CAPACITY BUILDING OF

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

A CONCEPT

Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

**Swiss Agency for Development
and Cooperation SDC**

PREPARED BY

EUROSIS
consultoria e
formação em gestão

FEBRUARY, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

1   INTRODUCTION

The Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) has hired this consultancy seeking answers to three main points, below (copied from the Terms of Reference):

1. Describe the evolution of the context of the CSOs within the Internal Governance and propose main products or indicators to be followed in order to reach a good performance in term of Internal Governance.

2. Describe the main causes and context behind the weak capacity of CSOs achieve results and propose the main products or indicators to be followed in order to reach good results.

3. Describe the main causes and context behind the weak capacity of the CSOs in work in networks or influence policies and propose the products or indicators to be followed.

To be able to bring some light into these issues, the Consultants Team conducted some literature review, but fundamentally interviewed 16 Civil Society Organizations, being only 2 of them international intermediary non-profit organizations.

Literature states that Capacity Development has to be understood as a long-term, complex change process that has to occur in three levels – individual, organizational and foster an enabling environment – as well as in their interdependencies. Ultimately, capacity development does not only refer to the acquisition of new knowledge and skills but above all also to changing values and behavioural patterns.

When preparing a process of capacity building, the measure has to start by responding to the fundamental question **"Capacity for what?"** – the type/quality of answers was directly linked to the "ranking" of the organization. Surveyed CSO perceived as "stronger" answered mainly in three domains: *(a)* to produce evidence, understand and influence the surrounding environment; *(b)* plasticity and resilience; *(c)* to be relevant/reference in their niche of activity. CSO perceived as "weaker" tend to bring forth *(i)* to have manuals, guidelines and systems for improved financial management; *(ii)* to mobilize more resources/funding*; (iii)* to be able to pay better their Human Resources (HR) – retention of personnel. However, CSO perceived as "stronger" do not understand rotation of HR as a threat per se – they see it as an opportunity to bring new ("blood") and innovative ideas, as long as they can secure a "core team" that is highly qualified.

From these answers it is perceived – and that is in accordance with relevant literature – that for a CSO to become more able to pursue its mission, it is strongly referred that not only material resources are decisive; but first of all strategic capabilities, competencies and abilities allowing to manage upcoming tasks but also to learn from experiences and to cope with changes. SDC puts that understanding of the essentials for a strong CSO in the above diagram[1].

Thus, after the Section on Methodology and Capacity Building Principles, this report is structured in three main Sections (dimensions): internal governance, capacity to produce results, and networking & advocacy.

---

[1] From "Estudo de mapeamento das organizações da sociedade civil em Moçambique, Comissão Europeia, 2015

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 SURVEYED ORGANIZATIONS

Eurosis interviewed 16 partner organisations identified by SDC. As part of the survey process, these organizations were categorised by SDC as "broadly successful / stronger" or "less successful / weaker.

The objective of this categorisation was to understand what worked well in the more "successful" organizations and what are the lessons learnt from the more "less successful" ones.

The list of surveyed organizations is included in the Annexes. Since it is not relevant for this report, the categorization is not presented in this document.

2.2 METHOD

Eurosis used:

1. **Semi-structured interviews focusing on timeline / learning journey** (a learning journey is the learning process experienced during time) approach to CSOs considered broadly successful (or stronger) or less successful (or weak/weaker).

   In order to better understand these learning journeys, in some cases more than one key person was present for each organization at the time of the interview. This was intended to collect and triangulate a variety of perspectives on the organisation's experience and the contribution that the partnership with SDC has made at various points in its development.

   In some organizations (e.g., N'weti, CESC, OMR) this was possible; however, in others (e.g. IESE, CTV, CESAB) this was not possible, particularly due to unavailability.

2. **Semi-structured interviews with other organisations** that have a role in building capacity of others (MASC, SNV, HELVETAS, Concern). These acted more as key informants, to learn from their experiences in building capacity of other CSOs as well as of working with other donors besides SDC.

2.3 INTERVIEW GUIDES

2.3.1 Semi-structured interviews focusing on timeline / learning journey

The initial prompting question was:

• Can you share your journey to be at the point where you are now? Please share it in a perspective of not only the most **relevant events in your journey**, but also the people in them, the period and context.

   o What is/was SDC's contribution for your journey?

   o Can you share the most relevant lessons learnt – both positive and negative. What could SDC have done in a different way? Why? What would be the result/consequence?

The following visual tool was used:

Time	Beginning				Today
Winners	☺		☺		☺
Qualifiers		☺			

Almost "disqualifiers"				☹	
What is/was SDC's contribution for your journey=					
What is/was other donors' contribution for your journey?					

- Do you think your experience can be replicated, with fewer pitfalls? Would your organization be willing to mentor/coach another organization so to learn from your expertise/experience? If yes, How do you think that could be done?

2.3.2 For all interviews

Other prompting questions are:

- What is, in your perspective an effective CSO in your field of activity? Can you nominate one? Why do you take that (those) as "models"? Are you there? If not what is missing?

- "In many cases, donors shape CSOs' agendas" – this was said in the USAID CSOSI of 2013. How does your organization respond to the "friendly pressures"? Does that put you at risk of losing funding? How do you structure and prepare yourself to be/become a more "independent" Mozambican CSO?

- From your interaction with other funding partners, what would you recommend that SDC should learn, include in their efforts to support Mozambican CSO?

In case interviewees did not mention specific aspects related to a) Governance, b) Capacity to achieve results and c) Networks, the set of questions received from SDC was used as guide to cover and prompt further details along the conversation with the interviewees:

1. **Internal Governance and organizational capacity; what is about? What to do to improve it?**

- How should SDC support CSOs to increase internal accountability?

- What are the key factors for CSOs to get legitimacy to challenge the government and hold it to account?

- How do CSO manage to put down deeper roots in their constituencies? How do they bridge urban and rural constituencies?

- How do they avoid becoming content in only planning for and reporting on delivery of outputs but thinking more transformative change and finding mechanism of measuring that change?

- How is the issue of sustainability tackled? Issue of aid-dependence? Organizational development and strategic thinking/planning?

2. **Capacity of CSOs to achieve results, to work in networks or influence policies**

- How can CSOs achieve results? How is it consistent with the principles of ownership and sustainability?

- How can CSOs widen opportunities available to citizens to participate in public affairs, demand accountability from state actors and challenge their power to dominate decision-making?

- How to improve coalitions among the work of partners?

- How does SDC support strengthen CSO's ability to influence state decision-making and behavior?

- How do CSOs supported by SDC engage in public policy?

- How do they build relationships of trust and cooperation with the government and other organization while keeping their autonomy?

- In their engagement in political society, are there any links to political parties? Parliament that can offer potential leverage?

In addition to this, EUROSIS tried to gather specific recommendations for SDC's approach to Capacity Building.

- What worked in SDC approaches to CS capacity building? What didn't? What are the lessons learned?

- Which approach (es) can be more effective for SDC to have better impact on CS capacity building?

2.4 METHODOLOGY

Most interviews were conducted in the form of focus group, so to gather the most from the lessons learnt in all aspects of the organization's core areas. The duration of interviews varied from 2.5 to 4 hours.

The next sections present detailed discussion on the three dimensions: internal governance, capacity to produce results, and networking & advocacy.

3   INTERNAL GOVERNANCE

Various authors state that "Governance" means: the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented), while defining "Good governance" as "A transparent decision-making process in which the leadership of a non-profit organization, in an effective and accountable way, directs resources and exercises power on the basis of shared values." Therefore, good governance is characterized by participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, effectiveness, equity, etc.

3.1   RELEVANT FINDINGS

Governance is a decision making process and also *how* it is carried out. It is not only about making "correct" decisions, but about the best possible process for making those decisions. It is not possible to list the different forms of governance because there are many standards that vary in different societies.

The "A handbook of NGO Governance"[2] states that "*No matter what the governance structure of the organization, there should be one governing body that wields constant and consistent oversight and decision-making authority. This principal governing body is not always the same as the highest governing body. In membership associations, for example, the highest governing body is always the general membership, whose decisions and instructions always outweigh those of other parts of the organization. But if the membership meets only for several hours a year, it can hardly be said to wield "constant and consistent" governing authority. A second, principal governing body is usually needed to perform governance duties between meetings of the general membership. This principal governing body may be known as the executive board or board of directors.*"

Therefore, in this document, as describing the Dimension "Internal Governance", "Governance Bodies" is used as an ample term that will either refer to the two blocks (in Mozambique known as Governance Bodies and "Direcção Executiva") or to only one of the two – most commonly the Executive Directorate - "Direcção Executiva".

