

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE (GCC) INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

FACILITATOR’S GUIDE

Revised: July 8, 2016

Version 1.0

Contents

[Introduction 3](#_Toc455756591)

[What is the Global Climate Change (GCC) Institutional Capacity Assessment? 3](#_Toc455756592)

[How is the GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment Used? 3](#_Toc455756593)

[Capacity Areas Included in the GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment 5](#_Toc455756594)

[Cover Sheet for the Assessment 6](#_Toc455756595)

[Pre-Assessment Discussion 7](#_Toc455756596)

[Instructions for the Assessment 7](#_Toc455756597)

[Section 1: Governance 9](#_Toc455756598)

[Sub-section 1.1: Mandate/Mission 9](#_Toc455756599)

[Sub-section 1.2: Leadership and Organizational Structure 12](#_Toc455756600)

[Section 2: Information, Data and Analysis 14](#_Toc455756601)

[Section 3: Strategic Planning 17](#_Toc455756602)

[Section 4: Resources 20](#_Toc455756603)

[Section 5: Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Management 23](#_Toc455756604)

[Sub-section 5.1: Design and Implementation 23](#_Toc455756605)

[Sub-section 5.2: Monitoring and Evaluation 26](#_Toc455756606)

[Sub-section 5.3: Knowledge Management 29](#_Toc455756607)

[GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment Score Sheet 31](#_Toc455756608)

[Annex 1: Supporting Documentation Checklist 32](#_Toc455756609)

[Annex 2: Illustrative Application of the Tool 34](#_Toc455756610)

# Introduction

*The GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment, which is informed by USAID’s Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA), was developed to measure the effectiveness of USAID’s climate change capacity building efforts at the institutional/organizational level. Unlike the OCA, which emphasizes self-assessment, the GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment emphasizes a joint external-internal assessment of climate change integration into the structure and fabric of organizations that are important for moving a country’s or sector’s climate change agenda forward.*

## What is the Global Climate Change (GCC) Institutional Capacity Assessment?

Building institutional capacity to address climate change is recognized as an important result across USAID’s climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts.[[1]](#footnote-1) The GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment is a structured tool for **assessing an organization’s or institution’s capacity to address climate change issues.** It can be used as a baseline assessment tool to inform assistance and enable an evaluation of impact at a later date. It can also be used – in full or in part – as a performance monitoring tool to document progress.

The tool can facilitate monitoring and reporting on standard indicators related to institutional capacity to address climate change: EG11-2 (adaptation), EG12-2 (clean energy), EG13-2 (sustainable landscapes). Actions undertaken by the organization *that are the result of* the increased capacity (and may also be used to signify the change in capacity) may additionally be captured under other GCC standard or custom indicators.[[2]](#footnote-2) As an example, if assistance enables a governmental organization to draft and adopt a climate change policy, this may be captured under the enabling environment standard indicator (laws, policies, regulations, standards).[[3]](#footnote-3) If assistance enables a non-governmental organization to install solar panels thereby replacing diesel, this may be captured under the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions avoided standard indicator.

## How is the GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment Used?

The tool is designed to measure the progress of formal organizations, including government ministries, non-governmental organizations (NGO), and civil society organizations (CSO) at the regional, national or sub-national level. It is not designed for informal groups, such as village development committees (VDC). Tools being developed at that level include the Community Performance Index (CPI), which was developed by Pact with support from USAID. CPI could be modified to be specific to climate change capabilities.

The assessment is facilitated by individuals outside the organization (USAID staff or other partners) but relies on members of the organization for insight and information. The facilitators should take care to define and explain the objectives and content of the assessment in advance so that the organization can adequately prepare. The assessment can either be conducted with a single set of participants for all sections or different participants for the various sections. The first page of every section lists suggestions for participants playing relevant functions in the organization. If possible, the assessment should be held at the offices of the partner organization so that additional staff can be brought in to answer specific questions if needed and additional supporting documentation can be obtained quickly. A supporting documentation checklist is provided in Annex I.

During the facilitated session, the facilitators should begin by asking for objective data relevant to the area at hand, encouraging the partner organization participants to consider that information before they start to interpret it and ascribe scores. The facilitators guide the process, helping the participants understand the characteristics of different levels of capacity so they can assess their strengths and weaknesses related to addressing climate change. Then, with the facilitator, they reach a consensus on scores on a scale of one to four, with four representing the highest capacity in the tool. The score should be based on the consensus scores, rather than averages of the scores of each individual. It is the responsibility of the facilitator(s) to verify evidence for a given score - both that it exists and that it is of high quality. If evidence does not back up the organization’s selected score, it is the responsibility of the facilitator(s) to suggest that a different score better reflects the current reality. Evidence collected through this process can enable an independent review of the organization’s capacity (e.g., an external evaluation).

The facilitator’s guide includes representative questions in each section and sub-section meant to facilitate scoring. These questions and related discussion should be tailored to the organization being assessed and the intended outcomes and impacts of the institutional capacity building efforts. This means that the facilitator(s) also needs to prepare in advance of the facilitated session. More detail on tailoring the tool can be found in the “Capacity Areas Included in the GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment” section below.

It is useful for one or more USAID mission staff to be on the team of facilitators so they can gain a better understanding of their partners and deepen their relationships with them. Include Agreement Officer Representatives (AORs) or Contract Officer Representatives (CORs), or Activity Managers and a representative of the Implementing Partner (IP) organization, where appropriate. Ideally there should be two facilitators for each section of the assessment, as one will need to take notes. The number of participants in a session should outnumber the facilitators. It may be desirable for different individuals to facilitate certain sections, depending on expertise. Whether the facilitators are USAID staff or other partners, the facilitators will need to be sensitive to how USAID is perceived by the organization. Although perceptions will vary, USAID will still be viewed as a current and future donor. Consequently, it may be challenging to get organizations to be open about their weaknesses, especially during their first assessment.

