Initiative for Climate Action Transparency for Adaptation (ICAT-A)

Capacity Assessment Tool for Climate Action Transparency (CAT4CAT)

Toolkit for assessing stakeholders' capacity building needs on climate change adaptation MRV

Facilitators' Guidance Document

INITIATIVE FOR
Climate Action Transparency

August 2019

Table of Contents

1. Background

The Initiative for Climate Action Transparency for Adaptation (ICAT- A) aims to put into practice the request stated in the Paris Agreement to strengthen national institutions and to create the foundation for the enhanced transparency requirements under the Agreement. The overarching goal of the project is to strengthen the capacity of countries to implement, monitor, and evaluate effective and efficient adaptation actions in a transparent manner.

In line with ICAT's mission, this project intends to establish transparent and flexible systems for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) [1]of adaptation action. The project will develop and test tools through which to assess adaptation policies and actions in four pilot countries - Bangladesh, Dominican Republic, India and South Africa, and advance the implementation and adoption of these policies and actions via national dialogue and training. These activities respond directly to country demand for capacity building and methodology support to enhance transparency and learning of adaptation MRV at national and global levels.

To establish and foster national systems for adaptation MRV, active involvement of an array of relevant stakeholders in the country would be required. An effective MRV system would comprise of all the different entities engaged in the climate change arena within a country. This would include governing bodies in charge of implementing national climate change policies, organizations with expertise in executing climate change interventions, actors engaged in the data management sector as well as entities responsible for reporting to international conventions. Government agencies, civil society organizations, NGOs, researchers, academia, private sector etc. will all need to be included in the process.

Building necessary capacity of a broad set of stakeholders is therefore imperative to guide effective MRV of adaptation measures and promote enhanced transparency and reporting of climate action in a country. Considering the cross-cutting and cross-sectoral nature of climate change action, it would be critical to build stakeholder capacity across a range of areas and using varied approaches. Capacity building could constitute tailored training workshops and dialogue events as well as the provision of knowledge products, communication materials and other forms of ongoing support to relevant stakeholders for implementing the tools and approaches developed by the project. This could entail application of transparency tools and methodologies for in country-level reporting at national and UNFCCC levels, training of trainers, and assistance for optimizing institutional and system structures to accommodate transparency for adaptation. It also includes training in management and planning, or social and methodological skills where these are required to achieve the outputs and outcomes of the project. In order to design and undertake necessary capacity building measures, it is therefore critical to assess and understand capacity needs of relevant national/in-country stakeholders.

[1] Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) have been used interchangeably in the document

2. Overview of the tool

The Capacity Assessment Tool for Climate Action Transparency (CAT4CAT) has been designed as a structured tool that can be used to recognize and assess the capacity building needs of relevant stakeholders for undertaking in-country MRV of climate change adaptation. The tool can be applied to stakeholders at the national, subnational and programmatic levels.

The key objectives of this tool are to:

- **Understand current institutional capacity** for undertaking MRV of climate actions
- **Determine existing gaps** in organizational capacity
- **Identify possible strategies** and interventions to strengthen relevant capacity

The tool aims to provide an insight into an organization's existing capacity and help establish a standardized baseline against which to assess their performance. Employing this tool will help recognize capacity limitations across different areas. Subsequently, results from the assessment will help identify and guide the steps that can be taken by an organization to contribute towards setting up MRV systems for adaptation at the national level. The exercise can be repeated again after a period of time to monitor any development in capacity following recommended interventions.

The tool has been developed drawing on elements and ideas from a number of similar tools already in practice and being applied by different organizations at various levels. This includes but not limited to, the Capacity Assessment Tool developed by the Governance Transparency Fund (GTF),[2] Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Assessment Toolkit (MECAT) developed by MEASURE Evaluation[3], and also USAID's Global Climate Change (GCC) Institutional Capacity Assessment[4]. Project partners, topic experts as well as relevant in-country stakeholders were consulted for further refinement of the tool.

The tool is primarily targeted for capacity assessment of the following set of actors/stakeholders:

- Government Organizations (Ministries/Divisions/Departments etc.)
- Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO)
- Civil Society Organizations (CSO)
- Research Institutes / Think Tanks
- Private Sector

The CAT4CAT Facilitators' Guidance Document provides an overview of the different areas and domains across which stakeholder capacities would need to be assessed to understand their relevance and functions for supporting a national framework on adaptation MRV. Guidelines and criteria for measurement and analysis of stakeholder capacity is outlined in the document. The document also provides thorough instructions for facilitators to apply the tool appropriately, and illustrates how assessment results can be appropriately analyzed.

