



Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA)
Facilitator Guide
Program Management Section Only

DRAFT September 2011

The OCA Purpose and Framework

Within USAID' Forward's Implementation and Procurement's Local Capacity Development (LCD) reform efforts, the OCA can be facilitated through a guided, interactive self-assessment with USAID's partners (NGOs, private businesses, and government counterparts) on an annual basis. This is based on the objective to enable organizational learning, team sharing, and reflective self-assessment within each partner organization. The tool is tailored to identify areas of need within management systems, project performance, program performance, and networking as well as reinforce healthy organizational practices. Through this process with a broad range of staff representation (all departments and levels represented), this snapshot promotes both a healthy, focused dialogue on organizational areas (and technical areas in year 2 and beyond through an additional tool) and leads to the development of an Action Plan identifying areas of high priority, ensuing steps, responsible staff identified, estimated completion dates, and additional support identified. Through the regular use of the OCA, an associated Action Implementation Plan, and supportive training/coaching/mentoring opportunities have demonstrated an increase in strengthening the self-sufficiency and sustainability of partners.

Acknowledgements

This compilation is based on a review and inclusion of the following Organizational Assessment Tools:

- The foundational tool is originally based on the New Partners Initiatives (NPI) OCA tool and process which was developed by Initiatives Inc. with contributions by John Snow Incorporated (JSI) under the USAID-funded New Partner's Initiatives Technical Assistance (NuPITA) Contract No. GHS-I-00-07-00002-00 and the CDC/HRSA-funded New Partner's Initiatives Technical Assistance (TA-NPI) Contract No. 200-204-05316.
- IDF originally based on USAID's TIPs #15
- Pact's Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT)
- Discussion-Oriented Organizational Self-Assessment (DOSA) Tool
- NGO Sustainability Index

Additional Resources

- Initiatives Inc. (2009). *Organizational Capacity Assessment for NGOs*. Boston, MA: Published by Initiatives Inc. for the United States Agency for International Development Support for HIV and AIDS Response in Zambia Project (SHARe).
- Management Sciences for Health. (2003). *Rapid Assessment Tool for HIV/AIDS Environments: A Guide for Strengthening HRM Systems*. Cambridge, MA: Published by MSH for the U.S. Agency for International Development Management and Leadership Program.
- Venture Philanthropy Partners. (2001). *Effective Capacity Building in Non-Profit Organizations*. Reston, VA: Venture Philanthropy Partners.

Program Management

Objective: The objective of this section is to assess the organization’s ability to respond to donor requirements and implement comprehensive programs that respond sensitively to local needs and priorities by reviewing key compliance issues, management of sub-grants with partner organization, technical reporting and processes for ensuring comprehensive health services that meet the needs of specific target populations.

Donor Compliance

Objective: The Objective of this sub-section is to assess the organization’s capability to respond to donor requirements and, thereby, ensure the effective implementation of its donor-funded programs.

Resources: Copy of the donor requirements, Financial Manual, Payment vouchers, Staff interviews

Donor Compliance	1	2	3	4		
	The organization is not familiar or does not comply with the donors’ principles as appropriate (i.e. reasonable, allocable, and allowable) and has not signed and filed required certifications.	The organization is knowledgeable about their various donors’ principles, has signed and filed required certifications for prime and partner organizations, but does not have systems in place to ensure compliance with reporting and approval requirements.	The organization is knowledgeable about their various donors’ principles as appropriate, and has systems in place to ensure compliance with reporting and approval requirements, but does not consistently comply.	The organization is knowledgeable of their various donors’ principles, has systems in place to ensure compliance with reporting and approval requirements, and complies consistently.		
Donor Compliance						
Sub-section Checklist			Yes	No	NA	Comments/Quality Notes
1. Does the organization have a copy of its various awards readily available?						
2. Are all required certifications signed and filed for the prime organization and any partner organizations?						
3. Are financial reports submitted in a timely manner to its donor(s)?						
4. Are the financial reports completed correctly per any donor requirements?						
5. Is international travel pre-approved if required?						
6. Are procurements of restricted commodities and procurements of items over \$5,000 (not included in approved budget) pre-approved if required?						
7. Are VAT expenditures exempted as required?						
8. Does the organization report semi-annually and annually on VAT expenses?						
9. Are annual workplans submitted?						
10. Are semi-annual reports submitted?						
11. Do the technical reports meet basic donor requirements?						