In order to understand how best to provide support for Mozambican CSO to strengthen their internal governance, some facts need to be brought forth, in terms of their formation:

a)   Mozambican legislation decrees that in order to be legalized, a CSO needs at least 10 individuals to agree on forming it. Most of the Mozambican CSO are born out of the desire of an individual (sometimes two or three) who decide to act on a given issue. The other 6 to 8 people are typically family members, co-workers, neighbours, who often are not fully committed to the CSO they are helping to establish. They are just numbers to "fill in". And these "fill in" people are "shoved" into the Governance Bodies of the CSO: the General Assembly of Members, the Fiscal Committee, and the Steering Committee.

b)   The "owners" of the idea to establish a CSO make up the Executive Directorate and are part of the implementing team – they are the ones in total control of the CSO. The Governance Bodies simply rubber stamp the reports and whatever documents the Executive Directorate sends for them to sign.

c)   The service delivery CSO tend to have a wider membership basis – the general understanding seems to be that the more members you have, the more legitimacy you have. In truth in some cases the governance bodies have actually "saved" a CSO, made hostage by the members who were also in the implementation side of the organization. It is known that the absence of a

---

[2] The Central and Eastern European working group on nonprofit governance – "A handobook of NGO governance", Marilyn Wyatt, 2004

governance body has destroyed some organizations that had given valuable contribution to their causes – their charismatic leaders began acting as if there is/was one single entity, made up of the symbioses between themselves and the organization turned into one.

d) Current legislation does not help to set entities that are driven by the commitment of a small group of people to produce the change they believe to occur in the way our country is managed. The current legislation was designed for "orgnizações **de** massas", while the advocacy organizations want to be "organizações **para** as massas" – therefore, they do not need to have an ample basis of members.

For the Mozambican reality, as it was found during the field work, the governance bodies in truth can be either divided in two functional blocks - one comprising the General Assembly of Members, the Fiscal Committee, and the Steering Committee; the other, the Executive Directorate; or, as it was found, the Governance of the CSO falls solely under the responsibility of the Executive Directorate. The fact that it is only the Executive Directorate that rules and runs the CSO is not necessarily a hindering feature for the organization, as long as the bylaws, codes of conduct and, most importantly, the organization's culture prompts internal democracy and respect for the Statutes; the decision making process is participatory and consensus oriented; the processes are transparent and the decision makers are made accountable to the CSO's stakeholders; the use of the resources entrusted is effective and efficient.

These "good governance" traits are most frequently seen in CSOs that were established by highly qualified people who are well ranked in their professional field and their setting process went through a form of "incubation" – i.e. were established after/from an initial process of program implementation that afterwards established a transitional period of some length (1 to 2 years or more) or they had direct support from SDC during their "introspective phase" – discovering who they want to be, how they want to contribute for the improvement of the country and the quality of life of its citizens. On top of that, it seems that the results, in terms of support to the development of the internal democracy and governance, are better and the recipient of the support becomes a stronger entity when directly interacting with SDC rather than when that capacity building is done through an intermediary organization. Such is the example of CIP, IESE, MASC, OMR, i-TC in comparison with AMA, AMASI and OLIPA, who are perceived as weaker organizations and other that get their support from an intermediary organization and/or are spin offs of INGO's programs. In this last circumstance it was noted that most of their executive personnel used to be the field officers and almost none was in managerial positions while employed by the INGO. This fact makes that the leading people not to have the needed knowledge, competency and/or skill to be able to make the organization to raise and grow. They were never "the brains" of the organizations they worked in, they were just "the hands".

Still on the characteristics of CSOs perceived as weak: it was noted that organizations that are spin offs of INGO's programs and or have an INGO as their funding partner/capacity builder, tend to stagnate; do not see the wider world that could be available. The stronger the tie with the INGO, the more the local CSO see the world, their capacities and their potential though the INGO lenses. These "capacity builders" of local CSO, when asked "build capacity for what" – responded – all of them – "to do what we are doing/to take over from us" – they did not foresee Mozambican CSO pursuing their own agenda and purpose. Furthermore, they (the INGO) have low expectations of the local CSO's capacity to become more sustainable and stronger. When asked about the characteristics of a sustainable Mozambican CSO, the answer was always "one that can diversify source of funding" and "capacity to manage funds and report according to agreed standards"; only after some prompting they would add traits like capacity to produce results. There is a need to understand if these capacity development programs are designed according to some of the principles generally accepted.

The most unsettling response from a capacity builder INGO was that "national CSO that are theme based have greater difficulty to survive", so they need to have a broader mandate to be able to engage other donors – they need to be more like fishing net. As literature and evidence verifies, the specialization makes the contribution of the CSO more valuable when that comes together with technical competency and expertise.

In terms of governance, stronger organizations understand that in order to be a strong organization it is paramount that right from the onset of the organization, the notion of leadership vs a charismatic leader to be brought forth and understood – while a charismatic leader is needed to start the organization, the entity needs to have/prepare a group of people who will become the "leadership". That leadership can be within the executive body and/or within the governance. Not setting this principle will have the "Alice Mabote effect" – a charismatic leader that was able to produce desired results, but saw herself, the organization and its cause as one and only entity.

Weaker organizations, even when they had been in the brink of "death" could not understand that their own incapacity to function in a more transparence form was the source and cause of loss of trust from donor community. They referred to their "loss of the spotlight" to the emergence of newer organizations with stronger ties to the new generation of managers and donors. In fact, organizations that have founding members as their executive directorate and/or taking part of the implementation team tend not to abide by their bylaws, in particular on the role of the governance bodies; rotation/ substitution of the members of the governance bodies; separation of functions. Only one organization understood its own responsibility as a result of an action of institutional capacity building that had as a starting point the members – gave them knowledge on what is "*associativismo*", how it works, what is the role of its members, the importance of the bylaws, etc. the process, in that organization lead to the ousting from their positions founding members that were holding both the positions of General Assembly Chair and the executive directorate. This made room for the rotation of the chief positions and the hiring of an "outsider" to be the executive director. However, in the case of "outsiders" managing the organization, the founding members revised the bylaws so to strongly limit the ability of the new executive directorate to make decisions – therefore, even if non-remunerated, these members still have a strong grip on the organization that is "theirs" and are still managing it.

In terms of representativity and constituency, advocacy organizations stated that by nature they do not need to have a constituency – they need to be committed to a cause, be equipped to address the issues and bring forth contributions to solve the injustice that is being made. Furthermore, they added, there is a risk in wanting to have a clearly set constituency and membership - it can be used against the very objective of the organization – for instance, if the entity is positioning itself as a watchdog, somehow members can be introduced into the organization and use the organizational internal democracy to sway the organization's direction. Therefore, they have their membership constricted to those invited to be part of the founding process and have stated that they had been very careful in the selection of these people. Their core thought had been the added value each individual would bring to their CSO and most importantly, their alignment with the cause and chosen role, in the case of the CSO focused solely in advocacy.

These advocacy organizations – all part of the group perceived as "strong" – state that they do not fit properly into the current legislation that was, as they put it, "designed to formalize movement of the masses". A different set of rules and regulation should be devised to respond to their particular dynamics since they need a "non-membership" entity, maintaining, however, all of the other characteristics of a non-profit.

3.2 SUMMARY OF GOOD PRACTICES

All interviewed organizations agreed that the most important feature of their relationship with SDC is the fact that the Cooperation understands that competency is a process and not an event. And the

length of this process varies in accordance to the context, situation and characteristics of the CSO they are providing support to.

Moreover, SDC can and does detangle its support from activities, providing supports were no one else does: strengthening the organization itself and investing in its potential to produce results, rather than investing only in those who have proven that they can perform with a certain quality. This willingness to "take risks" has produced entities like CIP and IESE. True there have been some failures but the sum shows more victories than defeats.

Different from other donors/funding partners that the interviewed Mozambican CSO have, SDC helps the organization to link up with potential donors and even promote the establishment of "common funds". This allows the entity to see itself as a "whole", not broken by the owners of the resources it receives, while reducing the tendency to pay attention to the one organization that provides the bulk of the funding.

SCD is a "hands off" organization, as stated by those in direct relationship with this entity, and this is one of the most treasured characteristics. This attitude helps the local CSO to gain the sense of ownership of their own organization and strengthen their assertiveness and self-worth.