[2] http://sanitationandwaterforall.org/tool/governance-and-transparency-fund-gtf-capacity-needs-assessment-tool-2/
[3] https://www.measureevaluation.org/pima/m-e-capacity
[4] https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/global-climate-change-institutional-capacity-assessment

3. Capacity assessment domains

To understand and assess the capacity of relevant organizations and stakeholders for contributing towards enhanced effectiveness and transparency of climate action in a country, ICAT-A recognizes a set of four (4) broad domains of institutional capacity that need to be considered. These four domains have been identified on the basis of desktop review of best practices and lessons learned in conducting institutional capacity needs assessment across different disciplines. The importance of each of these domains for assessing stakeholder capacity is outlined below. The four domains are:

1. **Goals and Strategy:** Organizational mission and vision statement, strategic plans as well as other governance and organizational policies.

Promoting increased effectiveness and transparency of climate adaptation action in a country would require commitment towards the issue from different key actors and stakeholders. Climate action is a major component of several national and global development goals, mainstreaming climate change into broader organizational mandates and programmes, is emerging as a key agenda for several stakeholders. To ensure ownership on the issue, it is essential, that relevant stakeholders take into account the issue of climate change adaptation within their broader mission and vision statements. Strategic plans outlining climate change objectives need to be in place to guide action. Therefore it would be critical to assess stakeholders' commitment and strategies on climate change, to better understand their interests for establishing a MRV framework on adaptation in the country.

2. **Systems and Infrastructure:** Processes, procedures and systems in place for running an organization in a coherent and consistent manner.

Establishing national framework for adaptation MRV would constitute better understanding of climate change adaptation and improved data harmonization among all relevant stakeholders. It is therefore vital for these institutions to have robust systems on monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management, information and communication technology, financial operations etc. to allow them to contribute effectively to the process.

3. **Human Resources:** People who manage or work for an organization, as well as the processes in place for supporting and developing them to fulfill their functions well and contribute towards the organization's aspirations.

For an organization to effectively play their role and contribute towards effective systems for adaptation MRV and enhanced reporting on climate change adaptation, capacity building of its human resources would be essential. Staff would need to possess knowledge on climate change issues and develop expertise in employing a range of M&E tools and approaches. The number of personnel engaged in the climate change unit and the M&E unit need to be sufficient as well.

4. **<u>Organizational Assets</u>:** Many types of skills or aptitudes that support effective functioning of an organization, in line with its mission, vision and goals

Organizational assets serve as building blocks for setting up national systems on adaptation MRV. To engage with the process, stakeholders would need to be aware of the local context of climate change, national priorities and also the issue at hand. It is also important to develop partnerships with other organizations and actively engage the community. Capacity to influence policies on the issue would also be a key factor in the broader uptake of the tools and approaches by relevant stakeholders

Each domain is comprised of a number of sub-domains, which represent different factors characterizing the broad domain. It should be acknowledged that targeted capacity building interventions for some of these sub-domains may not be directly achievable due to limitations in scope and resources. However, it would still be important to understand them as they constitute core elements of institutional capacity. At the same time, it would be useful to track if increased capacity in one area indirectly influences an increase in another. The table below provides a list of capacity assessment domains and sub-domains identified by the tool.

Domain	Sub-domain
Goals and strategy	• Mission/mandate • Strategic planning • Leadership quality • Funding model • Gender and social inclusion
Systems and infrastructure	• Organizational structure • Interfunctional coordination • Monitoring & evaluation • Knowledge management • External communication • Information and communication technology (ICT) • Financial operations management
Human resources	• Staffing levels • Knowledge and expertise on climate change • Technical skills on M&E • Access to capacity building
Organizational assets	• Understanding of issue, context and role of relevant stakeholders • Partnerships/network development and fostering • Local community presence and engagement • Policy influence

4. Application of the tool

The tool aims to assess existing capacity of an institution across the four domains by ascribing a score between 1 – 4 for each of their sub-domains. The scoring criteria outlining requisite characteristics within a sub-domain for each score have been presented in **Annex A.** A series of guiding questions and supporting documentation are also listed in **Annex B** to help assign and validate a score.

The facilitation of the assessment is to be led by an organization or a team of individuals with sound knowledge on the issue and considerable experience of working with climate change actors in the country. Access to a wide network of actors and positive relationships with targeted stakeholders would be beneficial. The ICAT-A country partners are well placed to perform this role.

