Evaluation of Oxfam Canada's
Capacity Assessment Tools - Final Report

Revised version submitted to the Program Impact Unit
October 14, 2020
Megan McGlynn Scanlon (evaluation team lead) with
Nelti Anggraini and Muhammad Rahimuddin

Acknowledgements

We have not named individuals or their organizations in the report in order to preserve the confidentiality promised during our interviews. However, this evaluation was only possible with the time and support of the twenty individuals representing civil society and women's rights organizations that partner with Oxfam Canada-funded projects Creating Spaces, Sexual Health and Empowerment, and Women's Voice and Leadership-Pakistan. Similarly the efforts and inputs of Oxfam staff in Indonesia, Pakistan, and the Philippines and of Oxfam Canada's Program Impact Unit and project teams were necessary to make the evaluation happen, and to our understanding of the broader context for the experiences partners conveyed to us.

Megan McGlynn Scanlon wrote the report, based on interviews Nelti Anggraini, Muhammad Rahimuddin, and she conducted. Ms. Scanlon takes full and final responsibility for the analysis of evaluation data and other information contained here.

Contact
Megan McGlynn Scanlon
Evaluation Team Lead
megan.scanlon@gmail.com

Table of Contents

Acronyms

5Cs	5 Capabilities
AKF	Aga Khan Foundation
CAT	Capacity Assessment Tool
CAT4EVAWG	Capacity Assessment Tool for Ending Violence Against Women and Girls
CAT4GJO	Capacity Assessment Tool for Gender Just Organizational Strengthening
CAT4SRHR	Capacity Assessment Tool for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Programming
COVID-19	Novel Coronavirus
CS	Creating Spaces
CSO	Civil society organization
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EC	Engendering Change
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
EQ	Evaluation question
EVAWG	Ending Violence Against Women and Girls
FGD	Focus group discussion
FOCS	Feminist Organizational Capacity Strengthening
GAC	Global Affairs Canada
GAL	Gender Action Learning
GJO	Gender just organization
HFHC	Her Future Her Choice
IDF	Institutional Development Framework
IPD	International Programs Department
KII	Key informant interview
LOE	Level of effort
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning
MSC	Most Significant Change

MSI	Management Systems International
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OCA	Oxfam Canada
OPI	Organizational Performance Index
PIU	Program Impact Unit
RFP	Request for Proposals
SHE	Sexual Health and Empowerment
SRHR	Sexual and reproductive health and rights
TOF	Training of Facilitators
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VAWG	Violence against women and girls
VCAT	Values Clarification and Attitude Transformation
WRL	Women's Rights and Leadership
WRO	Women's rights organization

Terms

Benchmarking is a process of comparing an organization or service model against others known to perform at a high level while pursuing similar objectives, with aim of identifying areas for improvement.

Capacity strengthening is a process whereby the structures, policies, procedures, and programming of an organization, institution, collective, or network become more effective at supporting the entity to further its goals and objectives. The terms "capacity building" and "capacity development" are often used interchangeably with "capacity strengthening;" OCA prefers capacity strengthening as the former have been used to devalue local knowledge and experience and reinforce power dynamics in development.

Conceptual Framework refers to OCA's 2012 publication *The Power Of Gender-Just Organizations: A Conceptual Framework For Transformative Organizational Capacity Building*.

Feminist approach as defined by OCA's CAT4GJO is one that goes beyond targeting women and girls to address the root causes of gender inequality. These root causes persist through unequal systems of power and harmful social norms, especially patriarchy, that perpetuate inequalities between women, men, and people of diverse sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. A feminist approach seeks to change these power dynamics; takes into account the multiple forms of discrimination that different women, in all their diversity, face; supports women's agency and decision making by recognizing, valuing, and supporting their leadership; and commits to a project design and implementation process reflecting feminist principles and values.

Feminist principles. OCA has ten feminist principles, listed in the CAT4GJO as follows: Support transformative change; recognize power and privilege; put women's rights actors at the centre of our work; honour context and complexity; celebrate diversity and challenge discrimination through an intersectional approach; nothing about me without me; do no harm; balance learning and accountability; support knowledge for transformative change; and commit to organizational transformation.

