks, and vulnerabilities, however no members are trained, and no structured information system is in place.	The group or organization understands the need to assess food security, risks, and vulnerabilities. Members are trained and a structured information system is in place.	The group manages an information system, created and operated by the community, with regular meetings to analyze situation. The system documents the food security situation for all groups on a continuous basis.	
<b>Plans in place for coping with risks</b>	Oral plan without capacity to implement.	Written plan without capacity to implement or preparations.	Written plan exists with capacity and preparations in place, communicated to community formal and informal leaders.	Effective preventive plans help mitigate shocks, risks and vulnerabilities. Plan is communicated to the entire community	

**LCCI Category 9: Core Capacity of Local Communities Capacity to Manage Risks associated with Production**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Diversification of productive activities</b>	At least 10% of households have diversified their productive activities.	At least 25% of households have diversified their productive activities.	At least 75% of households have diversified their productive activities.	At least 90% of households have diversified their productive activities.	

**LCCI Category 10: Core Capacity of Local Communities Capacity to Manage Risks associated with HIV/AIDS**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Knowledge HIV/AIDS in their community</b>	Less than 20% of the group or organization members have received basic HIV/AIDS awareness training.	Only half of the group or organization members have received HIV/AIDS awareness training and few know where to access up-to-date HIV/AIDS technical information.	Most of the group or organization members have received HIV/AIDS awareness training and know where to access up-to-date HIV/AIDS technical information.	Majority of members have received training and know where to access HIV/AIDS technical information. Group leaders can name a person or organization for each technical area of HIV/AIDS.	

**LCCI Category 11: Core Capacity of Local Communities Capacity to Manage Risks associated with Health**

Indicator	Indicator rankings for each progressive stage				Score
	Very limited capacity (1)	Limited capacity (2)	Acceptable capacity (3)	High capacity (4)	
<b>Formal collaboration between the community and health service providers.</b>	The group or organization does not communicate with health care services in the area.	The group or organization has informal contacts with health service providers in the area.	The group or organization has identified key services and has made contact with at least 50% of the health care service providers for in the area.	The group or organization has identified key services and has established a formal mechanism for referral of community members to these services.	



## Additional LCCI Data

The following list will assist CRS, partners, and communities to identify and collect data on the general food security situation in the area. The food security analysis developed, together with the data from the LCCI, present a holistic picture of community capacity and the food security situation at the same time. These data are similar to the data required for the food security mapping exercise, although broader and more qualitative in nature. It is recommended that CRS partners, and communities discuss the following topics and identify the information that would be most useful for developing food security capacity building programs.<sup>17</sup>

**General demographic statistics:** Total population, life expectancy, fertility rates, infant mortality, and maternal mortality.

**General food security:** Food and water consumption, prevalence of stunting in children under 5.

**Availability:** Agriculture and the environment (dominant food and cash crops, access to improved varieties, seed systems, production levels, land size and use, marketing systems, productivity and yields, crop pests and diseases and management practices, farming systems, irrigation systems, utilization of natural resources, access to and quality of extension services, and agricultural policies).

**Access:** Poverty and the economy (poverty levels, income-generating activities, employment, economic activities, access to financial services and related policies, training and education levels, roads and infrastructure, and market systems and prices, and dominant coping strategies).

**Utilization:** Health statistics (malnutrition in particularly stunting among children under 2 years old, immunization rates), micronutrient deficiencies, practices (including data on exclusive breastfeeding, infant and young child feeding, feeding practices during illness, use of complimentary foods, hygiene and sanitation), prevalence of diseases by age and sex that may impact nutritional status and productivity (e.g. intestinal worms, HIV, tuberculosis, malaria, schistosomiasis, others), access to and quality of health services, access potable water and relevant government policies, often developed by the Ministry of Health.

**Shocks, Cycles and Trends:** Prevalence of conflicts, natural disasters, other food security risks, the populations affected and their mitigation strategies. Existence and quality of early warning systems and relevant government policies.

**HIV and AIDS:** Prevalence, behavioral practices (related to prevention, care, and support), access to treatment, and government policies.

**Education:** Literacy rates, access to education, average years of schooling, enrollment levels.

**Governance:** Government policies in the key sectors/areas, political system, participation of the population in local and national governments.