Prior to undertaking the exercise with a stakeholder, it would be important to ensure that the objectives and the content of the assessment is defined and explained to them well in advance to allow them sufficient time to make necessary preparations. Depending on the circumstances and availability, the assessment can either be conducted with the same set of participants for the entirety of the tool, or with different participants for the various domains presented. Recommended set of participants for each domain has been listed in **Annex B**.

To ensure easy access to necessary information and documents, the assessment exercise session should be held at the office of participating stakeholder/organization. It is recommended that a minimum of 2 hours is set aside to maximize the outputs and results of the exercise

At the beginning of the session, the facilitators must ensure that the characteristics and criteria for different levels of capacity are expounded upon so that the participating organization can accordingly assess their strengths and weaknesses. The guiding questions provided help facilitators move the discussion forward and consider appropriate scores. These questions and discussions will however need to be tailored according to the participating organization's goals and functions as they relate to the issue. Therefore, the facilitators will also need to do some preparation prior to a session.

Following a participatory discussion, scoring for each item should be ascribed upon consensus among all participants present and the team of facilitators. Where relevant, supporting documentation for validating the score can be requested. The score should be noted in the scoresheet provided in **Annex C.** Once a final score is assigned to a sub-domain, the facilitators will have to prompt a discussion with the participants to identify strategies and interventions for addressing their capacity building needs against that particular sub-domain (See **Annex C**)

The exercise can be repeated on a periodic basis following capacity building interventions to measure changes in institutional capacity over time and understand whether interventions are being effective.

❖ Facilitation pointers

When administering the tool for assessing stakeholder capacity, facilitators need to apply the following principles and approaches to ensure fruitful discussions with the participating organization, and to subsequently produce assessment results that are useful. These include:

- Listen attentively with no judgement
- Pay attention to non-verbal cues in addition to what is being said
- Encourage wide participation during the discussions
- Clarify when participants do not understand something
- Respond when guidance questions need to be adapted or excluded
- Formulate probing questions to follow up on responses
- Apply tact to challenge other participants to reconsider their responses if contradiction to supporting evidence is recognized

❖ Limitations of the tool

There are number of limitations associated with using the tool for assessing stakeholders' capacity building needs which need to be recognized. These include:

- The scoring for the assessment, while facilitated by qualified and eligible experts, is largely dependent on self-reporting by organizations. This would mean there would be still be a risk of misrepresentation, either due to lack of clarity regarding scoring criteria, guidance questions or in the interest of positive representation of the organization by the participants.
- Ensuring accurate scores for the assessment can in some cases constitute extensive discussion and debate between the participants and the facilitator – which can be time consuming and the participating organization might not be able to allocate sufficient time towards the exercise due to other priorities
- While the key underlying purpose of the tool is to identify capacity building needs of the stakeholders across the different domains, it must be acknowledged that the extent to which these needs can be addressed would be contingent upon available resources (temporal, financial, human etc.), the scope of work and stakeholder priorities.

5. Analyzing the results

While the aggregate score of an institution for all the domains provides a reasonable appraisal of the stakeholder's capacity in regard to adaptation MRV, it might not be unequivocally representative of their competence and relevance on the issue. It must be acknowledged that stakeholders' priorities and roles are varied and therefore some capacity domains could be more critical to one stakeholder than the others.

It would therefore be useful to compute the average capacity score for each domain and then based on the understanding of a stakeholder's roles and functions within the broader framework of adaptation MRV in a country, a more accurate assessment of their capacity needs may be deduced. A key objective of the tool is to identify strategies and interventions for improving stakeholder capacity in a targeted way. Hence each sub-domain will also need to be separately assessed and understood when prescribing capacity building interventions for them.

The ICAT-A approach recognizes that in order to establish systems for effective adaptation measures and enhanced reporting and transparency on the issue, would require engaging a variety of stakeholders. This includes entities responsible for policy formulation and international reporting in the country, climate change researchers and practitioners with technical expertise on the issue, as well as those involved in data generation and analysis. These groups are expected to have varied priorities and accordingly, and capacity in certain domains would be of greater significance than others. Capacity building needs would thus have to be analyzed in reference to this and strategies accordingly applied to them.

It would therefore be beneficial to undertake a comprehensive mapping and profiling of key stakeholders prior to employing the tool. This will help understand stakeholders' function and relevance better, as well as their interests and influence on the issue of adaptation MRV. The level of interest and influence of the stakeholder in question will also define the extent to which certain capacity needs has to be diagnosed. Considering, the scope of work at hand and limited resources, this is would be important for setting priorities.