Gender Justice as defined by OCA's CAT4GJO is the goal not only of full equality but also equity between women, men, and people with diverse sexual orientation and gender identity and expression in all spheres of life, resulting in women, in all their diversity, jointly and on an equal basis with men defining and shaping the policies, structures, and decisions that affect their lives and society as a whole. In this sense gender justice requires fundamentally transforming gender and power relations, as well as the structures, norms, and values that underpin them.

Program for OCA refers to technical areas in which the institution works; the International Programs Department has program teams focused on sexual and reproductive health and rights, ending violence against women and girls, and women's economic empowerment and transformative leadership.

Project for OCA refers to a single, planned piece of work that is implemented under a program area. They typically represent distinct funding agreements with Global Affairs Canada.

Safeguarding according to OCA's CAT4GJO refers to an organization's responsibility to make sure their staff, operations, and programs do no harm to children and vulnerable adults, uphold their rights and avoid exposing them to the risk of violence, harm and abuse. A given organization also has a duty to protect its staff, volunteers, consultants, and partners from sexual harassment and bullying by others within the organization.

Toolkit refers to OCA's 2012 publication *The Power of Gender-Just Organizations: A Toolkit for Transformative Organizational Capacity Building*.

Women's transformative leadership according to OCA's CAT4GJO means leadership on gender and diversity and the capacity to nurture leadership. Women hold decision-making positions and/or have the confidence, capacity, and opportunity to influence an organization's agenda. Within women's and feminist organizations, fostering women's transformative leadership may mean supporting processes that explore the characteristics of feminist leadership, particularly in relation to core values and respecting differences.

Executive Summary

Since 2009, Oxfam Canada (OCA) has used a suite of Capacity Assessment Tools (CAT) in its projects aiming at strengthening civil society and women's rights organizations (CSOs/WROs) as gender just organizations. Between May-September 2020, a team of three independent consultants conducted a feminist, utilization-focused evaluation of the CAT process commissioned by OCA's Program Impact Unit (PIU). The evaluation aimed understand Oxfam's CSO and WRO partners' perceptions of the CAT process and how it could improve.

The team conducted 20 semi-structured key informant interviews with CSO/WRO representatives, consulted with 27 Oxfam and CSO/WRO staff, and conducted a series of focus groups with OCA staff. In addition the team conducted extensive desk review including to benchmark OCA's approaches to comparative self-assessment and capacity strengthening models. In keeping with feminist principles and core concerns behind the evaluation, data collection and analysis centred the perspective of OCA's local partner CSOs/WROs and to some extent the perspectives of Oxfam country teams familiar with the CAT process.

Findings from the evaluation suggest that partners have generally positive views of the CAT self-assessment workshop and the potential for the process to positively affect their organizations in a sustainable way. Partners found value in the workshop itself and in the values clarification discussions in some versions of the CAT. They were engaging in capacity strengthening activities with their own resources in the absence of or while waiting for OCA support to be available. Trainings that Oxfam provided to cohorts of partners in response to common capacity strengthening needs did not leave an impression.

Among informants who used or were familiar with other self-assessment methods, most preferred the CAT workshop or saw it as complementary to tools in use at their organizations. Still others noted that organizational self-assessments are a common approach on which they were happy to be getting experience for the first time. These positive reactions centred mostly on the self-assessment methodology, holistic organizational focus, and/or action learning orientation of the CAT. Four informants familiar with other capacity self-assessment tools cited the overall gender justice focus and/or the specific technical content as unique.

The evaluation identified a number of ways in which the CAT process was or was not meeting partners' needs related to the CAT manuals, workshop plans, workshop facilitation, the online data visualization/storage tool, planning and budgeting following a self-assessment, ongoing monitoring and evaluation, and support systems for the CAT process. Partners valued the participatory method and way in which it brought individuals from different functions in the organization together to discuss capacity priorities. One particular concern was ownership of the

process. Partners did not have a choice to participate and had diverse needs and preferences for the content of the tool and workshop plans that were not being fully met.