Donor Compliance	
Score	Criteria
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization does not have policies relevant to donor requirements • Compliance: Non of the checklist items are complete
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has policies relevant to donor requirements • Compliance: Some of the checklist items are complete • Staff awareness: Relevant staff are aware of the donor requirements and where to find information. • Application: Systems are not in place to ensure that reporting and approval requirements are followed.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has policies relevant to various donor requirements • Compliance: Most of the checklist items are complete • Staff awareness: Relevant staff are aware of donor requirements and where to find information. • Application: Systems are in place to ensure that reporting and approval requirements are followed, but requirements are not routinely adhered to.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has policies relevant to donor requirements • Compliance: All of the checklist items are complete • Staff awareness: Relevant staff are aware of donor requirements and where to find information. • Application: Systems are in place to ensure that reporting and approval requirements are followed, staff do routinely comply

Program Management: Sub-Grant Management

Objective: The Objective of this sub-section is to assess the organization’s ability to ensure effective program implementation through partners by reviewing systems and processes for sub-contracting to other organizations and for monitoring financial management and technical implementation of sub-grants.

Resources: Grants manual or written procedures, Partner Agreements, Donor documentation, Staff interviews, Financial reports from grantees, Financial tracking of grantees, Technical reports from grantees, Trip reports, Research reports

OPTIONAL: Sub-grant Management (where applicable)	1	2	3	4
	The organization does not have policies and procedures to guide subgrant management, including technical and financial oversight/ supervision. The organization does not have formal sub-grants with partner organizations	The organization has policies and procedures to guide subgrant management; they are fully compliant with their donors’ rules and regulations. Formal subgrants with some partners exist but the subgrantee(s) has not been oriented to its	The organization has policies and procedures and a subgrantee management manual. Formal subgrants with all partners exist and organization oriented the subgrantee to its responsibilities. The subgrantee is not consistent in submitting	The organization has policies and procedures and a subgrantee management manual. Formal subgrants with some partners exist and organization has oriented the subgrantee to its responsibilities. The subgrantee submits all required reports in a timely

		responsibilities and does not submit regular financial and technical reports in accordance with its agreement. There are basic policies and guidance for supervision and support to sub-grantees, but no regularly scheduled supervisory visits.	financial and technical reports. There are basic policies and guidance for supervision and support to subgrantees. Supervisory visits are conducted.	manner. There are solid policies and guidance for providing supervision and support to subgrantees according to a regular schedule. Regular supervision visits assess inventory, financial records, and implementation of technical programs.
--	--	--	--	---

Sub-grant Management				
Sub-section Checklist	Yes	No	NA	Comments/Quality Notes
Sub-grant Management				
1. If the organization gives sub-grants to government entities, did they get donor approval?				
2. Does the organization have formal sub-agreements with partner organizations?				
3. Is the sub-agreement compliant with donor rules and regulations (inclusive of all required flow down clauses)?				
4. Have sub-partners signed all required certifications and are they on file with the prime recipient?				
5. Is there a sub-grant management manual which includes financial policies and procedures and reporting guidelines?				
6. Do the sub-partners prepare and submit regular technical reports?				
7. Do the sub-partners prepare and submit regular financial reports?				
8. Do the sub-partners record and report on cost-share contributions?				
Sub-grant Monitoring and Supervision				
9. Are there written policies and procedures related to sub-grant monitoring and supervision?				
10. Are monitoring and supervision visits undertaken?				
11. Are findings from the visits recorded?				
12. Are the findings shared with the partner organizations?				
13. Are the findings referenced on future visits?				
14. Are financial records reviewed and certified on a regular basis?				
15. Are sub-partner inventory records reviewed and verified at least annually?				