Characteristics of a good facilitator include the ability to 1) listen attentively and non-judgmentally, 2) understand what is being said as well as non-verbal cues, 3) encourage broad participation in the discussions, 4) gently guide the discussion back on track if it veers off course, 5) sense whether participants do not understand something, 6) decide whether guiding questions from the facilitator’s guide need to be used or adapted, 7) think quickly and formulate additional probing questions to follow up on what has been said, 8) tactfully challenge participants to rethink if their responses are contradictory or not supported by the evidence.

Action planning can be an important part of the process. The action plan should be directly tied to the shared climate change goals and objectives between USAID and the organization. Many donors have found that capacity development activities are more likely to bring about sustainable change if the client organizations have strong ownership of the action plans.[[4]](#footnote-4) Consequently, the partner organization is critical for identifying its weaknesses and opportunities and setting the priorities for addressing them. For each of the identified areas for improvement, an action plan can designate next steps, a lead and other staff responsible for overseeing each priority item, a timeline for capacity development activities, resource requirements, and possible sources of technical assistance. The action plans may help USAID plan its technical assistance.

## Capacity Areas Included in the GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment

The GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment addresses five areas of organizational capacity to address climate change (see Table 1). Two of the areas are divided into sub-areas. USAID recommends reviewing all the sections before the assessment, though not all sections need to be used.

**Table 1: Five areas of institutional capacity included in the assessment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Factors** |
| Governance | * Mandate or mission to address climate change * Commitment of leadership or organizational ownership to address climate change (e.g., senior person is assigned/empowered, unit charged with addressing climate change, coordinating bodies in place) * Climate change is explicitly incorporated in the organizational structure |
| Information, Data and Analysis | * Access to information, data and analysis * Quality of information, data and analysis * Capacity to monitor, generate and use * Routine monitoring, generation and use |
| Planning | * Processes, procedures, tools in place to integrate climate change into planning * Relevant stakeholders (internal and external) involved with integrating climate change into planning process * Current plans and strategies integrate climate change |
| Resources | * Budget for addressing climate change issues * Human resources – adequate numbers of trained staff assigned to address climate issues * Infrastructure (hardware, software, etc.) |
| Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Management | * Planned climate change actions implemented * Climate change services/goods provided * Targeted stakeholders/constituents benefitting * Climate change actions monitored, feedback from stakeholders solicited, open reporting on results of implementation * Performance of services and programs is evaluated * System in place disseminating information on and improving strategies, implementation, services and programs |

To tailor the assessment for the organization, in preparation for the assessment, USAID should reflect upon why improving the climate change capacity of this organization is critical to achieve USAID’s and the country’s climate change and development goals and objectives. The facilitator should revisit the relevant goals and objectives of the program, project or activity that is relevant to the organization. Sources of information may additionally include the contract/agreement, activity work plans, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans. Organizations will vary in their different capacity needs/priorities depending on their role. For instance, there could be a greater focus on adaptation compared to mitigation; also the focus might be on a particular function or section of the organization. If any organizational assessments were undertaken or referenced in deciding to work with this organization, those should also be gathered and reviewed in preparation for the assessment. **A clear picture on the role of the organization in achieving broader climate change and development goals and objectives and evidence of its potential contribution will help** **(1) determine the sections and sub-sections of assessment that are relevant to the organization, (2) determine which departments or staff of the organizations should be involved in the assessment, and (3) determine the focus of the facilitator’s questions**. If there is uncertainty on if a section or sub-section should be included as part of the assessment, it is suggested that it be included.

# Cover Sheet for the Assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of Organization** |  |
| **Date of Assessment** |  |
| **Dates of Previous GCC Assessments** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Names and Positions of Participants from Organization** | **Names and Positions of External Facilitators** |
| **Section 1: Governance** |  |  |
| **Section 2: Information, Data and Analysis** |  |  |
| **Section 3: Planning** |  |  |
| **Section 4: Resources** |  |  |
| **Section 5: Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, Knowledge Management** |  |  |

## Pre-Assessment Discussion

Before conducting the assessment, discuss with the organization the shared (USAID and organization) climate change and development goals and objectives and the role of the organization in achieving those goals and objectives. This may include a discussion of the expected results within the year and by the end of the project. It may be helpful to review and discuss, and potentially document if not documented already, the following:

1. Goals and objectives of the USAID-funded project (relevant to the organization) and the reasons the organization is critical/important to achieving those goals and objectives.
2. Why/how this project is important to the organization (in other words, how the project is relevant to the organization’s and/or country’s climate change agenda).
3. Intended current-year and end-of-project results (relevant to the organization) and the role of the organization in achieving results. These can be results the organization is fully or partially responsible for achieving, acknowledging where the organization’s success may be dependent on others.

Once this discussion has occurred, the facilitators and organization should review the tool and agree on which sections and sub-sections are relevant to the assessment. For instance, if the activity is working with the organization for the purposes of providing climate services in the agriculture sector, the capacity should be assessed based on that purpose and the sections used and discussion when administering the tool should be tailored accordingly.

## Instructions for the Assessment

**Composition of the Teams:**  The assessment can either be conducted with a single set of participants for all sections or with different participants for the various sections. The first page of every section lists suggestions for participants playing relevant functions. Relying on a single set of participants can increase communications and learning across organizational divisions. However, if separate teams work on different sections simultaneously, the assessment can be done more quickly and with less total staff time.

**Supporting documentation:** The introduction to each section and sub-section lists illustrative supporting documentation that can serve as evidence for assessing capacity and assigning scores. Cite the supporting documentation used in the Notes section. A supporting documentation checklist is included as Annex 1.

**Identifying the Questions**: The tables within each section and sub-section describe characteristics that are considered low (1), basic (2), moderate (3), and strong (4) capacity. The questions underneath each table are aligned to the characteristics and are meant to seed the discussion to facilitate scoring. The questions are illustrative and should be narrowed and tailored to the organization and intended outcomes and impacts of building the organizations capacity.

**Score Sheet:** A score sheet is included at the end of the facilitator’s guide. An example of how to display results across multiple years of applying the tool is shown in Annex 2.