Informants were positive about workshop facilitation particularly when facilitators knew the organization and the CAT material well. Possession of regional language skills was important for some facilitators as well as workshop documenters. Findings support training CAT workshop facilitators, as well as workshops documenters. The online tool was not working well, including because it focused on numerical scores rather than full process documentation which informants felt was important.

Despite positive workshop experiences, findings suggest room for improvement in Oxfam's follow up from the self-assessment workshops. OCA communications to country teams and to partners about the process and plans post-workshop happened in a piecemeal way, if at all. Informants including Oxfam country staff were unclear about what should be taking place outside the initial self-assessment workshop, why, and how best to support it. Negative consequences due to the lack of clarity and communication ranged from delays and frustrations in finalizing capacity strengthening plans to damaging partners' trust in Oxfam's responsiveness to partners' priorities. Partners were not aware of expectations to conduct regular self-monitoring of capacity strengthening progress.

Overall, the evaluation recommends OCA continue to use the CAT in its projects. Based on the findings, feedback from informants, OCA FGDs, and benchmarking, the evaluation discussed 39 recommendations OCA should consider making to enhance its capacity strengthening approach overall, of which the CAT is a part. These relate to institutional knowledge and leadership, foundations of OCA's capacity strengthening approaches, ongoing learning, partner ownership, managing the donor funding context, accessibility to participants, gender justice content, facilitation, workshop documentation, strategy & planning, capacity strengthening resources and approaches, and monitoring and evaluation. As detailed in an annex providing action planning guidance, 31 of the 39 recommendations on modifications require low levels of effort by OCA and associated costs are project recoverable. The remaining recommended modifications require varying levels of effort, though only three to five of them may require use of unrestricted funds.

While there is work for OCA to do in order to align with general good practices in capacity strengthening, the benchmarking process also showed that capacity strengthening guided by feminist values is not common. This is particularly true within an international donor-funded context. This suggests that OCA has potentially valuable contributions to make from continuing to pursue and refine its capacity strengthening approaches. Before marketing the CAT, OCA should complete prerequisites suggested by OCA staff that overlap with recommended modifications. The evaluation recommends forming a learning community within Oxfam and/or with like-minded organizations on feminist capacity strengthening over marketing at this stage.

Introduction

Since 2009, Oxfam Canada (OCA) has used a suite of Capacity Assessment Tools (CAT) in its projects aiming at strengthening civil society and women's rights organizations (CSOs/WROs) as gender just organizations. In May 2020 OCA's International Programs Department (IPD) through its Program Impact Unit (PIU) commissioned an evaluation of the CAT. OCA was at a decision point about whether or not to continue to build CAT into its projects, what modifications might be necessary to increase impact and effectiveness of the tools, and whether there might be value to others in external marketing and promotion of the tools.

A team of three independent consultants, Megan McGlynn Scanlon, Nelti Anggraini, and Muhammad Rahimuddin, conducted the evaluation between May-September, 2020. The team is referred to as the evaluation team or the team throughout the report. Team members have expertise in organizational capacity strengthening as well as social research experience in several of OCA's program geographies. This helped to shape the approach of the evaluation as well as the analysis and recommendations. Additional background on the team appears in Annex B.

The evaluation was participatory, utilization focused, and aligned with feminist evaluation principles.[1] The evaluation aimed to produce actionable recommendations for OCA, particularly the IPD, well-supported by data. At the same time in keeping with feminist principles and core concerns behind the evaluation, data collection and analysis centred the perspective of OCA's local partner CSOs/WROs and to some extent the perspectives of Oxfam country teams familiar with the CAT process.