Sub-grant Management	
Score	Criteria
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization does not have any written policies or guidelines (open and transparent bid process, evaluation criteria, award letter template, reporting requirements) to guide contractual arrangements with sub-grantees nor does the organization have any written financial or technical grant policies or guidelines (Agreement for each partner, modifications documented, copies of financial reports, outstanding advances tracked, obligation to grantees tracked and monitored) to guide contractual arrangements with sub-grantees.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has sub-granting policies or guidelines including financial and technical management policies but these are not necessarily appropriate, well known or understood by staff. Grant guidelines are not in compliance relevant donors. • Quality: Existing policies are incomplete or not appropriate to the organization's context or needs • Compliance: Existing policies do not ensure full donor compliance
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has sub-granting policies or guidelines including financial and technical management policies • Quality: Existing policies are complete and appropriate to the organization's context or needs • Compliance: Existing policies ensure full donor compliance • Sub-grantee awareness: Sub-grantees have been oriented to their responsibilities • Staff Awareness: Relevant staff are aware of the policies • Application: Sub-grantees do not submit financial and/or technical reports on time and/or the reports show problems or issues related to donor compliance or agreement with the sub-grant conditions. • Supervision: There are basic guidelines for providing supervision and support to sub-grantees and supervision visits are conducted.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has sub-granting policies or guidelines including financial and technical management policies • Quality: Existing policies are complete and appropriate to the organization's context or needs • Compliance: Existing policies ensure full donor compliance • Sub-grantee awareness: Sub-grantees have been oriented to their responsibilities • Staff Awareness: Relevant staff are not adequately aware of the policies • Application: Sub-grantees submit financial and technical reports on time and the reports reflect donor compliance and agreement with the subgrant conditions. • Supervision: There are solid guidelines for providing supervision and support to sub-grantees and supervision visits are conducted.

Technical Reporting

Objective: The Objective of this sub-section is to review the organization's ability to document technical activities and results for donors, program planning and program development.

Results: Most recent Technical Report

Technical Reporting	1	2	3	4
	The organization does not document quantitative or qualitative progress on its workplan, including a review of its objectives and strategies, facilitating factors and barriers, identification of lessons learned and/or best practices, report on donors' or program indicators or use information to review/revise strategy with staff and stakeholders.	The organization documents qualitative progress on its workplan, including a review of objectives and strategies facilitating factors and barriers, but does not identify lessons learned or best practices or report on donors' or program indicators or use information to review/revise strategies with staff or stakeholders or submit on time in compliance with their award(s).	The organization documents both qualitative and quantitative workplan progress including a review of objectives and strategies, facilitating factors and barriers, lessons learned and best practices, and reports on program indicators but does not use information to review/revise strategies with staff and stakeholders or submit on time in compliance with their award(s).	The organization documents both quantitative and qualitative workplan progress, including a review of objectives and strategies, facilitating factors and barriers, lessons learned and best practices, reports on donors' and program indicator results, and reports are submitted on time in compliance with their award(s). Organization uses information to review/revise strategies with staff and stakeholders.

Technical Reporting	
Score	Criteria
1	<p>Documentation: The organization has not completed a technical report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems: Few, if any, processes are in place for regular review of progress on workplan
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has a completed a technical report that documents progress on the workplan and specifies reasons for gaps or shortfalls • Systems: Systems are in place for regularly reviewing progress on workplan • Quality: Systems do not include the identification of lessons learned or best practices and do not assess or report on indicators
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has a completed a technical report that documents progress on the workplan and specifies reasons for gaps or shortfalls • Systems: Systems are in place for regularly reviewing progress on workplan • Quality: Systems include the identification of lessons learned or best practices and assess and report on indicators

4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has a completed a technical report that documents progress on the workplan and specifies reasons for gaps or shortfalls • Systems: Systems are in place for regularly reviewing progress on workplan • Quality: Systems include the identification of lessons learned or best practices and assess and report on PEPFAR or program indicators • Staff Awareness: The organization reviews findings and revises strategies, based on findings, with staff and stakeholders • Timeliness: Reports are submitted on time
----------	--

Linkages & Networks

Objective:

Resources: Sector network

Linkages & Networks	1	2	3	4
	The organization is not a member of any sector network nor participates in broad sector discussion formats. Organization is not aware of the country legal environment. The organization is not linked with other institutions (local or national).	The organization is familiar with their sector network and may have participated intermittently in broad meetings. The organization intends to reach out to other local or national organizational networks.	The organization participates in a shared vision of its role in society. The organization is a recognized member of key national networks. The organization may have limited linkages with broader insitutions, government entiitiies, private sector. The organization engages in enhancing its relevant enabling environment.	The organization is a leader in their respective network(s). The organization may advocate for or shape the vision for their sector within the broader national context. The organization seeks to improve legislative status of civic or business standing. The organization influences the enabling environment.