For instance, building capacity of stakeholders with high influence is more crucial for the process of establishing adaptation MRV at the country level and their capacity requirements will thus need to be evaluated and understood with more scrutiny. Stakeholders with high interest are likely to be more interested and receptive towards assessing their own capacities, allowing for more effective assessment results. On the other hand, stakeholders with low interest and low influence can be given less priority for the purposes of the exercise.

A sample report template has been developed as a supplementary document to the tool, which provides further details on how results of the assessment can be analyzed and shared across stakeholders,

Annex A: Scoring Criteria

1. Goals and Strategy

1. Goals and Strategy	(1) Low level of capacity	(2) Basic level of capacity	(3) Moderate level of capacity	(4) High level of capacity
Mission/Mandate	No clearly defined mission, vision or organizational goals dictating it to address climate change issues. Organization's climate change mandate is not well known and accepted by relevant stakeholders (internal and external).	Mission and vision has provisions for climate change action, however there is lack of clarity and metrics for measuring attainment. Organization's climate change mandate is known and accepted by a small number of relevant stakeholders (internal and external).	Mission and vision clearly expresses and entails actionable goals for addressing climate change - however they are not well aligned with organization's broader mission and national priorities. Organization's climate change mandate is fairly well known and accepted by relevant stakeholders (internal and external).	Addressing climate change is well defined in the organization's mission and vision statements with clear goals, and this which are widely followed and aligned with national priorities and supports the organization's broader mission. Organization's climate change mandate is widely known and accepted by relevant stakeholders.
Strategic planning	Strategy document for addressing climate change or a general plan with climate change objectives does not exist.	Strategy document for addressing climate change or a general plan with climate change objectives exist, but is largely inadequate as it is in conflict with the organization's broader mission/mandate. There is limited access to climate change data and the document or plan is not regularly reviewed or updated.	Strategy document, or a general plan outlining short-medium term plans for addressing climate change exists . The document is regularly reviewed and updated to reflect national priorities. However, climate change issue is not extensively integrated across the organization's work portfolio. There is limited focus on M&E, transparency and reporting as well as gender and social inclusion considerations.	Strategy document with clear and coherent medium-to-long term plan for addressing climate change in place – both actionable and linked to mission, vision and goals - has strong considerations for M&E, transparency, reporting as well as climate change mainstreaming. Gender and social inclusion considerations are also adequately incorporated within the document. Strategy document is regularly reviewed and updated to

1. Goals and Strategy	(1) Low level of capacity	(2) Basic level of capacity	(3) Moderate level of capacity	(4) High level of capacity
				reflect new information and data, as well as national priorities.
Leadership quality	Limited technical expertise on climate change within leadership positions – also characterized by little direction and low commitment from senior management, towards addressing climate change.	Limited technical expertise on climate change within leadership positions , however leadership demonstrates reasonable commitment towards the issue of climate change.	Senior management / steering committee possess necessary technical expertise on climate change, provide strong direction and support, however is not actively engaged in M&E processes.	Senior management / steering committee possess necessary technical expertise, on the issue of climate change as well as MRV. Leadership also embodies diversity and provide strong direction and support as well as active participation.
Funding model	Inadequate access to or allocation of financial resources for supporting climate change priorities and objectives.	Minimal access to financial resources for supporting climate change priorities and objectives – insufficient access to funding sources.	Modest access to financial resources for supporting climate change priorities and objectives - limited sources and types of funding support available (e.g. government, donor agencies, private sector etc.) with little budget allocated towards enhancing transparency and reporting or M&E of climate action.	Substantial access to financial resources for supporting climate change priorities and objectives - various sources and types of funding support available (e.g. government, donor agencies, private sector etc.) with budget allocated towards enhancing transparency and reporting or M&E of climate action.
Gender and social inclusion	No gender and social inclusion strategy or guidelines exist and inclusion not actively practiced.	Gender and social inclusion strategy or guidelines in place, however not actively practiced.	Gender and social inclusion strategy in place and actively practiced, but is not mainstreamed across different programmes.	Comprehensive gender and social inclusion strategy in place and mainstreamed across different programmes, ensuring an enabling space for inclusive participation and contribution of diverse views towards strategic decision-making.