An evaluation study done by the Operations Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) indicates some factors that were driving successful development of a capacity development (CD) support initiative – these are the characteristics nominated by those in **direct contact with SDC Mozambique:**

a) a clear results framework and the possibility to measure and monitor CD;

b) a strategic direction with realistic CD objectives;

c) an adequate diagnostic baseline assessments at all CD levels (individual, organizational, network and contextual levels);

d) a long-term continuity to institutionalize CD, careful phasing/sequencing and exit strategy;

e) an appropriate mix of modalities;

f) mainstreaming project implementation and management units' activities into target agencies' normal operations;

g) adequate staff time and skills, and financial resources;

h) an inclusive participatory approach, with strong commitment of and ownership by target agencies; and

i) cooperation and harmonization with other development partners.

3.3 SUGGESTED INDICATORS AND ACTIONS

The table below identifies sub-dimensions of Governance, describes standards for each sub-dimension, as well as indicators / outcomes to be used as reference in the development of capacity in the specific sub-dimensions.

To build its content, the consultancy not only listened to SDC partners but also reviewed literature and recommendation not only from SDC practice papers but also from other sources.

- **"Indicators / Outcomes"** we provide SDC with the tools to measure the process and growth of the CSO it has selected to provide support to. Indicators include "qualifier" and "winner"

characteristics; the products that can be delivered in capacity building and the indicator of the process and/or changes or consequence of the capacity building process.

- o "**Qualifiers**" have to be perceived as the basis and the first level of achievement for the selected CSO to benefit from the capacity building initiative. It does not mean that the acquisition of skills and competences is sequential or lineal – the learning process and curve will differ from organization to organization and SDC will evaluate the pace and capacity of each.

- o "**Winners**" is that trait/competency/skill that makes a given organization a "winning" one, i.e., that puts it in the level of "highly qualified" CSO.

In **"Sample Actions"** we describe actions that SDC can undertake foster growth and strengthening of its   CSO   partners.

Table 1: Internal Governance – Suggested Indicators / Outcomes and Capacity Building Actions

Dimension	Governance				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (Winners)**	
The Statutes and Bylaws; Policy and Procedure documents	•Statues and Bylaws are not complete and/or updated. The CSO governance bodies are aware of the need of updated organizational policies, systems and procedures	•The CSO has adequately written Statutes and Bylaws. •Responsibilities, authority, and working relationships of board and staff are not defined. •The CSO has administrative and financial policies, procedures and tools, but they are not complete and/or updated.	•The CSO has adequately written Statutes and Bylaws •Responsibilities, authority, and working relationships of board and staff are not clearly defined. •Existence and adherence to updated organizational policies, systems and procedures.	•The statutes are clear and uncomplicated, and not too detailed, giving the CSO the framework to operate and adjust within its chosen niche. •Responsibilities, authority, and working relationships of board and staff are not only clearly defined, but are adhered to. • Codes of conduct & ethics, organizational policies, systems and procedures' manuals and guidelines are used as resources by both governance bodies and the staff.	•Technical support to design appropriate Statutes and Bylaws as well as their operationalization (manuals, guidelines, processes, systems…). •Technical support to develop and adopt Code of Ethics/Principles and other policies that foster integrity/honesty, equity, inclusion, transparency, accountability, etc.
The governance bodies	•The Governance bodies do not meet regularly as per the CSO's Statutes. •The Governance bodies are not fully aware of their role and responsibilities. •Meetings of the governance bodies are not well documented. •Decisions are not taken or not strategic.	•The governance bodies meet as defined by the Statutes and Bylaws. •The Governance bodies are informed of the activities implemented and managed by the executive body. •Minutes of the governance body meetings are made.	•The governance bodies meet regularly to discuss the CSO's performance and provide some inputs. •The Governance bodies are informed of the activities implemented and managed by the executive body. •Members of the Governance bodies occasionally represent the CSO in public events and meetings. •Minutes of the meetings have clearly stated decisions, follow-up recommendations. •The governance bodies protect the organization's assets.	•The governance bodies provide strategic thinking and leadership on: organizational management and accountability; programmatic matters; and/or resource mobilization. •The governance bodies use their network of influence to leverage their CSO's visibility and reputation. •The governance bodies shoulder the responsibility of maintaining connection and communication with the CSO's main stakeholders as well as accountability to beneficiaries, donors and other stakeholders. •The governance bodies approve monitoring and evaluation systems and review their results. •The governance bodies do respect their bylaws in terms of their rotation and/or replacement, having established a succession plan.	•Capacity building of the governance bodies on roles and responsibilities. •Technical support for the development of position descriptions for members of the governance bodies; the procedures and guidelines for their activities and accountability to one another and to the external stakeholders; internal rules and regulations. •Coaching and mentoring to strengthen strategic thinking and leadership skills. •Technical support to design tools and instruments to monitor and evaluate the organization's performance and ensure accountability. •Provide support to expose governance bodies to good practices from other organizations.
Strategic Planning, structures and systems	•The governance bodies are aware of the need to design a strategic plan for their organization. •The CSO does not have infrastructural and/or logistics stability to function. •Financial control is done through non-secure instruments.	•The organization has a strategic plan that provides framework to its projects and activities. •The organization has the basic infrastructure and logistics to function for at least 12 months. •Administrative and financial operations need to be strengthened.	•The organization has a sound and focused Strategic Plan. •The organization has secured funding to ensure its infrastructure and logistics to function for the next x number of years. •The organization's initiatives and decision making processes are evidence and knowledge based.	•The Strategic plan is a result of situational analysis; its development process was inclusive and has engaged representatives of potential beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders; it is aligned with the organization's vision and mission. •Asset, risk, and technology management are strong and appropriate to the organization's purpose. •The organization utilizes information effectively for organizational and project	•Provide technical assistance for Strategic Planning. •Provide technical support and resources to install adequate financial and administrative management systems. •Provide technical support to plan, organize and manage resources to bring about the successful completion of specific project goals, outcomes and outputs. •Provide resources to hire HR with the adequate skills for institutional as well as

Dimension	Governance				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (Winners)**	
	•There is little or no separation of powers/ disaggregation of roles and responsibilities.	•The organization has its organogram and chain of responsibilities clearly stated in its bylaws and manages the organization by them.	•Financial operations are responsibly managed and reflect sound accounting principles.	management purposes •The organization has efficient and effective operations, and strong management support systems. •Financial operations are responsibly managed and reflect sound accounting principles.	and programmatic management. •Provide support to expose managerial staff to good practices from other organizations.
Leadership & Management	•Governance Bodies have a tight grip on operations of the CSO even if without competences. •There is no separation of powers •CSO is donor driven. •Struggles to give positive guidance and leadership to the CSO members and staff. •CSO leadership has no "vision" and is not able to inspire its staff and other members to action. •Seldom provides accurate reports.	•The organization has its organogram and chain of responsibilities clearly stated in its bylaws and manages the organization by them. •Mostly the executive branch leading the organization with little involvement from the Governance Bodies. •Faces challenges following up recommendations and the chain of actions. •Has reporting a competency as per donors demands both for programmatic and financial areas.	•Demonstrate some flexibility to adapt plans and make decisions in rapidly changing environments. •Document lessons learned and apply them to future projects. •Follow-up on decisions and recommendations. •Ensure efficient and transparent use of resources in accordance with donors' requirements. •The CSO leadership is inspiring and lead by example.	•The organization's activities are designed, implemented and managed based in the understanding of the project cycle. •The leadership of the organization dedicates energy and effort into making linkages, coalitions, building relationships and securing partnerships. •Management is agile, able to cope with the instability of the environment and is able to adapt, identify opportunities and adopt new paradigms. •The management and leadership is inspiring and encourage initiative and values individual and group learning; allows team to take risks; and promote innovation. •Follow-up on decisions and recommendations. •Established accountability system for governance body's members entrusted with specific tasks. •Ensure efficient and transparent use of resources in accordance with internal controls.	•Capacity building in project cycle management. •Coaching & mentoring from reference managers and CSO leaders to strengthen understanding of role and responsibilities. •Provide support to expose leadership of the CSO to good practices from other organizations. •Technical support to develop job descriptions, tools and instruments to reinforce the role of each of the governance bodies. •Technical support to CSO members to develop understanding of the importance, role and responsibilities of the different bodies of governance.