Description of the project

The "tool" in capacity assessment tool refers to workshop manuals OCA-funded projects use to guide project partner CSOs/WROs through self-assessments of their organizational capacities and prioritization of action steps for capacity strengthening. The capacities that organizations assess while working through the CAT manuals are ones that OCA has "identified as central to building strong, effective organizations with the capacity to advance women's rights and gender justice."[2] Diverse staff of an organization, and occasionally volunteers and Board members, participate in the 2-3 day workshop. Facilitators may be Oxfam staff or contracted for the task and have a role to be "critical friends" in the workshop to help partners reflect on their own capacities and behaviours.

---

[1] Miller & Haylock, 2014; Patton, 2012.
[2] CAT4GJO Manual p.7. Note these organizations need not be women's rights organizations; OCA explicitly aims in some of its projects to work with organizations which are not WROs but still wish to support women's rights and gender justice.

Based on the results of the participatory discussion, partners identify priorities for capacity strengthening. Following the workshops, partners are meant to plan and carry out capacity strengthening activities tailored to the needs and strengths they identified. OCA projects plan for partners to carry out three such facilitated workshops, at the beginning, midline and endline of a project, to help partners monitor progress and adjust their capacity strengthening plans. In between, manuals suggest partners do annual, lighter self-assessments and that project staff monitor partners' progress against capacity plans.[3] Beyond that rule of thumb, resources and approaches for supporting CAT workshops and related capacity strengthening activities has varied considerably in practice depending on project context.

Evolution of the CAT

OCA first piloted use of a CAT during implementation of Engendering Change (EC)[4] which ran from 2009-2014 and focused on strengthening the gender justice of CSOs and WROs in diverse countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The project centred on the application and follow up of iterative rounds of gender audits, CAT "surveys," and other self-assessments.[5] Oxfam staff directly supported partners in their capacity assessments and strengthening process. EC's Midterm Learning Review and a partner feedback survey highlighted partners' positive feelings about the CAT and its potential for impact.[6] As a result in 2012, OCA published a The Power of Gender-Just Organizations: A Toolkit for Transformative Organizational Capacity Building (the Toolkit) accompanied by a document that provided an overview of the theory behind OCA's focus on capacity strengthening for gender equality and women's rights (the Conceptual Framework).[7]

The Toolkit consisted of tools for capacity assessment (the "original CAT"), strategy development, monitoring, learning, and evaluation. The Conceptual Framework cited a number of existing capacity assessment and strengthening models though the connection to the Toolkit and the original CAT itself was not explicit. OCA staff reported they did not realize until further adaptation of the tool in 2016 that organizational self-assessment tools were common. Subsequent to EC, Power Up (Indonesia, 2017-2020) also used the original CAT; however, the project halted use of the CAT after one round of workshops due to budget concerns.

In 2016 and 2018, OCA developed iterations of the CAT with specific thematic focuses. The CAT for Ending Violence Against Women and Girls (CAT4EVAWG) for Creating Spaces (CS;

---

[3] The guidance in the CAT4EVAWG and CAT4SRHR manuals on monitoring is limited to one sentence. The Toolkit and the CAT4GJO provide specific tools namely a scoring template, framework for monitoring capacity priority areas, and suggestions for gathering most significant change (MSC) stories.
[4] Hyperlinks are to OCA documents in Box compiled by/for the evaluation team
[5] Borgman-Arboleda et al., 2014.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Note that with the CAT4GJO OCA shifted its terminology from capacity "building" to "strengthening," and the evaluation uses the latter unless directly quoting from a source that does otherwise.

Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, 2016-2021) was then subsequently used in Amplify Change (Afghanistan, 2017-2022). The CAT4EVAWG adapted the original CAT by drawing on an International Centre for Research on Women assessment tool focused on VAWG. An online platform was rolled out with the CAT4EVAWG, and later incorporate a tool for the CAT4SRHR, to provide visual representations of scoring during the workshops and for permanent storage and comparison of workshop scores over time.