2. Systems and Infrastructure

2. Systems and Infrastructure	(1) Low level of capacity	(2) Basic level of capacity	(3) Moderate level of capacity	(4) High level of capacity
Organizational structure	The organization does not have a formal organizational structure with clearly defined roles and responsibilities of departments, functions and lines of authority, particularly for accomplishing climate change objectives. .	Organizational structure with clearly defined roles and responsibilities of departments, functions and lines of authority, particularly for accomplishing climate change objectives is in place but is not appropriately followed.	Organizational structure with clearly defined roles and responsibilities of departments, functions and lines of authority particularly for accomplishing climate change objectives is in place, and is adequately followed.	Organizational structure with clearly defined roles and responsibilities of departments, functions and lines of authority, particularly for accomplishing climate change objectives is in place, and is effectively applied.
Interfunctional coordination	Limited to no coordination across departments or key functions, particularly between the climate change and M&E unit, for achieving climate change goals.	Weak coordination across departments or key functions, particularly between the climate change and M&E unit, for achieving climate change goals.	Moderate coordination across departments or key functions, particularly between the climate change and M&E unit, for achieving climate change goals.	Strong coordination across departments or key functions, particularly between the climate change and M&E unit, for achieving climate change goals.
Monitoring & evaluation	Monitoring • Significant difficulty in establishing suitable indicators for measuring organizational performance, particularly in regard to climate change objectives • Lack of expertise in collection and analysis of baseline and performance monitoring data, particularly on climate change • Performance monitoring data,	Monitoring • Some difficulty in establishing suitable indicators for measuring organizational performance, particularly in regard to climate change objectives • Minimal expertise in collection and analysis of baseline and performance monitoring data, particularly on climate change • Performance monitoring data,	Monitoring • Reasonably capable of establishing suitable indicators for measuring organizational performance, particularly in regard to climate change objectives • Moderate expertise in collection and analysis of baseline and performance monitoring data, particularly on climate change • Performance monitoring data,	Monitoring • Experienced in establishing suitable indicators for measuring organizational performance, particularly in regard to climate change objectives • Strong expertise in collection and analysis of baseline and performance monitoring data, particularly on climate change • Performance monitoring data,

2. Systems and Infrastructure	(1) Low level of capacity	(2) Basic level of capacity	(3) Moderate level of capacity	(4) High level of capacity
	particularly on climate change, is not transparently collected and reported to relevant stakeholders <u>Evaluation</u> • Lack of expertise in programme evaluation, particularly climate change objectives • Evaluation is conducted rarely and is of poor quality • Evaluation is rarely guided by stakeholder inputs and results and recommendations are rarely incorporated in new and existing strategies and programming	particularly on climate change, is occasionally collected and reported to relevant stakeholders in a transparent manner <u>Evaluation</u> • Minimal expertise in programme evaluation, particularly climate change objectives • Evaluation is conducted occasionally and is of minimal quality • Evaluation is occasionally guided by stakeholder inputs and results and recommendations are occasionally incorporated in new and existing strategies and programming	particularly on climate change, is regularly collected and reported to relevant stakeholders in a transparent manner <u>Evaluation</u> • Moderate expertise in programme evaluation, particularly climate change objectives • Evaluation is conducted frequently and is of moderate quality • Evaluation is regularly guided by stakeholder inputs and results and recommendations are frequently incorporated in new and existing strategies and programming	particularly on climate change, is frequently collected and reported to relevant stakeholders in a transparent manner <u>Evaluation</u> • Strong expertise in programme evaluation, particularly climate change objectives • Evaluation is conducted regularly and is of high quality • Evaluation is frequently guided by stakeholder inputs and results and recommendations are periodically incorporated in new and existing strategies and programming
Knowledge management	No established systems in place for capturing and documenting internal knowledge, organizational data and best practices, particularly for climate change.	Some systems and procedures in place for capturing and documenting internal knowledge, organizational data and best practices, particularly for climate change, however they are not comprehensive (e.g. easy access to data and information, user-friendliness of data-collection tools, data analysis etc.).	Systems exist for capturing and documenting internal knowledge, organizational data and best practices, particularly for climate change, which are somewhat comprehensive, but are not widely used for guiding future actions, particularly on climate change (e.g. organizational growth, policy influencing on climate change etc.).	Well-designed, comprehensive and user-friendly systems in place for capturing and documenting internal knowledge, organizational data and best practices, particularly for climate change, which are widely used for guiding future actions, particularly on climate change.