4 CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE RESULTS

4.1 RELEVANT FINDINGS

Capacity to achieve results refers to the programmatic and technical competence of the organization that will ultimately produce results conducive to the fulfilment of the organization's mission. Literature and the interviewed organizations agree on the main aspects that make a "competent" organization:

a) First and foremost – resources (material, financial and human) need to be available in quality and quantity that will enable the organization to structure itself for the Vision, Mission and Strategic Objectives it has set onto itself.

b) The organization has members of the governance bodies that bring added value and provide technical guidance for strategic decision making; the leadership has a clear vision and understanding of the mission of the organization[3]. This clear vision has to drive and provide a purpose, the prioritization, focus and most importantly the sense of ownership of the organization that allows leadership and staff to understand their organization's agenda, the reason for it and stand by it.

c) Strong organization culture that promotes accountability, transparency, respect for the law, and ethics in the entity's life and personnel's conduct.

d) The leadership and its personnel have the competences needed to analyze and understand their context and make strategic programmatic decision to act on the areas that the CSO can add most value. The management leads its team to innovate and "think out of the box"; to search for new solutions for old problems.

e) The CSO interventions have to be technically strong; therefore the organization has to have human resources that have the technical skills and competencies to deliver high quality results within with the niche set by the Strategic Plan, on time, on the budget and on quality so establishing credibility with key stakeholders. However, organizations (in particular those with focus on advocacy) need to have the capacity – and leeway – to adjust and re-plan activities and even objectives in accordance to the ever-changing dynamics of their society.

f) The technical strength comes also from systematic monitoring the technical quality of their work and ensuring that it meets appropriate standards. This happens through the understanding and execution of the project management cycle that ensures the chain of outputs that will ultimately produce the expected outcomes. In particular for CSO that have their focus in advocacy, their activities ought to be designed, implemented and managed based in the understanding of the project management cycle that uses the "outcome mapping"/"outcome harvesting" perspectives for planning and M&E, so to bright forth some of the impact of their action.

g) CSO actions have to draw on the best current knowledge of how to tackle the issues, applying it imaginatively in different contexts. One such knowledge it the understanding of how important are relationships, networks and the visibility given to one's work. In advocacy, results are the reflex of productive relationships that include the government the CSO are trying to influence and sway.

---

[3] Be that the combined "two blocks", or at least the component that has the ultimate responsibility for the management of the organization.

h) The leadership/management has the capacity and ability to delegate tasks and responsibilities, while making sure that the staff has clear understanding of the expectations of the leadership/management.

In spite of this knowledge and understanding, some of the interviewed organizations do not have the capacity to produce results that would "deliver high quality results within with the niche set by the Strategic Plan".

The divide is clearly established by the quality of human resources the organizations can afford to hire. The stronger organizations have highly qualified people in their payroll and/or governance bodies. More, both the Governance Bodies and the executive body have clear understanding of what results the organization needs to achieve, linking those to their strategic plan and objectives, and the activities to produce the desired output, and ultimately the change they desire in the society/community they serve.

The budgets of the weaker CSO are limited by the perceived capacity their "handlers" have of them and do not allow them to surpass a certain threshold that is, in all cases, below a third of what an executive director would earn in the least strong of the strongest organizations. So, instead of providing leadership, the governance body(ies) of weaker CSO is/are more concerned with survival, but in a perspective of a pauper – it is a hand-to-mouth situation and there is no room to aspire to bigger and wider "pastures" and tend to perform more to please donors rather than their constituency or internal stakeholders – members and governance bodies. Therefore, with difficulty their actions and scope of interest will be self-inducted – their donor partner will be the guide and decision maker on their what, when and how.

This pauper mentality, it has to be noted, comes from the difficulty that these organizations have to hire more qualified HR. This is for two reasons: *(a)* the governance bodies tend to hire HR that they understand as not to be a threat – either by academic competencies or by the pro-activeness, drive to do more, etc.; or *(b)* they <u>have</u> to hire low payment demanding HR and avoid "experts" due to the higher salary rate of such professionals – for most of them, their donor puts a cap on what type of salaries they can pay and it is noted that it is way lower than what the least paying successful CSO pays to is personnel.

In terms of the results the organization needs to achieve, weaker organizations tend to describe the image they want to project; "were they want to be" or better how they want to be perceived by their stakeholders, and of those, the donor community and the government.

Another outstanding difference between stronger and the weaker organizations that were interviewed lays in the fact that the first measure their performance and seek to learn from their practice; hold regular work meetings to discuss their work, each other's performances and hold each other accountable – or at least there is someone that holds the others accountable for tasks and results. They systematically monitor the technical quality of their work and ensure it meets appropriate standards. The weaker CSO tend to brush off their own weaknesses and/or live out of their once existing good reputation – the organizations tend to be a kind of "brotherhood" so there is difficulty to hold each other accountable; therefore the organization does not have the capacity to learn from its mistakes.

Field work brought forth the sense that sometimes partners demand way more from the local CSO than what they can deliver – the organizations considered here "weaker" do have considerable "know-how" in terms of culture, socio-economic dynamics of their milieu. But they have stagnated and have not/could not acquire updated perspectives and understanding of what society and citizens demand nowadays; what the new trends for non-government actions are all about; the rights based perspective/approach and action. This means that these CSO can barely understand what is going on,

let alone be able to catch up and innovate, their response to the current situation in the country and with the donor community. This kind of "narrow mindedness" comes from seeing the same problems that drove them to establish themselves as a CSO, and their interpretation is that "if only more money would be poured into it, they would be able to solve the problem" – there is no evident conjecture on the hypothesis of a need of change of paradigm.

4.2 SUMMARY OF GOOD PRACTICES

All interviewed CSO – both national and INGO stated that SDC was one of the best funding partner that any CSO would want to be engaged with, especially because it understood the need to adjust and innovate plans and activities to respond to critical changes in the dynamics of the society these CSO are immersed in. Therefore neither the strategic plan, nor the operational plans were seen as "written in stone" but as frameworks to give direction and focus.

All interviewed CSO reiterated that SDC was always able to provide direct programmatic and managerial assistance or thought its network of consultants and partnerships, which made them more able to achieve their intended results. Furthermore, they said that SDC does take time to analyse non-performances in order to understand what went wrong and how to provide support either to correct or to avoid repetition.

Most donors demand that CSO "change the tire while driving in high speed" – SDC understands that growth is a process and sometimes results may take longer to occur.

4.3 SUGGESTED INDICATORS AND ACTIONS

The table of suggested indicators and actions for capacity to achieve results is presented below.

Table 2: Capacity to Achieve Results – Suggested Indicators / Outcomes and Capacity Building Actions

Dimension	Capacity to Achieve Results				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (Winners)**	
Project Management, including Monitoring & Evaluation and Learning	•At least the executive director has experience and programmatic skills to implement activities. •Staff as some competences in the critical areas of a CSO management and program/project cycle management. •M&E is done following basic M&E tools.	•Managers and staff have good knowledge of project design methodologies and techniques. •Tools for reporting, monitoring and supervisions are filled by the staff; reports are timely produced, responding to the requirements of relevant stakeholders. •On M&E, significant energy is put towards data collection and processing. •M&E of CSO program and projects is done according to agreed tools and guidelines. •CSO has periodic internal assessment of its performance.	•Managers and most staff are competent in results based project design and project implementation. •Managers and most staff are competent in project cycle management and in the use of a wide range of tools to gather information, evidence and M&E the organization's activities. •Monitoring & Evaluation of the CSO activities, results and image using a wide range of tools including "outcome mapping"/"outcome harvesting". •On M&E, significant energy is put towards producing information and reports. •Project management follows the project cycle principles and has had a strong identification, designing and planning phase that has clearly identified all of the CSO stakeholders.	•There is significant evidence that Research and M&E is used for learning, new and innovative project design, and more effective decision making •Significant energy is put towards knowledge management and strategic thinking on current and future projects. •The organization designs recurrently new and innovative projects. •Organization's projects are recurrently being financed.	•Capacity building to increase knowledge and skills on project cycle, project design and M&E. •Provide technical support to adequate M&E as well as reporting methodology/approaches that captures the influence of CSO's action. •Technical assistance to develop M&E Plans. •Technical assistance Upgrade M&E Databases. •Improve data collection, processing and reporting systems.
Personal and professional development of Managers and Staff	•HR is recruited according to the resources available not the needs of the organization. • Some of the HR of the organization are at the same time founding members/members of the organization. •The organization does not have a talent retention / succession plan.	•The organization has recruiting and selecting HR policies. •The organization has some level of disaggregation of functions and responsibilities, in particular for finances. •The organization has performance evaluation practices. •Some of the HR of the organization are at the same time founding members/members of the organization. •The organization has a talent retention / succession plan that covers the organization (Governance bodies, executive body, managers, staff).	•The leadership of the organization has skills and competences to provide technical guidance to its staff. •The organization has descriptions of staff competencies and functions needed to attain results, and its HR recruitment responds to those needs. •The CSO has some financial capacity to hire most of the HR needed to fulfil its mission and implement the strategic plan. •There is coaching to junior staff members, with clear definition of learning targets. •Talent retention / succession plan (Governance bodies, executive body, managers, staff) has produced positive results for the organization's technical sustainability.	•The executive body of the CSO has competencies to lead the entity for high level performance and respond on quality, on time and on budget. •Managers and staff are widely recognized by members, donors, stakeholders as innovative in their programmatic approach (or interventions). •Managers and staff are recognized as experts in the matter and recurrently being requested to share knowledge and good practices with other organizations (participation in seminars do not count). •Performance evaluation is widely used as opportunity to learn and managers both personally and professionally. •Mentoring and coaching by most senior personnel to new recruits and/or junior staff members is part of their performance evaluation.	•Provide support to describe what attributes staff needs to develop to meet present and future organizational challenges. •Assisting the organization to take stock of staff capability and the organization's ability to deliver against its goals. •Provide financial resources and stability to hire HR with needed competencies and skills. •Provide technical support to introduce performance evaluation that is 360º. •Provide technical support, training opportunities and coaching to the executive leader to be prepared and lead his/her own succession plan. •Provide technical support, coaching and mentoring to the leadership to make the organization a learning one.