**Using the tool to score:**

1. Start with a discussion around the broader points in the section and sub-section objectives.
2. Use the questions underneath each table to facilitate scoring:
   1. The questions should be narrowed and tailored depending on the organization and situation
   2. Questions that are not relevant for the organization or have already been covered in the general discussion can be skipped
   3. Facilitators should use their judgment in deciding what questions are needed to enable the organization to make a sound assessment
   4. Facilitator’s questions should be woven skilfully into a conversation; they should not be read aloud verbatim
3. Decide, by consensus, which score best represents the organization. Not all the characteristics may be applicable. Base the scoring on the applicable characteristics only. If the organization merits different capacity levels for different characteristics, choose where these attributes cluster most. This is more often than not a subjective judgement.
4. Note reasons and/or identify supporting documentation for the score in the Notes section.
5. Record the score in the score sheet. The score sheet shows how to determine the overall score.
6. Use the tool to set the baseline capacity then repeat annually or bi-annually to assess the change in capacity. Annex 2 provides an illustrative application of the tool.

# Section 1: Governance

**Section Objectives:** Review the organization’s mandate or mission to address climate change, review commitment of leadership or organizational ownership to address climate change (e.g., senior person is assigned/empowered, unit charged with addressing climate change, coordinating bodies in place), and review if climate change is explicitly incorporated in the organizational structure.

**Potential Participants**: Chief executive (director), board chair or representative, senior managers, legal counsel for the organization (in-house or external), chief financial officer

## Sub-section 1.1: Mandate/Mission

**Sub-section Objective:** To assess if the organization has a mandate or mission to address climate change

**Illustrative Supporting Documentation:** Vision statement, mission statement, documentation on mandate

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **1.1**  **Mandate / Mission** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| The organization does not have a clearly stated mandate (governmental) or mission, policy or vision statement (governmental or non-governmental) requiring or exhorting the organization to address climate change.  The climate change mandate or mission is not known or well-accepted by relevant stakeholders (internal and external).  The mandate or mission, policy or vision statement does include addressing climate change, but it is not considered in decisions on priorities and actions. | The organization has a formally or informally articulated mandate or mission to address climate change, but it lacks specificity or clarity or is in conflict with the organization’s overall mission.  The climate change mandate or mission are not widely known or accepted by relevant stakeholders (internal and external).  The mandate or mission is only occassionally used to set priorities and guide actions. | The organization has formally received a mandate or articulated a mission to address climate change that is reasonably clear, consistent with the organization’s overall mission.  The climate change mandate or mission are fairly well known and accepted by relevant stakeholders (internal and external).  The mandate or mission are usually considered in setting priorities and guiding actions. | The organization has formally received a mandate or articulated a mission to address climate change that is clear and furthers the organization’s overall mission.  The climate change mandate or mission are well known and accepted by relevant stakeholders (internal and external).  The mandate or mission are consistently considered in setting priorities and guiding actions. |

| **Questions for Discussion (as appropriate)** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Is there a permanent mandate (laws, by-laws) with regard to climate change? Temporary mandate (political/Board leadership priority)? Is there a written mission or policy statement on addressing climate change? Is there an articulated vision or leadership statement on addressing climate change? |  |
| 2. When is the last time the mandate/mission was revised? Is it revisited on a reoccurring basis? What is the process for revising the mandate/mission? If it was changed recently, in what ways did it change? |  |
| 3. What are the primary objectives of the mandate/policy with regard to how the organization will address climate change? |  |
| 4. How is the climate change mandate/policy consistent with the overall mandate or mission of the organization? How does it, or the individual objectives of the policy, conflict with the overall mandate or mission of the organization? |  |
| 5. To what extent does leadership own the climate change mandate or mission? What examples come to mind? |  |
| 6. To what extent does staff know about the climate change mandate/policy? To what extent do they support it? How were they involved in developing it? To what extent is the mandate externally imposed? To what extent is it internally supported or resisted? On what do you base your assessment of the extent of internal support or resistance? |  |
| 7. Is there a mechanism to foster compliance with the climate change mandate/mission? How well is the mechanism enforced? |  |
| 8. To what extent is the climate change mandate/mission known to and respected by relevant external stakeholders (e.g., other relevant organizations, beneficiaries)? Which external stakeholders were involved in defining the mandate, mission or policy? How were these stakeholders identified? How did these external stakeholders participate in defining it? Has their support—or lack thereof—benefitted or hurt the organization’s work on climate change? |  |
| 9. To what extent does the climate change mandate/mission overlap with other organizations’ mandates/missions, therefore confusing or duplicating efforts? How does the organization coordinate with organizations with similar climate change mandates/missions? Is there a formal mechanism for coordination? If so, what is it? |  |
| 10. To what extent is the climate change mandate/policy considered by the organization when setting priorities and taking actions? Can you please provide some examples of when and how the organization considered climate change in setting its priorities and taking action? |  |

## Sub-section 1.2: Leadership and Organizational Structure

**Sub-section Objective:** To assess if the organizational structure supports the mandate or policy of addressing climate change. To assess if there is a person in the organization’s leadership accountable for ensuring climate change is addressed.

**Illustrative Supporting Documentation:** Organizational chart (organogram), documentation on how roles and responsibilities are defined within the organization

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **1.2**  **Leadership and Organizational Structure** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| The organization does not have a formal organizational structure to address climate change.  Roles and responsibilities of departments, functions, and lines of authority for defining the organization’s climate change policies are not established.  Coordination when defining the organization’s climate change goals and objectives across departments or key functions does not take place or is rare. | There is a documented organizational structure, but it is inadequate for leading and executing the climate change mandate, mission or policy (or it is not being followed).  Roles and responsibilities of departments, functions, and lines of authority for defining the organization’s climate change policies are not clear.  Coordination when defining the organization’s climate change goals and objectives across departments or key functions is weak. | There is a documented organizational structure that is adequate for leading and executing the climate change mandate, mission or policy.  Roles and responsibilities of leadership, departments or functions, and lines of authority for defining the organization’s climate change policies are defined and adequate.  Coordination when defining the organization’s climate change goals and objectives across departments or key functions is adequate. | There is a documented organizational structure that enables leadership and execution of the climate change mandate, mission, or policy.  Roles and responsibilities of leadership, departments or functions, and lines of authority for defining the organization’s climate change policies are defined and effective.  Coordination when defining the organization’s climate change goals and objectives across departments or key functions is strong. |