**Gender:** To the extent possible, all data should be disaggregated by sex, which may help to highlight differential access to food security related assets, services and outcomes. Knowing gender policies and practices of the government, partners and other stakeholders relevant to food security is also helpful (e.g. differences in men's and women's property rights related to various assets, gender related risks such as migration and its impacts on men and women, etc.).

---

<sup>17</sup> "Designing Title II Multi-Year Assistance Programs (MYAPs): A Resource Manual for CRS Country Programs" Catholic Relief Services 2008. Jenny C. Aker, Anne Sellers, Carrie Miller, Bridget Rohrbough, page 42

## Appendix D References

A Guide to the WWF Organizational Assessment Process, WWF International 2003.

A Report on the Community Clinics Initiative: Building Capacities Self- Assessment Survey, Blueprint Research and Design, 2003.

Aker, Jenny and Valerie Stetson. Designing Title II Development Proposals: Assessment, Analysis, Action. Catholic Relief Services 2002.

Burke, Marshall. Partnership-Policy, Principles and Practices. CARE Concept Paper.

Burpee, Gaye, Tom Remington, and Paige Harrigan. A Cooperating Sponsors Filed Guide to USAID Environmental Compliance Procedures. Catholic Relief Services 1998.

Burpee, G., K. Wilson, and Catholic Relief Services/South Asia Regional Team. 2004. Natural Morningstar: a Simple Guide for Cross-Partner Review to Improve Natural Environments and Buffer Natural Disaster. Catholic Relief Services 2004.

Capacity Assessment and Performance Indicators (CAPI 2). Application Guide for National Society Organisational Self-Assessment. Geneva: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. 2000.

Compton, Donald W., Michael Baizerman, and Stacey Hueftle Stockdill, eds. The Art, Craft, and Science of Evaluation Capacity Building. New Directions for Evaluation. No. 93, Spring 2002.

Exploring Corporate Strategy, Gerry Johnson, Kevan Scholes & Richard Whittington, 7th Edition, Financial Times Prentice Hall, 2005.

Ferris-Morris, Margie. Community Capacity Building Indicator Matrix. FAM 2002.

Ferris-Morris, Margie. Individual Capacity Building Indicator Matrix. FAM 2002.

Ferris-Morris, Margie. Organizational Capacity Building Indicator Matrix. FAM 2002.

Ferris-Morris, Margie. Progress Report: Local Capacity Building in USAID Supported Title II Programming. FAM 2002.

Fisher, Wes, Walter Knausenburger, and Charlotte Bingham. Environmental Documentation Manual. Catholic Relief Services 1999.

Food for Assets: Adapting Programming to an HIV/AIDS Context. The C-Safe Learning Center ([www.c-safe.org](http://www.c-safe.org)) n.d.

Food Security Community Capacity Index for Title II programs. Africare, February 2005.

Gervais, Suzanne. Local Capacity Building in Title II Food Security Projects: A Framework. FANTA2003.

Gervais, Suzanne, Judy C. Bryson, and Karen Schoonmaker Freudenberger. Africare Field Manual on the Design, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of Food Security Activities. Africare 2003. (Revised second edition)

Gold Star: Program Quality Review—CRS Country and Field Office. Version 1.0. Catholic Relief Services South Asia Regional Team 2001.

Gosling, L. with Mike Edwards. Toolkits: A practical guide to planning, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. Save the Children/UK 2003 Second Edition.

Graef, Jessica. Selected Bibliography of Local Capacity Building Resources. Food Security Resource Center 1999.

Green, Hank. Inter-Organizational Corporation in Uncertain Environments: the case of Food AID Management. Unpublished PHD Thesis, University of Florida, 2003.

Gubbels, Peter and Catheryn Koss. From the Roots Up. World Neighbors 2000.

Hahn, Susan L. Institutional Building Assessment. Catholic Relief Services 1992

Halliday, Joyce, Sheena N.M. Asthana, and Susan Richardson. Evaluating Partnership: The Role of Formal Assessment Tools. Evaluation 10 (3): 285-303 2004.

How to Measure the Months of Adequate Household Food Provisioning in Food Security Interventions. Africare, 2005.