2. Systems and Infrastructure	(1) Low level of capacity	(2) Basic level of capacity	(3) Moderate level of capacity	(4) High level of capacity
External communication	No established systems in place for communicating climate change objectives and action to relevant stakeholders.	Some systems exist (e.g. websites, social media, print media etc.), but not actively used and often partially targeted.	Systems exist and are widely used, but they are not well targeted at relevant stakeholders.	Robust systems in place for communicating with relevant stakeholders (e.g. communication strategy) and are well used and targeted to pursue organizational goals, particularly on climate change.
Information and communication technology (ICT)	Inadequate access to necessary equipment, hardware and software for data collection as well as knowledge management, resulting in loss of effectiveness and efficiency.	Sufficient access to equipment, hardware and software required to meet the most important and immediate needs.	Significant access to necessary equipment, however advanced hardware and software not available.	Wide access to necessary equipment and also advanced hardware and software for data collection as well as knowledge management, that contribute towards enhanced effectiveness and efficiency.
Financial operations management	Basic financial activities undertaken with supporting documentation collected and retained, however there is limited transparency.	Financial activities are transparent, and are clearly and consistently recorded, documented and tracked.	Formal internal controls in place governing all financial operations including tracking, reporting and cash flow management.	Robust systems and controls in place governing all financial operations including tracking, reporting which are well aligned with organizational strategy and aspirations.

3. Human Resources

3. Human Resources	(1) Low level of capacity	(2) Basic level of capacity	(3) Moderate level of capacity	(4) High level of capacity
Staffing levels	No dedicated unit for climate change in place. M&E unit within the organizations either does not exist or is small in size.	Dedicated units for climate change as well as M&E exists, however staff levels are very low compared to other departments.	Dedicated units for climate change as well as M&E exists, composed of medium sized teams with staff levels equal to or lower than other departments.	Dedicated units for climate change as well as M&E exists, composed of large sized teams, with staff levels equal to or higher than other departments.
Knowledge and expertise on climate change	Majority of the staff, including those in the dedicated climate change unit, do not have necessary training, technical expertise or professional experience on climate change.	The climate change unit has some training, technical expertise or professional experience on climate change research and practice. However, the organization-wide knowledge on climate change across different departments is limited.	The climate change unit has necessary training, technical expertise or professional experience on climate change research and practice. Also, moderate levels of knowledge on climate change across different departments / units.	Organization-wide awareness on the issue of climate change among staff. The climate change unit is composed of staff with substantial expertise on climate change research and practice. The climate change unit also has dedicated people for M&E.
Technical skills for M&E	Staff in the M&E or unit does not have sufficient training and technical expertise on employing M&E tools and very little knowledge and understanding on climate change issues.	Staff in the M&E unit has necessary training, technical expertise or professional experience on employing M&E approaches and tools. However, they do not possess necessary knowledge and understanding on climate change issues.	Staff in the M&E unit has necessary training, technical expertise or professional experience on employing M&E tools and approaches, with low levels of knowledge and understanding on climate change issues.	Staff in the M&E unit has substantial training, technical expertise or professional experience on employing M&E approaches tools and are also trained on climate change in some capacity.
Access to capacity building	Staffs in the climate change and M&E unit do not generally have access to training and capacity development opportunities.	Staffs in the climate change and M&E unit have some access to training and capacity development opportunities, however this is somewhat irregular.	Staffs in the climate change and M&E unit have regular access to training and capacity development, however this is limited to those in leadership positions.	All staff in the climate change and M&E unit have regular access to training and capacity development opportunities, on a diverse range of topics and skillset

4. Organizational Assets

4. Organizational Assets	(1) Low level of capacity	(2) Basic level of capacity	(3) Moderate level of capacity	(4) High level of capacity
Understanding of issue, context and role of relevant stakeholders	Solid institutional knowledge of and engagement with the issue of climate change adaptation and other relevant global and national commitments (SDGs, annual development plans etc.), as well as relevant actors and local context for these issues.	Solid institutional knowledge of and engagement with the issue of climate change adaptation and other relevant global and national commitments (SDGs, annual development plans etc.), as well as relevant actors and local context for these issues.	Solid institutional knowledge of and engagement with the issue of climate change adaptation and other relevant global and national commitments (SDGs, annual development plans etc.), as well as relevant actors and local context for these issues, however with limited scope for regular and continuous learning.	Extensive institutional knowledge of and engagement with the issue of climate change adaptation and other relevant global and national commitments, as well as relevant actors, local context and the international policy architecture for these issues, with systems and processes in place for regular and continuous learning.
Partnerships / network development and fostering	Small network of partners, mostly comprised of the same type of organizations within the climate change arena and relationships are largely informal.	Medium network of partners, comprised of a variety of organizations within the climate change arena, however relationships entail limited communication and scope for cross-learning.	Vast network of partners comprised of a diverse range of organizations within the climate change arena, with whom communication and cross-learning is fostered however relationships are not actively maintained.	Vast network of partners comprised of a diverse range of organizations with strong and well-maintained relationships that are mutually beneficial.
National presence and engagement	Presence either not recognized or generally not regarded as positive within the sector or field the organization is working in.	Presence somewhat recognized and generally regarded as positive within the sector or field the organization is working in.	Reasonably well recognized and regarded as positive within the sector or field the organization is working in, however with limited coordination with other actors in the sector.	Widely recognized within the within the sector or field the organization is working in and regarded as proactive in cooperating with other actors in the sector.
Policy influence	Very little scope for influencing policy-making, particularly on climate change action.	Minimal scope for influencing policy-making particularly on climate change action.	Moderate scope for influencing policy-making and particularly on climate change action change action.	Actively engaged in climate change - policy influencing and formulation processes at both local and global context.