| **Questions for Discussion (as appropriate)** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Who on the leadership team is accountable for guiding the climate change mandate, mission or policy? Is there sufficient climate change expertise at a leadership level? Is one person responsible for climate change? Is it their sole responsibility (or one of their many responsibilities)? Is there a documented organizational structure for defining climate change policy? Please describe, attach or draft a chart. |  |
| 2. When was the organizational structure last revised with regard to climate change goals and objectives? What prompted the organization to revise it? If it has changed recently, what ways did it change? |  |
| 3. To what extent is the organizational structure conducive for exercising leadership on the climate change objectives? |  |
| 4. To what extent are climate change-related departmental or functional responsibilities and lines of authority clear and appropriate? What works well? What encourages decisive leadership on climate change? |  |
| 5. What mechanisms exist for communication and coordination across relevant parts of the organization for climate change? How well do these mechanisms work? In what ways has the organization collaborated internally across units on setting climate change goals and priorities? |  |

# Section 2: Information, Data and Analysis

**Section Objectives:** Review the organization’s access to and quality of climate change information, data and analysis[[5]](#footnote-5); review the capacity to and occurrence of monitoring, generation and use of climate change information, data and analysis[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Potential Participants**: Senior managers; staff involved in monitoring, generating or using climate change information, data and analysis

**Illustrative Supporting Documentation:** Reviews or assessments of the organization’s climate change information, data and analysis; guidance or policies for acquiring, assessing the quality of, generating, and/or using climate change information, data and analysis; examples of data or analysis produced by the organization

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **2**  **Information, Data and Analysis** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| There is no or very limited access to climate information, data and analysis.  Available climate information, data and analysis, either produced internally or accessed externally, is poor quality, and/or is not considered trustworthy.  Data is not archived.  There are no or limited staff knowledgable about the appropriate use of climate information, data and analysis; there are no or limited systems and procedures for monitoring, generating, and using climate information, data and analysis; there are no or limited resources (budget, staff) for the monitoring, generation, and use of climate information, data and analysis  Climate information, data and analysis is never or rarely monitored for quality, generated by the organization, or used for decision-making. | Access to climate information, data and analysis is on an ad hoc basis. It exists but is in paper format or otherwise.  Basic climate information, data and analysis are produced or available, but rarely at the spatial or temporal scale needed for decision-making.  Data is archived but not widely available.  Staff is knowledgable about the appropriate use of climate information, data and analysis, but not in sufficient numbers or not sufficiently knowledgable; there are systems and procedures in place for monitoring, generating and using climate information, data and analysis but they are low quality; resources (budget, staff) for the monitoring, generation and use of climate information, data and analysis are not sufficient.  Climate information, data and analysis is occasionally monitored, generated or used for decision-making. | There is occasional access to climate information, data and analysis but access is not sustainable (e.g., cost, no SOP in place). Only portions are available electronically.  The climate information, data and analysis are of moderate quality and are often at the spatial and temporal scale to support decision-making.  Data is archived and accessible to climate change professionals.  Sufficient numbers of staff have a moderate understanding of the appropriate use of climate information, data and analysis; the systems and procedures are in place for monitoring, generating and using climate information, data and analysis are of moderate quality; modest resources are made available.  Climate information, data and analysis is adequately monitored, generated or used for decision-making. | There is suffiicent access to climate information, data and analysis. It is available electronically.  The climate information, data and analysis is considered “state of the art” and at a sufficient spatial and temporal scale to support decision-making.  Data is archived and accessible to all.  Sufficient numbers of staff have a strong understanding of the appropriate use of climate information, data and analysis; high quality systems and procedures are in place; sufficient resources (budget, staff) are available.  Climate information, data and analysis is effectively monitored, generated or used for decision-making. |

| **Questions for Discussion (as appropriate)** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Are efforts made to prioritize needed climate information, data and analysis? How well does the prioritization match with stated climate change goals and objectives of the organization? |  |
| 2. From where does the organization access climate information, data and analysis? Is it available from more than one source? How long has the organization used these sources? How reliable are the sources? |  |
| 3. What is the geographic and temporal scale of the available climate information, data and analysis (either produced internally or accessed externally)? What sectors within the organization use the climate change information, data and analysis? How well does the available climate information, data and analysis inform decision-making? Is decision-making based on scenario planning? |  |
| 4. Is there a system (procedures, infrastructure, resources) in place to collect and monitor appropriate climate data, information and analysis? Has this system changed recently? Is it regularly revisited? Is there a quality control mechanism? How well is it followed? |  |
| 5. How well does relevant staff understand climate information, data and analysis? Who are the relevant staff? How well does leadership understand climate change information, data and analysis? |  |
| 6. Does the organization generate climate data, information or analysis? For what purpose? How were the purposes chosen? Does the generated climate data, information or analysis satisfy stated purposes? How is the quality monitored? |  |
| 7. How is historic data archived? How useable is the format? Who has access to it? |  |

# Section 3: Strategic Planning

**Section Objectives:** Review the organization’s processes, procedures, and tools to integrate climate change into planning; review if relevant stakeholders (internal and external) are involved in integrating climate change into planning, review if current plans and strategies integrate climate change

**Important Participants**: Senior managers; staff involved in (responsible for and/or otherwise involved) strategic planning

**Supporting Documentation:** Strategic plans, annual reports, program reports, surveys or interviews of staff, donors, and clients