Community Involvement

Objective: The Objective of this sub-section is to ensure the organization's programs are responsive to and address community needs by reviewing processes for involving community members in planning and decision-making. Examples of participatory planning and decision making processes include community representation at quarterly meetings and workplanning, clear channels available in the organization for community members to voice their concerns or desires, quarterly meetings with community associations to brief community members on the project and share assessment results, reports and action or workplans.)

Resources: This may not be documented discuss approach with appropriate staff

Community Involvement	1	2	3	4
	The organization does not have participatory planning	The organization has participatory planning and	The organization has participatory planning and	The organization has participatory planning and

	and decision making processes that involve affected families and communities.	decision making processes that involve affected families and communities, but their views are not integrated into the program design to improve the continuum of care.	decision making processes that involve affected families and communities. Their views are sometimes integrated into program design to improve the continuum of care. Community has limited involvement in program activities.	decision making processes that involve affected families and communities. Their views are consistently integrated into program design to improve the continuum of care. Community is mobilized to be active in program activities
--	---	--	---	---

Community Involvement	
Score	Criteria
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems: The organization has no systems for including community representatives in program planning and decision making processes
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems: The organization has systems for including community representatives in program planning and decision making processes • Quality: The views of community representatives are not integrated into program design to improve program activities
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems: The organization has systems for including community representatives in program planning and decision making processes • Quality: The views of community representatives are sometimes integrated into program design to improve the program activities • Involvement: Community has limited involvement in planning and carrying out program activities at the community level
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems: The organization has systems for including community representatives in program planning and decision making processes • Quality: The views of community representatives are consistently integrated into program design to improve the program activities • Involvement: Community is actively involved in carrying out program activities at the community level

Culture and Gender

Objective: The Objective of this sub-section is to assess the organization’s ability to ensure high quality, relevant programs by reviewing its systems for assessing culture and gender issues among the populations it serves and integrating cultural and gender concerns into its programs.

Resources: Community or client assessments, Program plans

Culture and Gender	1	2	3	4
	Organization does not consider local culture or	The organization considers local culture or gender	The organization considers local culture or gender	The organization considers local culture or gender

	gender issues when programming its activities and has no tools or process for assessing local cultural or gender issues.	issues when programming activities, but does not have tools or a process for assessing local cultural or gender issues relevant to its programs and incorporates elements only when convenient.	concerns when programming activities; it views culture and gender as integral to program success, has a clear process and tools for assessing cultural and gender issues relevant to its programs but incorporates elements in its programming and activities only when convenient.	concerns when programming activities; it views culture and gender as integral to program success, has a clear process and tools for assessing cultural and gender issues relevant to its programs and specifically incorporates elements in its programming and activities.
--	--	---	---	---

Culture and Gender	
Score	Criteria
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has no tools for culture or gender assessments (these may be integrated with more general community/client surveys or separate) • Assessment: culture and gender assessments are not carried out.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has no tools for culture or gender assessments (these may be integrated with more general community/client surveys or separate) • Assessment: culture and gender assessments are not carried out. • Planning: Findings of culture and/or gender assessments are not used when developing program strategies and plans but organization does incorporate understandings of cultural and gender issues, based on staff perceptions but not on objective assessments into its program design and/or planning process.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has tools for culture or gender assessments (these may be integrated with more general community/client surveys or separate) • Assessment: culture and gender assessments are carried out. • Planning: Findings of culture and/or gender assessments are only sometimes used when developing program strategies and plans or designs
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation: The organization has tools for culture or gender assessments (these may be integrated with more general community/client surveys or separate) • Assessment: culture and gender assessments are carried out through a systematic process (as an integral part of program design and review for example). • Planning: Findings of culture and/or gender assessments are consistently used when developing program strategies and plans or designs