Integral Human Development (IHD): the Concept and the Framework, Gaye Burpee, Geoff Heinrich and Rosann Zemanek, Catholic Relief Services 2008  
[http://www.crs.org/publications/showpdf.cfm?pdf\\_id=235](http://www.crs.org/publications/showpdf.cfm?pdf_id=235)

Internal Control Policy, Catholic Relief Services Office of Finance, 2007.

Internal Control Procedure and Accompanying Checklists, Catholic Relief Services Office of Finance, 2007.

Internal Control Questionnaire, Catholic Relief Services .AIDS Relief, revised 2007.

Learning to Fly: Practical Knowledge Management from Leading and Learning Organizations, Collison, Chris and Parcell, West Sussex, England, Capstone Publishing, 2004

Lessik, Alan and Victoria Michener. Measuring Institutional Capacity. Recent Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation: TIPS. Number 15 and Number 15 Annexes. MSI (Management Systems International) for USAID Center for Development Information and Evaluation. PN-ACG-612 (Number 15). PN-ACT-624 (Number 15 Annex) 2000.

Levinger, Beryl and Evan Bloom. POET (Participatory Organizational Evaluation Tool) User's Manual. Pact Inc. and Education Development Center n.d.

MAGI (Microfinance Alliance for Global Impact): Planning Assessment User's Guide. Catholic Relief Services 2000.

Mattessich, Paul W. The Manager's Guide to Program Evaluation: Planning, Contracting, and Managing for Useful Results. Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Publishing Center 2003.

McCorkle, Constance and Scott Killough. International Institute for Rural Reconstruction. A Transregional Program to Build Capacity for Sustained Development Impact. ADMA Technologies for the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation, Bureau for Humanitarian Response, USAID 2000.

McCorkle, Constance. 2000. African Wildlife Foundation Conservation Services Program Final Evaluation. Washington, DC: AMA technologies for USAID. McMillan, Della E. 2001. Africare Institutional Support Grant (ISA) (1998-2003). Midterm Evaluation. Washington, DC: Africare.

McMillan, Della and Alice Willard. Evaluation Planning Tool for Project Managers. American Red Cross and Catholic Relief Services 2005.

McMillan, Della E. Food Aid Management (FAM) Institutional Support Assistance Program. Final Evaluation. FAM 2002.

Nonprofit Good Practice Guide, Johnson Center at Grand Valley State University, <http://www.npgoodpractice.org/Default.aspx>

Office of the special adviser on gender issues and advancement of women, UN, <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/gendermainstreaming.htm>

Organizational Assessment, a Framework For Improving Performance, Lausthaus C, M Adrien, G Anderson, F Carden and G Montalvan. IDRC Canada 2002.

Organization Assessment Guide, Canadian International Development Agency, June 2006

Organizational Assessment Tool, NGO Manager, April 2003, <http://w.ngomanager.org/tools.htm>

Organizational Development Self-Assessment Tool, ABA/CEELI, the NIS Regional Institution Building Program, 2004.

Partnering to Build and Measure Organizational capacity. Christian Reformed World Relief Committee. 1997.

Power and Partnerships: Experience of NGO Capacity Building, James, Rick INTRAC Management and Policy series No. 12 2004.

ProPack I, The CRS Project Package: Project Design and Proposal Guidance for CRS Project and Program Managers, Valerie Stetson, Guy Sharrock and Susan Hahn, Catholic Relief Services 2004.

ProPack II, The CRS Project Package: Project Management and Implementation Guidance for CRS Project and Program Managers, Valerie Stetson, Susan Hahn, David Leege, Debbie Reynolds and Guy Sharrock, Catholic Relief Services 2007.

Renzi, Mark. An Integrated Toolkit for Institutional Development. Public Administration and Development. 16: 469-483 1996.

Revised Technical Application for Institutional Capacity Building (ICB). Catholic Relief Services 2003.

RRA/PRA Manual. Karen Schoonmaker Freudenberger. Catholic Relief Services 1999.

Strategic Organizational Development Approach, Self-assessment Guidelines, Caritas Europa 2002

Strengthening The Capacity Of Southern NGO Partners: A Survey Of Current Northern NGO Approaches, James, Rick .INTRAC occasional papers series, Vol. 1, No. 5 1994.

Tango International, Inc. 2004. Guide for Measuring Food Access. FANTA and FAM 2004.

Tearfund UK, The Capacity Self Assessment Tool, [www.tearfund.org](http://www.tearfund.org)2003

Team Based Strategic Planning, C. D. Fogg, American Management Association, 1994.