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **3**  **Strategic Planning** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| A climate change plan or a general plan with climate change objectives does not exist.  Or, a climate change plan exists but is dismissed by stakeholders. Reasons may include:   * Exists, but climate change objectives conflict with organization’s broader mission/mandate * Uses dated or inadequate climate information, data, and analysis or uses information inappropriately * Does not identify resources to address climate change * Does not reflect stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Does not appropriately incorporate gender and cultural considerations related to climate change * Does not identify climate change priorities or lacks measurable climate change objectives and targets * Plan or climate change content within plan not regularly reviewed based on information and learning * Not regularly reviewed based on appropriate climate information, data and analysis * Climate change plan or portion of plan not used for management decisions or operational planning | A climate change plan or a general plan with climate change objectives exists and includes **more than three** of the following attributes:   * Climate change is extensively incorporated (eg, in problem analysis, objectives, metrics) * Reflects the organization’s vision, mission, and values related to climate change * Problem analysis, objectives and approaches are based on sound analysis of climate change risks and opportunities * Includes realistic resource requirements to implement climate change objectives * Identifies adequate resources to implement climate change objectives * Integrates win-win climate change adaptation/mitigation objectives[[7]](#footnote-7) into broader organizational objectives * Reflects stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Appropriately incorporates gender and cultural considerations related to climate change * Includes clear and specific climate change priorities, measurable objectives/targets * Plan is regularly reviewed based on information, learning, and appropriate climate information, data and analysis * Consisently used for management decisions or operational planning for climate change | A climate change plan or a general plan with climate change objectives exists and includes **more than five** of the following attributes:   * Climate change is extensively incorporated (eg, in problem analysis, objectives, metrics) * Reflects the organization’s vision, mission, and values related to climate change * Problem analysis, objectives and approaches are based on sound analysis of climate change risks and opportunities * Includes realistic resource requirements to implement climate change objectives * Identifies adequate resources to implement climate change objectives * Integrates win-win climate change adaptation/mitigation objectives into broader organizational objectives * Reflects stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Appropriately incorporates gender and cultural considerations related to climate change * Includes clear and specific climate change priorities, measurable objectives/targets * Plan is regularly reviewed based on information, learning, and appropriate climate information, data and analysis * Consisently used for management decisions or operational planning for climate change | A climate change plan or a general plan with climate change objectives exists and includes **more than seven** of the following attributes:   * Climate change is extensively incorporated (eg, in problem analysis, objectives, metrics) * Reflects the organization’s vision, mission, and values related to climate change * Problem analysis, objectives, approaches and approaches are based on sound analysis of climate change risks and opportunities * Identifies adequate resources to implement climate change objectives * Includes realistic resource requirements to implement climate change objectives * Integrates win-win climate change adaptation/mitigation objectives into broader organizational objectives * Reflects stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Appropriately incorporates gender and cultural considerations related to climate change * Includes clear and specific climate change priorities, measurable objectives and targets * Plan is regularly reviewed based on information, learning, and appropriate climate information, data and analysis * Consistently used for management decisions or operational planning for climate change |

| **Questions for Discussion (as appropriate)** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Does the organization have a written plan to implement its climate change mission or objectives? Is it publicly available? When was it last written/revised? What time period does it cover? To what extent are the climate change objectives congruent with the organization’s broader mission/mandate? |  |
| 2. How well does the strategic plan address climate change risks, challenges and opportunities? What are the climate change goals and objectives? To what extent are these informed by the challenges and opportunities? By what method were the climate change goals and objectives prioritized? |  |
| 3. To what extent is the climate change plan informed by quality climate information, data, and analysis? To what extent is it based on best practice? What sources of evidence were used? Is there a mechanism to update the plan based on the latest knowledge and information? How well is the mechanism followed? |  |
| 4. Does the plan include resource requirements? How realistic are these requirements given available resources and other constraints? To what extent will identified resources be sufficient to accomplish stated climate change goals and objectives? |  |
| 5. Who are the stakeholders and how were they selected? How were stakeholders (counterparts, beneficiaries) consulted as this plan was written? How are their climate change priorities documented and incorporated? How well are gender and cultural considerations related to climate change incorporated? |  |
| 6. To what extent is the plan—and its climate change objectives - used in guiding management decisions and operational planning? Can you give some examples? |  |

# Section 4: Resources

**Section Objectives:** Review the organization’s budget for addressing climate change issues, whether adequate numbers of trained staff—at leadership, management and technical levels--are addressing climate change issues, and infrastructure (hardware, software, etc.) for addressing climate change issues

**Potential Important Participants**: Senior managers; human resources director and staff; financial staff; IT manager; staff responsible for addressing climate change issues

**Illustrative Supporting Documentation:** Human resources policy and manual; sample position descriptions; recruitment guidelines or policy; staff and consultant resumes; organization chart; senior manager and staff interviews or questionnaires

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **4**  **Resources** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Human:   * Key climate change-related positions have not been established, remain vacant, or are filled by people without appropriate skills * The staffing plan does not exist or is not well aligned or does not facilitate the achievement of climate change goals and priorities   Financial:   * There is currently inadequate financial resources to achieve climate change priorities and objectives * Future year budgets are inadequate for achieving climate change priorities and objectives * Funding sources for climate change are unstable or unreliable   Infrastructure:   * Infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) needs for achieving climate change priorities and objectives have been inadequately assessed or planned * Current infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) is inadequate for addressing climate change priorities and objectives * Planned infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) is inadequate for addressing climate change priorities and objectives | Human:   * Key climate change-related positions have been established, some have been filled by people with appropriate skills * The staffing plan is minimally aligned to climate change goals and objectives   Financial:   * There is currently minimal financial resources to achieve climate change priorities and objectives * Future year budgets can minimally achieve climate change priorities and objectives * Funding sources for climate change are occasionally stable and reliable   Infrastructure:   * Infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) needs for achieving climate change priorities and objectives have been minimally assessed and planned * Current infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) can minimally support achieving climate change priorities and objectives * Planned infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) can minimally support achieving climate change priorities and objectives | Human:   * Key climate change-related positions have been established and funded, most are filled by people with appropriate skills * The staffing plan is moderately aligned to climate change goals and objectives   Financial:   * There is currently modest financial resources to achieve climate change priorities and objectives * Future year budgets can moderately achieve climate change priorities and objectives * Funding sources for climate change are generally stable and reliable   Infrastructure:   * Infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) needs for achieving climate change priorities and objectives have been moderately assessed and planned * Current infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) can moderately support achieving climate change priorities and objectives * Planned infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) can moderately support achieving climate change priorities and objectives | Human:   * All key climate change-related positions have been established and filled with candidates with appropriate skills * The staffing plan is well aligned to climate change goals and objectives   Financial:   * There is currently adequate financial resources to achieve climate change priorities and objectives * Future year budgets can achieve climate change priorities and objectives * Funding sources for climate change are stable and reliable   Infrastructure:   * Infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) needs for achieving climate change priorities and objectives have been adequately assessed and planned * Current infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) can fully support climate change priorities and objectives * Planned infrastructure (e.g., hardware, software) can fully support climate change priorities and objectives |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Discussion (as appropriate)** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| 1. Who are the current staff responsible for climate change? How well do their skills align with the climate change priorities and objectives? |  |
| 2. Are key management and technical positions related to climate change filled with people with the appropriate qualifications and skills? Are there positions that have yet to be established or filled? |  |
| 3. How extensively does the organization work with targeted beneficiaries? |  |
| 4. How does the budget (current year, future years) align with climate change goals and objectives? Is there a dedicated budget for climate change goals and objectives? Are transparent criteria applied when allocating climate change resources? What are they? |  |
| 5. In the past, have financial resources been sufficient to achieve climate change priorities and objectives? Are they currently? What has changed? What are the sources of funding? To what extent are the financial resources to address climate change stable and reliable? |  |
| 6. Have infrastructure (e.g. software, hardware) needs been assessed with regard to achieving climate change priorities and objectives? When was the last time infrastructure needs for implementing climate change objectives assessed? |  |
| 7. To what extent are infrastructure needs for implementing climate change objectives currently being met? If they are not adequately met, is a plan in place to obtain sufficient infrastructure? |  |