The CAT for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Programming (CAT4SRHR) was first developed for Sexual Health and Empowerment (SHE; Philippines, 2018-2023) and was subsequently built into Her Future, Her Choice (HFHC; Ethiopia, Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia, 2019-2023).[8] The CAT4SRHR built on the CAT4EVAWG by updating the scoring approach, adding a values clarification and attitude transformation (VCAT) component, and incorporating SRHR-related content adapted from Jhpiego, Ipas, and the International Planned Parenthood Federation. OCA developed a Training of Facilitators (TOF) for roll out of the CAT4SRHR in response to internal lessons learned during use of the CAT4EVAWG.[9]

In 2019, as part of securing funding for two projects under Global Affairs Canada's (GAC) multi-country Women's Voice and Leadership (WVL) funding stream (Pakistan, Guatemala, 2019-2024), OCA developed the CAT for Gender-Just Organizational Strengthening (CAT4GJO) and an accompanying TOF. The CAT4GJO used the CAT4SRHR structure and updated the content of the original CAT, adding capacity domains and adapting content from African Feminist Forum, Ariadne, Artemisa, BRIDGE, AWID, CHS Alliance, CREA, Elige, Gender at Work, and the Global Fund for Women. It subsequently applied the CAT4GJO in Camino Verde (Guatemala, 2019-2024) and Securing Rights (Bangladesh, 2020-2024). OCA has waited on developing an online version of the CAT4GJO while considering the future of the CAT. In 2019, it began to do so, prompting a reflection workshop within IPD in December 2019 and this evaluation.

Program theory

The 2012 Conceptual Framework provides a basis for why OCA focuses on strengthening gender just organizations and how - at a general level - use of self-assessment fits within that.[10] The theory behind OCA's use of the CAT is that CSOs and WROs are embedded in social structures and practice through which gender inequality and other forms of discrimination are

---

[8] Two organizations partnering with Oxfam on both CS and SHE did one CAT4EVAWG workshop round under CS, and subsequently under SHE used a modified version that incorporated project indicators related to SRHR projects.

[9] According to discussions with OCA staff. The original CAT did not have any formal training associated with it and the CAT4EVAWG had a brief online orientation available. Materials/communications regarding the TOF also refer to it as a "training of trainers," but training of facilitators is more accurate.

[10] Language in this paragraph is sourced from the CAT4GJO manual, between p. 9-17.

perpetuated and replicated in their own organizations. This, and other complex and often interrelated capacity issues, prevent organizations from operating in ways compatible with their missions or goals related to women's rights and gender justice. Organizational self-reflection and discussion, and organizational strengthening methodologies, support organizational structures, policies, procedures, and programming to become stronger, more effective, and gender-just. As a result, strong CSOs and especially WROs are effective agents of change related to gender equality and women's rights within the community/communities they serve and in achieving gender justice in all societies. To put it another way, OCA believes organizations do better gender justice work with their communities when their own internal structures, processes, and work are more sustainable, democratic, and gender-just. OCA considers this crucial to ending poverty and inequality.

The Toolkit accompanying 2012's Conceptual Framework describes a cycle consisting of capacity needs assessment, capacity building strategy, a monitoring system, and evaluation.[11] The Toolkit cycle goes directly from strategy to monitoring without including a step for implementation of the strategy. More recent internal materials on use of the CAT describe the cycle as "assess, discuss, identify areas for capacity-strengthening, action plan and prioritization, implement."[12]

In practice, Oxfam staff's and partners' understanding of the "CAT process" come from the current CAT manuals themselves and Training of Facilitator materials. These focus primarily on the CAT workshop rather than other parts of the cycle, though with the CAT4GJO also briefly provide guidance on monitoring. As described above, the three current tools are related, each one having built on the last. One major difference in content is the targeted technical focus of the CAT4EVAWG and CAT4SRHR compared to the CAT4GJO. While the CAT4GJO contains one capacity domain called "transformative gender justice programming and advocacy," the CAT4EVAWG and CAT4SRHR include three domains that break this down into specific programming and advocacy responses. Additionally, the CAT4GJO contains domains on women's transformative leadership and on safeguarding. Other notable differences are the VCAT in the CAT4SRHR and CAT4GJO as well as their scoring method, which is more open-ended to encourage discussion.[13]

Oxfam's role in implementation of capacity strengthening plans or more generally supporting partner organizational strengthening is undefined in the reference documents. Rather, Oxfam's

---

[11] Toolkit, p.6

[12] CAT retreat slides, 3 December 2019. According to PIU this description was originally used in SHE project orientation materials.