Annex B: Guiding Questions and Documentation

1. Goals and Strategy

Potential participants:	Chief Executive Officer, Executive Director, Director, Senior managers
Supporting documentation:	Mission and vision documents, strategic plans, annual reports, programme reports, gender action plan

- Does the organization's written mission or vision statement, or a mandate (laws, by-laws) have provisions for climate change action?
- What sort of objectives regarding climate change action do these documents mention?
- When was the last time the mission/mandate was revised? How often are they reviewed? What is the process for reviewing and revising these mission/mandate documents?
- To what extent is the internal staff familiar with the mission/mandate on climate change? Is the mission/mandate on climate change well known to stakeholders? To what extent is the mission/mandate externally imposed?
- Does the organization have a written strategy document to implement its climate change objectives? Is Is it publicly available? What time period is covered by the document?
- How effective is the strategy document in accomplishing the organization's climate change objectives? Are the objectives well informed by global and local context as well as relevant challenges and opportunities? To what extent is the strategic plan informed by reliable information, data and analysis?
- How often is it revised? Is there a mechanism to review and revise the plan responding to new information and knowledge? How well is the mechanism followed?
- Does the strategic plan cover resource requirements needed to accomplish the objectives? Given available resources and constraints, how realistic are these requirements? How accurate are the resource requirements for accomplishing climate change goals and objectives?
- To what extent does the strategic plan help guide management decisions and operational planning?
- To what extent does leadership within the organization commit to and abide by the mission/mandate on climate change objectives?
- Is there sufficient climate change expertise at the leadership level?
- Does the organization have funding support to further its climate change objectives? What are the funding sources? How stable and reliable are these funding sources?
- Does the organization have a dedicated budget for climate change action? What criteria are applied for allocating budget and financial resources towards climate change objectives? Is the allocation sufficient?
- Has the organization identified its relevant stakeholders? Who are they and how were the identified?
- How well is gender and social inclusion integrated across the organization's work, particularly on climate change? Is there significant participation of socially excluded groups in implementing the plan?

2. Systems and Infrastructure

Potential participants:	Senior Manager, M&E Officer, Knowledge Management Officer, ICT Officer, Finance Manager
Supporting documentation:	Organizational chart, M&E strategy, financial reports,

- Does the organization have a formal structure for its operations? To what extent does the structure define climate change objectives? When was the organizational structure last revised to reflect climate change goals? Does the organizational structure allow for leadership to exercise climate change objectives?
- Are there clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and lines of authority of different departments and functions within the organization? How appropriate are they? How well do they work?
- Is there sufficient coordination among different functions and departments within the organization? What mechanisms are in place for ensuring communication and coordination among them, particularly for accomplishing climate change objectives? What are some of the ways different units and departments have collaborated on promoting climate change objectives?
- How does the organization conduct monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of its performance, particularly on climate change work? To what extent are the targets set realistic? Are the qualitative and quantitative indicators appropriately chosen? How often is M&E undertaken?
- Does performance monitoring data accurately portray intended results? Are lessons learned from M&E used to inform future decisions and strategies?
- Is there sufficient expertise among staff for undertaking M&E, particularly on climate change work?
- How well are gender and social inclusion issues incorporated into M&E of climate change action?
- What system does the organization have for documenting, storing, and disseminating organizational knowledge, as well as best practices and lessons learned, particularly on climate change? Is the knowledge accessible both internally and externally? Is there a system or process for sharing knowledge and best practices to external stakeholders? How well do these systems work?
- How often does the organization participate in discussions with relevant stakeholders and actors on climate change approaches, lessons learned and best practices? Are these discussions mutually beneficial? In what ways?
- Does the organization have a communication strategy for its stakeholders? What are some of the mediums used by the organization for communicating its goals, objectives and action to external audiences? How effective are they?
- Does the organization have sufficient Information and Communication Technology (ICT) facilities, including hardware and software for knowledge and data management? What sort of equipment does the organization employ? Is there sufficient financial resources allocated towards ICT? Does the ICT staff have necessary expertise? Are ICT approaches effective in accomplishing climate change objectives?
- Does the organizational have a financial policy? Is it aligned with organizational goals and strategies? What sort of internal controls are in place for financial operations? Are financial operations transparent and effective?