The Child Survival Sustainability Assessment, Technical Support Project, ORC, Eric Sarriot, Macro, 2002

United States Agency for International Development/Food for Peace. Guidance for the Title II Institutional Support Assistance (ISA) Program Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. United States Agency for International Development/Food for Peace 1999.

VanSant, Jerry. A Composite Framework for Assessing the Capacity of Development Organizations. February 2000

Venture Philanthropy Partners. N.D. Effective Capacity Building in Nonprofit Organizations and McKinsey Capacity Assessment Grid. Venture Philanthropy Partners ([www.venturephilanthropypartners.org](http://www.venturephilanthropypartners.org)) 2001.

## Assessing Organizational Capacity to Improve Food Security: Indices – Glossary <sup>18</sup>

**Accountable/Accountability** - the notion that consortium members are responsible for using the project's results to check that their project is on-track towards achieving the strategic objectives; the capacity and responsibility of an agency, institution, or government to justify and explain its actions as well as the right of the public to get a full explanation of the rationale for these actions.

**Assessment / Capacity Assessment**– a process undertaken as part of consortium design to determine the strengths and constraints of each member organization.

**Beneficiary/Beneficiaries** - a person or person in the project zone who receive the benefits, or proceeds, of the project; beneficiaries are oftentimes project designers and implementers.

**Best Practices:** the processes, practices, and systems identified in public and private organizations that performed exceptionally well and are widely recognized as improving an organization's performance and efficiency in specific areas. Successfully identifying and applying best practices can reduce business expenses and improve organizational efficiency in consortium or organizations. (*See good practices*)

**Capacity Assessment** - carried out as a part of project design and during detailed implementation planning to measure the ability of CRS, partners, and the community to implement a particular Project Strategy and related Activities.

**Change Management** - activities involved in defining and instilling new values, attitudes, norms, and behaviors within an organization that support new ways of doing work and overcome resistance to change; building consensus among customers and stakeholders on specific changes designed to better meet their needs; and planning, testing, and implementing all aspects of the transition from one organizational structure or business process to another.

**Community/Communities** - the aggregate of persons with common characteristics such as geographic, professional, cultural, racial, religious, or socio-economic similarities; can be defined by interest in particular problems or outcomes or other common bonds; the project area of action, and the people within the area.

**Community of Practice** - a group of practitioners with similar functions and using similar tools that works together over a period of time; linking learning to performance, develop their own operating processes, and evolve over time; membership is based on interest and leadership based on expertise.

**Compliance** - consortium members acting according to agreed-to and accepted standards; when a consortium member fully meets the requirements of laws, rules and regulations of the contract; performance according to standards.

**Consortium** - an association of independent organizations usually formed to undertake a specific project that requires skill and resources, which are not fully possessed by any of the participants

---

<sup>18</sup> Thanks to the following websites and CRS documents for their assistance in this glossary: ProPack I and ProPack II; CRS Europe/Middle East Social Change Glossary; Google; USAID; US General Accounting Office; Canada Business Services; the National Association of County and City Health Officials; The Ohio State University; the US Environmental Protection Agency; GlobalGiving; Businesswords.com; Special Libraries Association; the Canadian Council on Social Development; The World Bank; the International Institute for Sustainable Development; Defense Technical Information Center; The Grantsmanship Center; Beyond Intractability; Aspiration; Case Western Reserve University; The Low Level Radiation Campaign; Princeton University; and the Indian Institute of Management Bangalore

individually; organizations that operate in collaboration according to a formally stated agreement, and in recognition of their enhanced ability to compete for resources as a formal association.

**Effective** - producing or capable of producing an intended result or having a striking effect; able to accomplish a purpose; meeting or exceeding project, financial, or managerial requirements.

**Efficient** - being effective without wasting time, effort, or expense; able to accomplish a purpose; functioning effectively; producing the desired result with the least waste; a process that produces the required product or service at the lowest cost.

**Evaluation** - a periodic, systematic assessment of a project's relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact on a defined population; draws from data collected during monitoring as well as data from additional surveys or studies to assess project achievements against set objectives.

**Financial Capacity** - represents available organizational resources and relationships – both internal and external – that enable individual organizations to pursue their missions and fulfill their roles; ability to generate and administer funds; the instruments and mechanisms that structure the relationship between the organization and funder.