# Section 5: Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Management

**Section Objectives:** Review if planned climate change actions are implemented, climate services/goods are provided and targeted stakeholders/constituents are benefitting; review if climate change actions are monitored, feedback from stakeholders is solicited and results of implementation are transparently reported; review if a system is in place for improving implementation of climate change actions

**Potential Participants**: Executive director, program managers and staff; key stakeholders; managers and staff responsible for monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management

## Sub-section 5.1: Design and Implementation

**Sub-section Objectives:** Assess if planned climate change actions are implemented, climate services/goods are provided and targeted stakeholders/constituents are benefitting

**Illustrative Supporting Documentation:** Annual program and project workplans; reviews of workplan progress; quarterly and annual progress reports; questionnaires and interviews of senior managers and implementation staff

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **5.1**  **Design and Implementation** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Services and programs:   * Do not address climate change risks and opportunities (as identified in the strategic plan) * Are not adequately informed by climate information, data and analysis * Are not based on best practices for climate change adaptation and/or mitigation * Do not adequately address climate change objectives and priorities * Do not adequately address stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Do not address gender barriers and issues as related to climate change * Do not address cultural barriers and issues as related to climate change * Are not achieving clear and measurable climate change adaptation or mitigation results | Services and programs:   * Minimally address climate change risks and opportunities (as identified in the strategic plan) * Are minimally informed by adequate climate information, data and analysis * Are minimally based on best practices for climate change adaptation and/or mitigation * Minimally or indirectly address climate change objectives and priorities * Minimally or occasionally address stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Minimally address gender barriers and issues as related to climate change * Minimally address cultural barriers and issues as related to climate change * Are making clear and modest progress on climate change results | Services and programs:   * Moderately address climate change risks and opportunities (as identified in the strategic plan) * Are moderately informed by adequate climate information, data and analysis * Are generally based on best practices for climate change adaptation and/or mitigation * Moderately address climate change objectives and priorities * Moderately address stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Moderately address gender barriers and issues as related to climate change * Moderately address cultural barriers and other issues as related to climate change adaptation or mitigation goals * Are achieving tangible climate change adaptation or mitigation results | Services and programs:   * Effectively address climate change risks (as identified in the strategic plan) * Are well informed by adequate and appropriate climate information, data and analysis * Are consistently based on best practices for climate change adaptation and/or mitigation * Effectively address climate change objectives and priorities * Effectively address stakeholders’ climate change priorities * Effectively address gender barriers and issues as related to climate change * Effectively address cultural barriers and issues as related to climate change adaptation or mitigation goals * Are achieving climate change adaptation or mitigation results that are significant, sustainable and/or systemic |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Discussion (as appropriate)** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| 1. What are the climate change services and programs provided by the organization? How well do climate change services and programs align to climate change risks and opportunities identified in the strategic plan? To what extent do services and programs align with the priorities from the strategic plan? To what extent are they clearly making progress against the objectives laid out in the plan? |  |
| 2. To what extent are services and programs based on adequate and appropriate climate information, data and analysis? To what extent are they based on best practices for climate change adaptation and/or mitigation? Is there a transparent process for prioritizing services and programs? Describe the process. |  |
| 3. To what extent do services and programs address stakeholders’ climate change needs and priorities? How were these stakeholders identified and consulted? How well do they address gender and cultural barriers as related to climate change? |  |
| 4. Are clear timelines, responsibilities, and resources assigned for the climate change services and programs? |  |
| 5. To what extent do services and programs achieve clear and measurable climate change adaptation and mitigation results? What are examples of the results? What are some examples? |  |

## Sub-section 5.2: Monitoring and Evaluation

**Sub-section Objectives:** Assess if climate change actions are monitored, feedback from stakeholders is solicited and results of implementation are transparently reported; assess if performance of services and programs is evaluated

**Illustrative Supporting Documentation:** Monitoring plans, tools, and internal reports; project and program evaluation plans, evaluation tools, evaluation reports; senior manager and staff questionnaires or interviews; reports and presentations on lessons learned