Dimension	Capacity to Achieve Results				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (Winners)**	
Resource mobilization	•The CSO has no established capacity to mobilize resources. •The CSO has little or no revenue stream (own revenues). Or, the its own revenue stream is quite irregular.	•The organization has access to resources (material, physical and financial) that permit it to function and implement its activities. •Only the executive body of the organization is engaged in resource mobilization. •The CSO demonstrates some competence in using its programmatic competences and results as a tool to mobilize and secure partnerships.	•Existence of resource mobilization strategy and function (a specific structure); •Pledged resources over medium to long term periods. •Some of its personnel have competencies and skills to respond to programmatic and technical needs to design and implement good quality programs. •Some of the members of the governance bodies are engaged in resource mobilization and marketing of the organization. •Managers and staff with competencies and skills to respond to programmatic and technical needs for organizational growth, leading to good reputation and credibility.	•The majority of the members of the governance bodies are engaged in resource mobilization and marketing of the organization. •Most projects designed by the CSO are effectively funded. •CSO is recurrently accessing of donor (and other) funding. •Existence and donor adherence to a Common Fund. •Existence of a sustainable revenue stream (own revenues) to (at least) cover key running costs (particularly key personnel) in-between financed projects.	•Provide support to develop a evidence based Strategic Plan and its resource mobilization strategy. •Support the establishment of a Common Fund. •Technical support and resources to develop the organization's communication and visibility / promotion instruments. •Funding partner/donor as guarantor of the CSO to the donor community. •Support the organization to initiate revenue generating activities to cover their core costs.

5   NETWORKING & ADVOCACY

5.1   RELEVANT FINDINGS

Before setting the question about what could be done to strengthen each organization to be able to engage in collaborative work with others, there was a need to perceive what is networking and the benefits of that practice. Literature refers several reasons for any CSO, in particular those in advocacy, to work with other like-minded organizations: increased access to information, knowledge, expertise and financial resources; increased efficiency; a multiplier effect, which increases the reach and impact available to member organizations; solidarity and support; and increased visibility of issues, sharing of good practices, among other benefits. Other important perceived benefits are risk mitigation and increased credibility, particularly for CSO performing in countries with less freedom and democracy.

Another relevant evidence is that while the major target of advocacy efforts is the government, it is however, that very same government the most important stakeholder for the advocacy focused CSO. There was and there are issues that might demand a "name and shame approach" however, unless there are very strong commitments from other power forces at play, that strategy might not bring forth the results intended. On the other hand, if the CSO is taken as non-biased, honest and intent in contributing for the improvement of whatever situation or cause they defend, the government, private sector or other entity/group that it their target might seek their contribution and knowledge.

Interviewed organizations affirmed that advocacy cannot be "prompted" – the need to manifest discordance and denounce ill doings is part of an individual's perception of the "right to be indignant" ("direito a estar indignado"). Without that there is no advocacy. Courage is required – ones' "direito a estar indignado" has to be stronger than one's fear. So, it is truly paramount to identify if the group that seeks support has really perceived that a certain issue need to be brought forth to the public eye and are willing to stand by their mission even if chancing to become "outcasts".

5.2   NETWORK VS NETWORKING

Weaker/average CSO *do not network* – rather, they *belong* to networks. All interviewed organizations belonging to the average or weak category stated that is was incredibly important to belong to networks and platforms – in fact they are members of all of the provincial level networks that might be related to their mission. There is an understanding that "it is not good not to be part".

Positive reasons to be engaged in a network were "to be seen and known, so the organization is not left out". The other major reason to belong is the possibility to access to funds through the network – that rarely happens, but most donors are providing some funding to networks as a tool to refer that they are (even if indirectly) providing support to a great number of national CSO – claiming that there happens the "ripple effect". That, according to interviewees, sometimes makes the network to be perceived as competitor – "why invest in the competition?"; many members of CSO networks fear that the fund-raising efforts of the network/platform may conflict with those of their organization. Such issues are more acute when there has been inadequate openness and transparency on the part of the network management.

On the other hand, strong organizations tend to engage in results/issue driven coalitions – they network, but think that networks are a waste of time and effort. However, even these organizations, in their majority do not understand the entity(ies) that are targeted by their advocacy efforts as partners in the creation of the solution.

Generally the organizations do not have a budget line saying "networking" – when prompted; most said that they did not even try to request that to SDC related funds, due to their experience with other donors. Most of the stronger organizations have a budget line that is open enough to accommodate

some level of expenses related to networking – "participation in meetings"; "meetings and trainings", etc.

Most of the organizations did not have a professional/member of the staff dedicated to networking/partnership management, in the sense of coalitions and partnerships for synergies and collaboration. Most of the time it is one professional who goes to the meetings of a given network/platform, but the organizations do not have a system in place for sharing information and the decisions made in these meetings. If something happens and that person is not available anymore, then all the information, knowledge of the processes and dynamics of that organism is lost for the CSO.

5.3   THE NEXT LEVEL

All of the organizations listed as "weak" or "average" have the conception that their "next level" is to become an advocacy focused organization. The understanding is that these type of organizations need to have credibility (which comes from legitimacy and respect; by being objective, trustworthy and compliant with ethical standards); need to have the capacity to generate and communicate relevant evidence; have the ability to access risks and act accordingly.

These organizations believe that even if they cannot/do not have the capacity – being based in the provinces and not at the national capital – to reach to the highest levels of influence, there is room for intervention at provincial and local level, in light of the "decentralization" and "de-concentration" policies that give decision making powers to local governments – there is room for CSO to influence how the budget is set, how the decisions are made; there is even the opportunity to be allies with the provincial government when cuts are made to their budget by the central government – they can bring the province's concerns that cannot/will not be done by the members of the government. All they need is to learn how to do advocacy, identify the issues relevant for their province.

5.4   SUMMARY OF GOOD PRACTICES

Most of the most relevant Advocacy organizations in the country were supported by SDC from the stage of conception, i.e., the organization allowed itself to take the risk and support young dreamers who believed they should position themselves so to contribute for the greater good of the country. SDC assisted these groups to perfect their vision, what they mission should be, what strategies they could adopt in light of their evidence based chosen niche. This should be the pattern for the widening of advocacy organizations in the country.

5.5   SUGGESTED INDICATORS AND ACTIONS

The table of products for networking and advocacy is presented below.