**Goal** - a term for the longer-term, wider, development change in people's lives or livelihoods to which the consortium's project will contribute.

**Good Practices** - the processes, practices, and systems identified in public and private organizations that are believed to have improved a consortium's performance and efficiency in specific areas; does not have the same level of scrutiny or burden of proof as best practices. (*See best practices*)

**Governance** - The planning, influencing and conducting of the policy and affairs of an organization, consortium, or project.

**Intermediate Results** – expected changes in behaviors by participants in response to the successful delivery of outputs.

**Interpersonal communication** - people sending messages, from sender to receiver, through direct and indirect verbal and nonverbal communication.

**Learning** - *see Organizational Learning*

**Lessons Learned** - knowledge or understanding gained by a positive or negative experience.

**Management Capacity** - represents available organizational systems, structures, and relationships – both internal and external – that enable individual organizations to pursue their missions and fulfill their roles; ability to manage people and processes; the instruments and mechanisms that structure the relationship between the organization and community and civil society.

**Mission** - brief statement of the purpose of an organization; a clear and succinct representation of the enterprise's purpose for existence.

**Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** - a document reflecting mutual understanding of the parties about why each has entered into the consortium, expectations and how the parties will engage one another, developed through a process of discussion and negotiation.

**Operations Manual** - outlines systems, structures, and strategies to be used in managing the consortium; accounts for the development of operational procedures so that they can be passed on to subsequent project staff; contains critical organization information and step-by-step instructions for key operations procedures.

**Organizational Assessment** – a process to measure the capacity of an organization (e.g., structure, resources and staffing) to carry out a proposed project.

**Organizational Capacity** - the ability of organizations to undertake their work; to achieve their missions, bring their visions to life, and fulfill their roles; influence public policy; and delivering programs, services and activities.

**Organizational Development** - is the long-term process of improving the performance and effectiveness of human organizations to meet better their goals. This may involve incorporating new structures, systems, policies, capacities, tools and business practices, among other changes.

**Organizational Learning** - is the application and institutionalization of learning that comes out of organizational experiences, reflecting an organization's continuous quest to do business more efficiently and effectively toward greater impact on the organization's strategic objectives.

**Partnership** - is a relationship, based on common values and principles, and sustained by shared goals and resources, which results in a positive change in people's lives.

**Program Participants** - see beneficiary

**Project** - A unique venture with a beginning and an end, undertaken by people to meet established goals within defined constraints of time, resources, and quality.

**Process** - a procedure or a particular course of action intended to achieve a result; a naturally occurring or designed sequence of changes; method of doing something, involving steps or operations which are usually ordered and/or interdependent.

**Quality improvement** - the process of developing a quality improvement plan linked to an organization's strategy, goals, and objectives in order to improve or increase the effectiveness of a program.

**Results Framework** - an organigram that gives a snapshot of the top three levels of a project's objectives hierarchy in a way that makes it simple to understand the overarching thrust of the project.

**Risk** - the cumulative effect of the chances of uncertain occurrences, which will adversely affect project objectives; the degree of exposure to negative events and their probable consequences.

**Role** - the function or actions and activities assigned to, required, or expected of a person or group.

**Service Delivery** - the manner in which beneficiary or community needs are met; the types of assistance offered under the project, in line with donor requirements and host country priorities.

**Shocks** – external factors that influence all other elements of the consortium's project implementation, financial systems, or management structures.

**Stakeholder** - one who has a stake or interest in the outcome of the project or one who is affected by the project, could be the sponsor, donor, community, or individual beneficiaries.



**Strategic Objectives (SO)** - the central purpose of the project described as the noticeable or significant benefits that are actually achieved and enjoyed by targeted groups by the end of the project. **Strategy/Strategies** - the process by which a consortium envisions its work and develops goals, objectives, and action plans to achieve that future.

**Structure** - the structure and/or hierarchy of an organization and how its component parts work together to achieve common goals.

**Technical Capacity** - the ability of consortium members to furnish the technical expertise appropriate to project requirements; the ability of project personnel to implement the requisite technical knowledge.

**Transparent** - an open, clear, and unambiguous process that encourages the participation and/or awareness on the part of all consortium members of policies, procedures, decisions made, and other factors key to project success.