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **5.2**  **Monitoring and Evaluation** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Monitoring   * Substantial difficulty setting meaningful climate change performance indicators that align to goals and objectives and realistic targets * Inadequate expertise in collection and analysis of climate change baseline and performance monitoring data * Climate change performance monitoring data are missing, unrealiable, or not timely * Seldom identifies differences between actual climate change results achieved and targets and related remediation measures and lesson learned * Does not transparently collect and report climate change related performance monitoring data to relevant stakeholders * Inadequately incorporates gender and culture considerations into climate change performance monitoring   Evaluation   * Lacks adequate expertise in climate change program evaluation * Very rarely conducts climate change program evaluations * Climate change program evaluations conducted are poor quality; evaluation findings and recommendaitons are often not appropriate * Climate change program evaluations conducted rarely incorporate relevant stakeholders and results are rarely openly disseminated * Rarely incorporates climate change program evaluation findings and recommendations in existing and new strategies and programming | Monitoring   * Difficulty setting meaningful climate change performance indicators that align to goals and objectives and realistic targets * Weak expertise in collection and analysis of climate change baseline and performance monitoring data * Climate change performance monitoring data are often not complete or timely * Occasionally identifies differences between actual climate change results achieved and targets and related remediation measures and lesson learned * Occasionally collects and reports climate change related performance monitoring data in a transparent manner to relevant stakeholders * Weakly incorporates gender and culture considerations into climate change performance monitoring   Evaluation   * Has minimal expertise in climate change program evaluation * Rarely conducts climate change program evaluations * Climate change program evaluations conducted are of minimal quality; evaluation findings and recommendations are sometimes appropriate * Climate change program evaluations conducted occassionally incorporate relevant stakeholders and results are occassionally openly disseminated * Occassionally incorporates climate change program evaluation findings and recommendaitons in existing and new strategies and programming | Monitoring   * Usually sets meaningful climate change performance indicators that align to goals and objectives and realistic targets * Moderate expertise in collection and analysis of climate change baseline and performance monitoring data * Climate change performance monitoring data that are reasonably complete and reliable, but may not be timely * Often identifies differences between actual climate change results achieved and targets and related remediation measures and lesson learned * Often collects and reports climate change related performance monitoring data in a transparent manner to relevant stakeholders * Moderately incorporates gender and culture considerations into climate change performance monitoring   Evaluation   * Has moderate expertise in climate change program evaluation * Occasionally conducts climate change program evaluations * Climate change program evaluations conducted are of moderate quality; evaluation findings and recommendations are often appropriate * Climate change program evaluations conducted often incorporate relevant stakeholders and results are often openly disseminated * Often incorporates climate change program evaluation findings and recommendaitons in existing and new strategies and programming | Monitoring   * Consistently sets meaningful climate change performance indicators that align to goals and objectives and realistic targets * Strong expertise in collection and analysis of climate change baseline and performance monitoring data * Climate change performance monitoring data are complete and reliable, and timely * Consistently identifies differences between actual climate change results achieved and targets and related remediation measures and lesson learned * Consistently collects and reports climate change related performance monitoring data in a transparent manner to relevant stakeholders * Gender and culture considerations are well incorporated into climate change performance monitoring   Evaluation   * Has strong expertise in climate change program evaluation * Conducts the appropriate number of climate change program evaluations * Climate change program evaluations conducted are of high quality; evaluation findings and recommendations are appropriate * Climate change program evaluations conducted consistenly incorporate relevant stakeholders and results are consistently openly disseminated * Climate change program evaluation findings and recommendaitons appropriately incorporated in existing and new strategies and programming |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions for Discussion (as appropriate)** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| 1. Describe how the organization monitors and evaluates climate change work and results. How often are projects monitored? Are the needs and satisfaction of customers of the organization’s climate change services and programs assessed? How and how often? How often are evaluations of programming undertaken? |  |
| 2. To what extent does the organization consistently set realistic targets for appropriately chosen climate change quantitative and qualitative indicators? Are the targets sets yearly? Can they be revised? What information is used to set and revise targets? What actions are taken if targets are not met? |  |
| 3. Does performance monitoring data clearly and accurately represent intended results? Is it measured consistently over time? Does it have sufficient precision and timeliness to inform management decisions? Are there safeguards to prevent transcription errors and data manipulation? |  |
| 4. Who are the staff assigned to climate change performance monitoring and evaluation? Is there sufficient expertise in climate change and in performance monitoring and evaluation? |  |
| 5. How well are gender and cultural considerations incorporated into climate change performance monitoring and evaluation? What are some examples of how this is done? |  |
| 6. How well is the organization doing with regards to its climate change priorities and objectives? What are some examples? Is this clearly documented? |  |
| 7. How has climate change performance monitoring and evaluation data and lessons learned informed current and future strategies and programming? Can you give some examples? |  |

## Sub-section 5.3: Knowledge Management

**Sub-section Objectives:** Assess if there is a system in place for disseminating information on and improving strategies, implementation, services and programs

**Illustrative Supporting Documentation:** Reports and presentations on best practices; documentation on collaboration with other organizations and networks and participation in public and private sector and donor dialogues; senior manager and staff questionnaires or interviews

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Low Capacity** | **Basic Capacity** | **Moderate Capacity** | **Strong Capacity** |
| **5.3**  **Knowledge Management** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| * Substantial difficulty in identifying best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming * No systematic approach to documenting, storing, and disseminating (internal and external) climate change knowledge and best practices * Best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming are not analyzed, shared, or applied through a regular process * Not joined or very rarely participates in climate change related knowledge sharing networks | * Difficulty in identifying best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming * Weak systems for documenting, storing, and disseminating (internal and external) climate change knowledge * Best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming are rarely analzyed, shared and applied through a regular process * Has joined but rarely participated in climate change related knowledge sharing networks | * Generally identifies best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming * Moderate systems for documenting, storing, and disseminating (internal and external) climate change program knowledge * Best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming occasionally analyzed, shared and applied through a regular process * Occasionally participates in climate change related knowledge sharing networks | * Effectively identifies best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming * Sufficient systems for documenting, storing, and disseminating (internal and external) climate change program knowledge * Best practices and lessons learned in climate change strategy and programming are effectlively analyzed, shared, and applied through a regular process * Frequently and routinely participate in climate change related knowledge sharing networks |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-section 5.3: Knowledge Management** | **Notes/Sources of Evidence** |
| 1. How does the organization identify good climate change practices? Is there a systematic or formal process in place? How does it work? When was that process put in place? How closely is the process followed? What are the most important sources of learning? |  |
| 2. What is the organization’s system for documenting, storing, and disseminating climate change knowledge? Is knowledge accessible internally and externally? How well do these systems work? How have the relevant stakeholders been mapped? Who are the users of this information? Do you have evidence of this use? |  |
| 3. To what extent does the organization have a regular internal process for sharing and thinking about good practices and lessons learned with regard to climate change? If so, how often is this done? |  |
| 4. To what extent does the organization participate in discussions with counterparts and beneficiaries on climate change approaches, lessons learned, and good practices? If so, how often? Have these discussions been mutually beneficial? Why or why not? |  |