Table 3: Networking and Advocacy – Suggested Indicators / Outcomes and Capacity Building Actions

Dimension	Networking and Advocacy				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (winners)**	
Networking	•Founding members genuinely interested in fostering changes in society. •CSO is a member of a local network/platform of its programmatic area of activity.	•Founding members genuinely interested in fostering changes in society. •CSO is part of a national network/platform for the visibility.	•CSO recognizes networking as a requirement to complement resources. •CSO has used networking to complement resources and achieve objectives. •CSO is part of a national or international network/ platform.	•Network contributing with complementary resources (knowledge, financial, material) •Engagement with value adding international networks; •Participation in effective results-based coalitions (both international and national). •CSO is recurrently being requested to join specific target oriented coalitions to achieve objectives.	•Technical assistance for the development of effective results-based coalitions. •Allocation of resources to contribute for the strengthening of a national network/platform & participation in joint actions.
Advocacy	•Does not engage in advocacy being, however, involved in community mobilization.	•Have credibility and accountability in community mobilization and local lobbying.	•Adequate use of research and information to design position papers in coalition with others.	•Leverages connections, credibility and competency to send the message across more effectively. •Has the openness to accept the target of their advocacy efforts as a partner and relevant stakeholder. •HR is competent and trained to conduct research, monitoring/evaluation, information management for policy change •Adequate use of social media as an advocacy platform. •Has the openness to accept the target of their advocacy efforts as a partner and relevant stakeholder.	•Technical assistance in developing adequate advocacy and lobbying skills. •Technical assistance for adequate use research, information and lobby. •Support in developing guidelines and tools for effective advocacy to be used by staff and members.
Linkages and sharing of information and knowledge	•Governance bodies do not fully understand the potential for improved performance, visibility and recognition brought forth by establishing linkages networks. •CSO governance has the "humble attitude" towards self- publicizing. • Fragile capacity to provide accurate information to its different stakeholders.	•Governance bodies have the potential to establish linkages and fruitful working relationships. •CSO governance has the "humble attitude" towards self-publicizing. •Needs strengthening to be able to provide information that would bring evidence of the organizations' work.	•The organization is invited to major events and forums to share experience, knowledge, information; •Demonstrate accountability to partners - collect, analyses and disseminate information to and from relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries.	•The CSO "Stakeholders Spider" has the government as one of its components and strives to collaborate with it, as "part of the solution". •CSO has the ability to assess and manage risks and the capacity to generate and communicate relevant evidence. •The organization uses the available technology to acquire /share information and knowledge. •Accountability to service Recipients, donors and other stakeholders.	•Provide technical support to CSO from the onset of the designing of its strategic plan /project to correctly identify, analyse and map its stakeholder's spider. •Capacity building on the principles and strategies of results oriented advocacy and lobbying. •Workshops engaging CSO at different stages of capacity to exchange lessons learnt. •Technical support and resources for CSO to be able to use IT to disseminate its work and become more visible.
Visibility	•The CSO is not mentioned as a member of their specific	•The CSO is acknowledged as a member by the local/national	•Participation in informed television or radio dialogues;	•Regular production/dissemination of research, position papers, analysis,	•Technical support and resources for CSO to be able to use IT to

	programmatic area.	platform of their specific programmatic area.	• The organization is perceived as a valid contributor for the country's development. • CSO is part of a national or international network/platform for the visibility.	newsletters, articles etc. • Harnesses the potential of mass media communication including TIC to disseminate its work and to mobilize partnerships through that exposure. • Public access to information about the CSO and its activities	disseminate its work and become more visible.

6 PRINCIPLES AND TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT AND AN ACTION PLAN FOR CAPACITY BUILDING

6.1 CORE PRINCIPLES SUGGESTED FOR CAPACITY BUILDING IN MOZAMBIQUE

Before presenting the matrix that will provide support for the capacity building in each of the individual dimensions, it is important to recognize at least five Capacity Building Principles. These were directly or indirectly mentioned by the Surveyed Organizations:

1. **Sustainability as the core element** – Capacity Building initiatives should genuinely aim at the medium to long technical and financial sustainability of CSOs. Both the donor (SDC) and the founding members (or the leaders of the SCO) need to genuinely aim at sustainability when designing and implementing Capacity Building activities.

2. **Relevance and holistic approach** – To achieve principle 1, Capacity Building should be as integrated and holistic as possible; i.e, all elements of the triangle: internal governance, capacity to achieve results, and networking & advocacy should grow together in a harmonious manner. In addition, initiatives should be based on detailed needs assessment and be relevant for the specific organization and its development stage.

3. **Capacity Building as a long term commitment** – It takes 3 to 5 years of continuous human and institutional support to building a strong organisation. Short term initiatives have higher risk of failing to ensure ownership and sustainability of new policies, systems, procedures and practices. Short term initiatives also normally fail to ensure commitment to long term success from all parties involved; they are more concerned with immediate "quick wins" at the output level (e.g., financial manual revised, M&A plan designed). Instead, longer term (3 to 5 years) initiatives can aim at outcome level indicators (examples are provided for each dimensions in the following sections).

4. **The need to take risks** – Sometimes it is relevant to consider funding to emerging and genuine movements. CIP and IESE are perhaps the good examples of taking risks – funding these organizations at their embryo required taking the risk of funding organizations that do not have a track record. Instead, funding was based on the recognition that the leaders were genuinely interested in societal change.

5. **Basket Funding** – Regardless of its advantages (e.g., to know where every USD / Euro was spent), "project based funding" is historically been criticized for: need for multiple reporting (one for each donor) and thus inefficiencies; less flexibility to prioritize and reprioritize use of funds by the CSO; less autonomy for CSOs to intervene based on *their own* evidence-based objectives; increased accountability *towards donors* and less towards CSO constituents and society.

   Instead, basket funding is increasingly been seen as more effective to foster autonomy, efficiency, ownership and *genuine* accountability at the CSOs.

6.2 TOOL 1: CAPACITY ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT AND ACTION PLAN

In order to frame the action plan, we have established the highest level of performance and capacity – level 4 -, based on the comments and recommendations from interviewed CSO and good practices found in evaluation of other organizations from across the world, and in particular in Mozambique and the region. The other 3 "lower" levels were built based on the reality of the interviewed organizations, based on their own account of their progress and process when EUROSIS used the "timeline / learning journey" approach.

Dimension	Governance				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (Winners)**	
The Statutes and Bylaws; Policy and Procedure documents	•Statues and Bylaws are not complete and/or updated. The CSO governance bodies are aware of the need of updated organizational policies, systems and procedures	•The CSO has adequately written Statutes and Bylaws. •Responsibilities, authority, and working relationships of board and staff are not defined. •The CSO has administrative and financial policies, procedures and tools, but they are not complete and/or updated.	•The CSO has adequately written Statutes and Bylaws •Responsibilities, authority, and working relationships of board and staff are not clearly defined. •Existence and adherence to updated organizational policies, systems and procedures.	•The statutes are clear and uncomplicated, and not too detailed, giving the CSO the framework to operate and adjust within its chosen niche. •Responsibilities, authority, and working relationships of board and staff are not only clearly defined, but are adhered to. • Codes of conduct & ethics, organizational policies, systems and procedures' manuals and guidelines are used as resources by both governance bodies and the staff.	•Technical support to design appropriate Statutes and Bylaws as well as their operationalization (manuals, guidelines, processes, systems…). •Technical support to develop and adopt Code of Ethics/Principles and other policies that foster integrity/honesty, equity, inclusion, transparency, accountability, etc.
The governance bodies	•The Governance bodies do not meet regularly as per the CSO's Statutes. •The Governance bodies are not fully aware of their role and responsibilities. •Meetings of the governance bodies are not well documented. •Decisions are not taken or not strategic.	•The governance bodies meet as defined by the Statutes and Bylaws. •The Governance bodies are informed of the activities implemented and managed by the executive body. •Minutes of the governance body meetings are made.	•The governance bodies meet regularly to discuss the CSO's performance and provide some inputs. •The Governance bodies are informed of the activities implemented and managed by the executive body. •Members of the Governance bodies occasionally represent the CSO in public events and meetings. •Minutes of the meetings have clearly stated decisions, follow-up recommendations. •The governance bodies protect the organization's assets.	•The governance bodies provide strategic thinking and leadership on: organizational management and accountability; programmatic matters; and/or resource mobilization. •The governance bodies use their network of influence to leverage their CSO's visibility and reputation. •The governance bodies shoulder the responsibility of maintaining connection and communication with the CSO's main stakeholders as well as accountability to beneficiaries, donors and other stakeholders. •The governance bodies approve monitoring and evaluation systems and review their results. •The governance bodies do respect their bylaws in terms of their rotation and/or replacement, having established a succession plan.	•Capacity building of the governance bodies on roles and responsibilities. •Technical support for the development of position descriptions for members of the governance bodies; the procedures and guidelines for their activities and accountability to one another and to the external stakeholders; internal rules and regulations. •Coaching and mentoring to strengthen strategic thinking and leadership skills. •Technical support to design tools and instruments to monitor and evaluate the organization's performance and ensure accountability. •Provide support to expose governance bodies to good practices from other organizations.
Strategic Planning, structures and systems	•The governance bodies are aware of the need to design a strategic plan for their organization. •The CSO does not have infrastructural and/or logistics stability to function. •Financial control is done through non-secure instruments.	•The organization has a strategic plan that provides framework to its projects and activities. •The organization has the basic infrastructure and logistics to function for at least 12 months. •Administrative and financial operations need to be strengthened.	•The organization has a sound and focused Strategic Plan. •The organization has secured funding to ensure its infrastructure and logistics to function for the next x number of years. •The organization's initiatives and decision making processes are evidence and knowledge based.	•The Strategic plan is a result of situational analysis; its development process was inclusive and has engaged representatives of potential beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders; it is aligned with the organization's vision and mission. •Asset, risk, and technology management are strong and appropriate to the organization's purpose. •The organization utilizes information effectively for organizational and project	•Provide technical assistance for Strategic Planning. •Provide technical support and resources to install adequate financial and administrative management systems. •Provide technical support to plan, organize and manage resources to bring about the successful completion of specific project goals, outcomes and outputs. •Provide resources to hire HR with the adequate skills for institutional as well as