3. Human Resources

Potential participants:	Senior Manager, HR Manager, Climate Change staff, M&E staff
Supporting documentation:	HR policy; sample position descriptions, staff and consultant resumes

- To what extent is the organization's staff informed on the issue of climate change? Is there a dedicated unit for climate change work within the organization? Are the staffing levels sufficient to fulfill organizational goals and objectives on climate change? Is there a M&E focal person within the unit?
- Is there a dedicated unit for M&E in the organization? Are the staffing levels sufficient?
- Do people in key management and technical position related to climate change and M&E have the necessary qualifications and skills? Do they have sufficient knowledge on M&E approaches and tools?
- To what extent does the organizational staff have access to training? What types of training are available to the staff? Are they limited to staff in certain positions within the organization? What is the procedure for selecting staff for capacity building interventions

4. Organizational Assets

Potential participants:	Senior manager, project manager, chief financial officer, field officer
Supporting documentation:	Field reports, event reports, meeting minutes etc.

- Is the organization well informed and knowledgeable regarding issues relevant to climate change? Is the organization aware of international commitments and national priorities relevant to the issue? How does the organization stay up-to-date regarding emerging information on these issues? Are there systems in place for doing so? How effective are they?
- Is the organizations well informed regarding the roles and functions of other relevant actors within its domain of work? To what extent does the organization understand the influence and priorities of other actors working on climate change?
- What type of partners does the organization have? How are partnerships formalized? How wide and diverse is the organization's network of partners?
- Is the organization's functions and roles recognized by local communities and other actors in the field or secrtor? To what extent does the organization work with other actors? What sort of approaches does the organization employ to ensure participation of other actors in accomplishing its objectives, particularly on the climate change?
- To what extent is the organization aware of practices and approaches for influencing policy? Does organization have access to platforms for policy advocacy and influence? What are examples? How broad is the scope of influence?

Annex C: Capacity Assessment Exercise

Organization Information		
Name of organization:		
Organization type:	☐ Government ☐ Research/Academia ☐ NGO/CSO ☐ Private Sector ☐ International Organization ☐ Other	
Point of contact:		
List of participants:	**Name:**	**Designation:**
Date of assessment:		

Capacity Scoresheet				
Domain	**Sub-domain**	**Score (1-4)**	**Rationale for provided score (supported by evidence, if available)**	**Possible strategies and action steps for achieving a higher score (where appropriate)**
Goals and strategy	**Mission/mandate**			
	Strategic planning			
	Leadership quality			
	Funding model			

Capacity Scoresheet				
Domain	**Sub-domain**	**Score (1-4)**	**Rationale for provided score (supported by evidence, if available)**	**Possible strategies and action steps for achieving a higher score (where appropriate)**
	Gender and social inclusion			
Systems and infrastructure	**Organizational structure**			
	Interfunctional coordination			
	Monitoring & evaluation			

Capacity Scoresheet				
Domain	**Sub-domain**	**Score (1-4)**	**Rationale for provided score (supported by evidence, if available)**	**Possible strategies and action steps for achieving a higher score (where appropriate)**
	Knowledge management			
	External communication			
	Information and communication technology			
	Financial operations management			

Capacity Scoresheet				
Domain	**Sub-domain**	**Score (1-4)**	**Rationale for provided score (supported by evidence, if available)**	**Possible strategies and action steps for achieving a higher score (where appropriate)**
Human resources	**Staffing levels**			
	Knowledge and expertise on climate change			
	Technical skills on M&E			
	Access to capacity building			

Capacity Scoresheet				
Domain	**Sub-domain**	**Score (1-4)**	**Rationale for provided score (supported by evidence, if available)**	**Possible strategies and action steps for achieving a higher score (where appropriate)**
Organizational assets	**Understanding of issue, context and role of relevant stakeholders**			
	Partnerships/network development and fostering			
	National presence and engagement			
	Policy influence			

Capacity Scoresheet				
Domain	**Sub-domain**	**Score (1-4)**	**Rationale for provided score (supported by evidence, if available)**	**Possible strategies and action steps for achieving a higher score (where appropriate)**
Aggregate Score				