# GCC Institutional Capacity Assessment Score Sheet

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Sub-Section** | **Scores: GCC Assess. #1** | **Scores: GCC Assess. #2** | **Scores: GCC Assess. #3** |
|  | **Date:** |  |  |  |
| 1. Governance | 1.1 Mandate/Mission |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Leadership and Organizational Structure |  |  |  |
| Average for Section 1 ***(line 1)*** |  |  |  |
| 2. Information, Data and Analysis ***(line 2)*** | |  |  |  |
| 3. Strategic Planning ***(line 3)*** | |  |  |  |
| 4. Resources ***(line 4)*** | |  |  |  |
| 5. Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Management | 5.1 Design and Implementation |  |  |  |
| 5.2 Monitoring and Evaluation |  |  |  |
| 5.3 Knowledge Management |  |  |  |
| Average for Section 5 ***(line 5)*** |  |  |  |
| **AVERAGE SCORE OVER 5 SECTIONS *(lines 1-5)*** | |  |  |  |

# Annex 1: Supporting Documentation Checklist

Below is illustrative list of supporting documentation for each section and sub-section.

**Note:** Not all of these documents will be relevant to a given organization and there may be documents not listed here that could and should be used as part of the assessment.

| **Section/Sub-section** | **Illustrative Supporting Documentation** | ✓ |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 Mandate/Mission (1. Governance) | Vision Statement |  |
| Mission Statement |  |
| Documentation on mandate |  |
| 1.2 Leadership and Organizational Structure (1. Governance) | Organizational chart |  |
| Documentation on how roles and responsibilities are defined within the organization |  |
| 2. Information, Data and Analysis | Reviews or assessments of the organization’s climate change information, data and analysis |  |
| Guidance or policies for acquiring, assessing the quality of, generating, and/or using climate change information, data and analysis |  |
| Examples of data or analysis produced by the organization |  |
| 3. Strategic Planning | Strategic plans |  |
| Annual reports |  |
| Program reports |  |
| Surveys or interviews of staff, donors and clients |  |
| 4. Resources | Human resources policy and manual |  |
| Sample position descriptions |  |
| Recruitment guidelines or policy |  |
| Staff and consultant resumes |  |
| Organization chart |  |
| Senior management and staff interviews or questionnaires |  |
| 5.1 Design and Implementation | Annual program and project workplans |  |
| Reviews of workplan progress |  |
| Quarterly and annual progress reports |  |
| Questionnaires and interviews of senior managers and implementation staff |  |
| 5.2 Monitoring and Evaluation | Monitoring plans, tools and internal reports |  |
| Project and program evaluation plans, tools and reports |  |
| Reports and presentations on lessons learned |  |
| Senior manager and staff questionnaires or interviews |  |
| 5.3 Knowledge Management | Reports and presentations on best practices |  |
| Documentation on collaboration with other organizations and networks and participation in public and private sector and donor dialogues |  |
| Senior manager and staff questionnaires or interviews |  |

# Annex 2: Illustrative Application of the Tool

Below is an example of the tool being used to assess the capacity of an institution to address climate change. The baseline was conducted on October 1, 2012. The institution was subsequently assessed on October 1, 2014 to measure the change from baseline. In this example, **the overall average capacity of the institution increased from 1.6 to 2.2 over the two year period.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Sub-Section** | **Scores: GCC Assess. #1** | **Scores: GCC Assess. #2** | **Scores: GCC Assess. #3** |
|  | **Date:** | **10/01/2012** | **10/01/2014** |  |
| 1. Governance | 1.1 Mandate/Mission | 1 | 1 |  |
| 1.2 Leadership and Organizational Structure | 1 | 1 |  |
| Average for Section 1 ***(line 1)*** | **1** | **1** |  |
| 2. Information, Data and Analysis ***(line 2)*** | | **2** | **3** |  |
| 3. Strategic Planning ***(line 3)*** | | **1** | **2** |  |
| 4. Resources ***(line 4)*** | | **3** | **3** |  |
| 5. Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Management | 5.1 Design and Implementation | 1 | 2 |  |
| 5.2 Monitoring and Evaluation | 1 | 1 |  |
| 5.3 Knowledge Management | 1 | 3 |  |
| Average for Section 5 ***(line 5)*** | **1** | **2** |  |
| **AVERAGE SCORE OVER 5 SECTIONS *(lines 1-5)*** | | **1.6** | **2.2** |  |

The results of the baseline (2012) and subsequent assessment (2014) can be visualized in a “radar” or “spider” diagram.

1. The USAID GCC Adaptation, Clean Energy and Sustainable Landscapes Results Frameworks can be found on USAID’s intranet: https://pages.usaid.gov/E3/GCC/official-guidance [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Through FY 2015, GCC Standard Indicators are in Program Area 4.8 and Program Element 4.8.2. Starting in FY 2016, GCC Standard Indicators are in Program Areas Economic Growth (EG) 11, 12, and 13. The GCC Standard Indicators are available externally on Climatelinks: <https://www.climatelinks.org/monitoring-evalution/usaid-climate-change-resources> and internally on USAID’s intranet: https://pages.usaid.gov/E3/GCC/gcc-indicators [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Always refer to the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) to determine if the standard indicator can be used. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Baser, Heather et al. 2011. Lessons Learned and Actions for Busan and Beyond:  Synthesis Report, Prepared for the OECD Cairo Workshop on Capacity Development from Concepts to Implementation, 28-29 March 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Climate change information, data and analysis refers to information, data and analysis that is relevant for adaptation or mitigation decision-making [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Note: Some organizations are critical players in collecting and analyzing climate change data and information; others need to be educated users of climate change data and information. Facilitators should select discussion questions accordingly. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For example, revegetating hillsides can have anti-flooding and carbon sequestration properties. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)