| Sub-dimension | Indicators/Outcome | | | | Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes |
	Level 1	Level 2 (Qualifiers)	Level 3	Level 4 (Winners)	
Dimension			**Governance**		
	• There is little or no separation of powers/ disaggregation of roles and responsibilities.	• The organization has its organogram and chain of responsibilities clearly stated in its bylaws and manages the organization by them.	• Financial operations are responsibly managed and reflect sound accounting principles.	management purposes • The organization has efficient and effective operations, and strong management support systems. • Financial operations are responsibly managed and reflect sound accounting principles.	and programmatic management. • Provide support to expose managerial staff to good practices from other organizations.
Leadership & Management	• Governance Bodies have a tight grip on operations of the CSO even if without competences. • There is no separation of powers • CSO is donor driven. • Struggles to give positive guidance and leadership to the CSO members and staff. • CSO leadership has no "vision" and is not able to inspire its staff and other members to action. • Seldom provides accurate reports.	• The organization has its organogram and chain of responsibilities clearly stated in its bylaws and manages the organization by them. • Mostly the executive branch leading the organization with little involvement from the Governance Bodies. • Faces challenges following up recommendations and the chain of actions. • Has reporting a competency as per donors demands both for programmatic and financial areas.	• Demonstrate some flexibility to adapt plans and make decisions in rapidly changing environments. • Document lessons learned and apply them to future projects. • Follow-up on decisions and recommendations. • Ensure efficient and transparent use of resources in accordance with donors' requirements. • The CSO leadership is inspiring and lead by example.	• The organization's activities are designed, implemented and managed based in the understanding of the project cycle. • The leadership of the organization dedicates energy and effort into making linkages, coalitions, building relationships and securing partnerships. • Management is agile, able to cope with the instability of the environment and is able to adapt, identify opportunities and adopt new paradigms. • The management and leadership is inspiring and encourage initiative and values individual and group learning; allows team to take risks; and promote innovation. • Follow-up on decisions and recommendations. • Established accountability system for governance body's members entrusted with specific tasks. • Ensure efficient and transparent use of resources in accordance with internal controls.	• Capacity building in project cycle management. • Coaching & mentoring from reference managers and CSO leaders to strengthen understanding of role and responsibilities. • Provide support to expose leadership of the CSO to good practices from other organizations. • Technical support to develop job descriptions, tools and instruments to reinforce the role of each of the governance bodies. • Technical support to CSO members to develop understanding of the importance, role and responsibilities of the different bodies of governance.

| Sub-dimension | Indicators/Outcome | | | | Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes |
	Level 1	Level 2 (Qualifiers)	Level 3	Level 4 (Winners)	
Dimension			**Capacity to Achieve Results**		
Project Management, including Monitoring & Evaluation and	• At least the executive director has experience and programmatic skills to implement activities.	• Managers and staff have good knowledge of project design methodologies and techniques. • Tools for reporting, monitoring and	• Managers and most staff are competent in results based project design and project implementation. • Managers and most staff are competent	• There is significant evidence that Research and M&E is used for learning, new and innovative project design, and more effective decision making	• Capacity building to increase knowledge and skills on project cycle, project design and M&E. • Provide technical support to adequate

Dimension	Capacity to Achieve Results				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (Winners)**	
Learning	•Staff as some competences in the critical areas of a CSO management and program/project cycle management. •M&E is done following basic M&E tools.	supervisions are filled by the staff; reports are timely produced, responding to the requirements of relevant stakeholders. •On M&E, significant energy is put towards data collection and processing. •M&E of CSO program and projects is done according to agreed tools and guidelines. •CSO has periodic internal assessment of its performance.	in project cycle management and in the use of a wide range of tools to gather information, evidence and M&E the organization's activities. •Monitoring & Evaluation of the CSO activities, results and image using a wide range of tools including "outcome mapping"/"outcome harvesting". •On M&E, significant energy is put towards producing information and reports. •Project management follows the project cycle principles and has had a strong identification, designing and planning phase that has clearly identified all of the CSO stakeholders.	•Significant energy is put towards knowledge management and strategic thinking on current and future projects. •The organization designs recurrently new and innovative projects. •Organization's projects are recurrently being financed.	M&E as well as reporting methodology/approaches that captures the influence of CSO's action. •Technical assistance to develop M&E Plans. •Technical assistance Upgrade M&E Databases. •Improve data collection, processing and reporting systems.
Personal and professional development of Managers and Staff	•HR is recruited according to the resources available not the needs of the organization. • Some of the HR of the organization are at the same time founding members/members of the organization. •The organization does not have a talent retention / succession plan.	•The organization has recruiting and selecting HR policies. •The organization has some level of disaggregation of functions and responsibilities, in particular for finances. •The organization has performance evaluation practices. •Some of the HR of the organization are at the same time founding members/members of the organization. •The organization has a talent retention / succession plan that covers the organization (Governance bodies, executive body, managers, staff).	•The leadership of the organization has skills and competences to provide technical guidance to its staff. •The organization has descriptions of staff competencies and functions needed to attain results, and its HR recruitment responds to those needs. •The CSO has some financial capacity to hire most of the HR needed to fulfil its mission and implement the strategic plan. •There is coaching to junior staff members, with clear definition of learning targets. •Talent retention / succession plan (Governance bodies, executive body, managers, staff) has produced positive results for the organization's technical sustainability.	•The executive body of the CSO has competencies to lead the entity for high level performance and respond on quality, on time and on budget. •Managers and staff are widely recognized by members, donors, stakeholders as innovative in their programmatic approach (or interventions). •Managers and staff are recognized as experts in the matter and recurrently being requested to share knowledge and good practices with other organizations (participation in seminars do not count). •Performance evaluation is widely used as opportunity to learn and managers both personally and professionally. •Mentoring and coaching by most senior personnel to new recruits and/or junior staff members is part of their performance evaluation.	•Provide support to describe what attributes staff needs to develop to meet present and future organizational challenges. •Assisting the organization to take stock of staff capability and the organization's ability to deliver against its goals. •Provide financial resources and stability to hire HR with needed competencies and skills. •Provide technical support to introduce performance evaluation that is 360°. •Provide technical support, training opportunities and coaching to the executive leader to be prepared and lead his/her own succession plan. •Provide technical support, coaching and mentoring to the leadership to make the organization a learning one.
Resource mobilization	•The CSO has no established capacity to mobilize resources. •The CSO has little or no revenue stream (own revenues). Or, the its	•The organization has access to resources (material, physical and financial) that permit it to function and implement its activities. •Only the executive body of the organization is engaged in resource	•Existence of resource mobilization strategy and function (a specific structure); •Pledged resources over medium to long term periods. •Some of its personnel have competencies	•The majority of the members of the governance bodies are engaged in resource mobilization and marketing of the organization. •Most projects designed by the CSO are effectively funded.	•Provide support to develop a evidence based Strategic Plan and its resource mobilization strategy. •Support the establishment of a Common Fund. •Technical support and resources to

Dimension	Capacity to Achieve Results				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (Winners)**	
	own revenue stream is quite irregular.	mobilization. •The CSO demonstrates some competence in using its programmatic competences and results as a tool to mobilize and secure partnerships.	and skills to respond to programmatic and technical needs to design and implement good quality programs. •Some of the members of the governance bodies are engaged in resource mobilization and marketing of the organization. •Managers and staff with competencies and skills to respond to programmatic and technical needs for organizational growth, leading to good reputation and credibility.	•CSO is recurrently accessing of donor (and other) funding. •Existence and donor adherence to a Common Fund. •Existence of a sustainable revenue stream (own revenues) to (at least) cover key running costs (particularly key personnel) in-between financed projects.	develop the organization's communication and visibility / promotion instruments. •Funding partner/donor as guarantor of the CSO to the donor community. •Support the organization to initiate revenue generating activities to cover their core costs.

Dimension	Networking and Advocacy				
Sub-dimension	**Indicators/Outcome**				**Sample of Actions to attain "winners'" Outcomes**
	Level 1	**Level 2 (Qualifiers)**	**Level 3**	**Level 4 (winners)**	
Networking	•Founding members genuinely interested in fostering changes in society. •CSO is a member of a local network/platform of its programmatic area of activity.	•Founding members genuinely interested in fostering changes in society. •CSO is part of a national network/platform for the visibility.	•CSO recognizes networking as a requirement to complement resources. •CSO has used networking to complement resources and achieve objectives. •CSO is part of a national or international network/ platform.	•Network contributing with complementary resources (knowledge, financial, material) •Engagement with value adding international networks; •Participation in effective results-based coalitions (both international and national). •CSO is recurrently being requested to join specific target oriented coalitions to achieve objectives.	•Technical assistance for the development of effective results-based coalitions. •Allocation of resources to contribute for the strengthening of a national network/platform & participation in joint actions.
Advocacy	•Does not engage in advocacy being, however, involved in community mobilization.	•Have credibility and accountability in community mobilization and local lobbying.	•Adequate use of research and information to design position papers in coalition with others.	•Leverages connections, credibility and competency to send the message across more effectively. •Has the openness to accept the target of their advocacy efforts as a partner and relevant stakeholder. •HR is competent and trained to conduct research, monitoring/evaluation, information management for policy change •Adequate use of social media as an advocacy platform. •Has the openness to accept the target of their advocacy efforts as a partner and relevant stakeholder.	•Technical assistance in developing adequate advocacy and lobbying skills. •Technical assistance for adequate use research, information and lobby. •Support in developing guidelines and tools for effective advocacy to be used by staff and members.
Linkages and sharing of information and knowledge	•Governance bodies do not fully understand the potential for improved performance, visibility and recognition brought forth by establishing linkages networks. •CSO governance has the "humble attitude" towards self- publicizing. •Fragile capacity to provide accurate information to its different stakeholders.	•Governance bodies have the potential to establish linkages and fruitful working relationships. •CSO governance has the "humble attitude" towards self-publicizing. •Needs strengthening to be able to provide information that would bring evidence of the organizations' work.	•The organization is invited to major events and forums to share experience, knowledge, information; •Demonstrate accountability to partners - collect, analyses and disseminate information to and from relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries.	•The CSO "Stakeholders Spider" has the government as one of its components and strives to collaborate with it, as "part of the solution". •CSO has the ability to assess and manage risks and the capacity to generate and communicate relevant evidence. •The organization uses the available technology to acquire /share information and knowledge. •Accountability to service Recipients, donors and other stakeholders.	•Provide technical support to CSO from the onset of the designing of its strategic plan /project to correctly identify, analyse and map its stakeholder's spider. •Capacity building on the principles and strategies of results oriented advocacy and lobbying. •Workshops engaging CSO at different stages of capacity to exchange lessons learnt. •Technical support and resources for CSO to be able to use IT to disseminate its work and become more visible.
Visibility	•The CSO is not mentioned as a member of their specific programmatic area.	•The CSO is acknowledged as a member by the local/national platform of their specific programmatic area.	•Participation in informed television or radio dialogues; •The organization is perceived as a valid contributor for the country's	•Regular production/dissemination of research, position papers, analysis, newsletters, articles etc. •Harnesses the potential of mass media	•Technical support and resources for CSO to be able to use IT to disseminate its work and become more visible.

			development. • CSO is part of a national or international network/platform for the visibility.	communication including TIC to disseminate its work and to mobilize partnerships through that exposure. • Public access to information about the CSO and its activities	

6.3 TOOL 2: MONITORING MATRIX

SDC experts and personnel will be able to fill in the details of the assessment and agreed upon objectives and plan in each of the dimensions in the "Tool 1". After the baseline is performed and during capacity building initiative timeframe, the second part of the table will be used to monitor the process.

Dimension	Sub-dimension	Objective agreed with CSO	Baseline Assessment		Capacity Building Plan				Monitoring		
			Comments	Score from Tool 1	Actions	Expected Outcome	Date of completion	Responsibility	Progress	Score at M&E date from Tool 1	Follow up
Internal Governance	The Statutes and Bylaws										
	The governance body										
	Structures and systems										
	Leadership & Management										
Capacity to achieve results	Project Management, including Monitoring & Evaluation and Learning										
	Personal and professional development of Staff										
	Resource mobilization										
Networking & Advocacy	Networking										
	Advocacy										
	Linkages and sharing of information and knowledge										
	Visibility										

7 ANNEXES

7.1 SURVEYED ORGANIZATIONS

Dia	Data	Hora	Instituição	Nome do Informante	Contactos do informante	Endereço
2ª feira	7.12	14:00 – 17:00	iTC	Emídio Oliveira	eoliveira@itc-f.org 823019100	Av. Kenneth Kaunda, n° 624 Maputo
		08:00 – 11:00	Concern Universal	Helena Skember	Helena.Skember@concern-universal.org 823095200	Av. Padre António Vieira, n° 56 Maputo
3ª feira	8.12	09:00 – 12:00	MASC	Joao Pereira	j.pereira@masc.org.mz 822602574	Av. Do Zimbabwe, n.º 1374, Maputo
4ª feira	9.12	09:00 – 12:00	Helvetas	Fernando Curasse	fernando.curasse@helvetas.org 828903802	Av. Julius Nyerere Nº 1213 Maputo
		14:30 – 16:00	OMR	Joao Mosca	mmargamartins@gmail.com 843827530	Av. Paulo Samuel Kankhomba N°1011 Edificio da Reitoria Maputo
		15:30 – 18:30	CTV	Alda Salomão	alda.salomao00@gmail.com 823996200	Rua Daniel Tomé Magaia, nº 60
5ª feira	10.12	14:00 – 15:30	CIP	Adriano Nuvunga	nuvunga@cip.org.mz 824875710	Bairro da Coop, Rua B, nr. 79. Maputo-Moçambique Maputo
6ª feira	11.12	09:00 – 12:00	N'weti	Neusa Macaringue Marçal. Gildo	d.namburete@nweti.org.mz 82302800	Av. Lucas Kumato
6ª feira	11.12	11:00 – 12:30	CESAB	João Trindade	joaocarlostrindade@gmail.com	Rua Daniel Tomé Magaia, nº 60
2ª feira	14.12	08:15 – 10:15	CESC	Paula Monjane e equipa	pmonjane@cescmoz.org 823261800	Rua da Amizade N°83 Malhangalene Maputo
3ª feira	15.12	08:00 – 10:30	Wiwanana	Abide Dias	abidesdias@hotmail.com 826861328	Rua do Ibo, nº 79 - Pemba
3ª feira	15.12	18 horas	OLIPA	Nordino Chilane Basílio Amisse	nchilane@yahoo.com.br; Basilio.olipa@tdm.co.mz	Cidade de Nampula, Bairro da Expansão, perto da Desminagem Nampula
4ª feira	16.12	10:30 – 12:00	AMA	Tomás Jaime Langa	ama.tomas.langa@gmail.com 848206031/828477470	
4ª feira	16.12	Manhã	AMASI	Odete Muchanga	odetemuchanga@yahoo.com.br 827401700	Cidade de Nampula, Bairro da Expansão, perto da Desminagem Nampula
5ª feira	17.12	08:00 – 11:00	IESE	Salvador Forquilha	salvador.forquilha@iese.ac.mz 825614355	Av. Tomas Nduda N°1375 Maputo
5ª feira	17.12	14:30 – 16:00	SNV	Virgínia Mariezcurrena	Vmariezcurrenaconcernu@snvworld.org 82 67 00 682 / 82 727 6032	