[13] The CAT4SRHR and CAT4GJO list suggestions for "what capacity might look like" associated with specific capacity areas. Participants discuss then produce a holistic score for their organization's performance within the whole capacity area. In contrast, the CAT4EVAWG manual presents a relatively long list of specific assessment items each of which participants score on a 4-point scale.

role beyond the workshop depends on very different project contexts. WVL Pakistan and WVL Guatemala centre on the capacity strengthening of WROs, whereas for other projects the CAT process is one among many activities with varying levels of funding available for carrying out capacity strengthening activities. In each case, Oxfam has selected capacity strengthening activities to be implemented across a cohort of partners, and encourages or directly funds some capacity strengthening by individual partner organizations.

Evaluation Framework

OCA commissioned the CAT evaluation in May 2020 as a result of internal reflection in late 2019 about whether the CAT is something OCA should continue to "hang its hat on."[14] As indicated in OCA's terms of reference (TOR) for the evaluation (see Annex C), the evaluation originally intended to determine whether OCA's use of CAT has achieved organizational strengthening of its partner civil society organizations and whether use of the CAT supports partners to become more gender just organizations. The evaluation was also intended to contribute to an understanding of whether OCA should continue to use the CAT and with what modifications. Finally, the evaluation was aimed at assisting OCA in determining the value of rebranding and marketing the CAT for a wider development audience.

During inception, the evaluation team worked with PIU to clarify the purpose of the evaluation. Given the status of OCA projects at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation team realized that it was premature to attempt to capture the effects and impact of the CAT process. Only CS partners had gone through more than one CAT workshop round. As CS budget for capacity strengthening was small, partners had done limited capacity strengthening activities. In other projects, capacity strengthening activities had mostly not started. In SHE, one of the projects from which the evaluation team sampled partners in addition to CS, most partners went through one CAT workshop by 2019, and after some approval delays were just beginning to access the project funds available for capacity strengthening activities. In WVL-Pakistan, the third sample project for the evaluation, partners went through the CAT workshop in late 2019 but did not yet have signed agreements with Oxfam and no access to funding or support for capacity strengthening activities.

During inception discussions it became apparent that a driving concern for OCA was the perspective of their partner organizations and Oxfam country teams on the CAT process. PIU and the evaluation team agreed the evaluation should focus on understanding Oxfam's CSO and WRO partners' perceptions of the process and *potential* effects, impact, and sustainability, as well as perspectives on how the CAT process could improve. The team treated recommendations related to rebranding and marketing as dependent on the perceived value of the CAT by Oxfam's partners as well as desk review comparing the tool to others available.

---

[14] CAT retreat slides, 3 December 2019.

The team and PIU agreed on the following evaluation questions (EQ) to guide data collection:

> *EQ1. To what extent have partners' definitions of success in relation to their use of the CAT been achieved?*
> *EQ2. To what extent has use of the CAT strengthened partner organizations as gender just organizations?*
> *EQ3. To what extent are the CAT tools and approaches appropriate to partners' unique needs and features?*
> *EQ4. To what extent do CAT align or overlap with other capacity strengthening approaches used by other development institutions?*
> *EQ5. What resources are required for the CAT process to be satisfactory?*
> *EQ6. To what extent do partners expect they will sustain changes resulting from the CAT in the future?*

Methodology

Evaluation methodologies were primarily qualitative, along with a limited amount of financial analysis. The primary method was semi-structured key informant interviews (KII), some of which included the collection of cost data. Consultations with Oxfam staff and initial consultations with points of contact at partner organizations had a specific logistical purpose or served to clarify a narrow set of questions from the evaluation, but formed an important data source given the historical and contextual information and perspectives that emerged. The evaluation team also held select focus group discussions (FGD) for validation of emerging findings. In addition the team conducted desk review focused on comparative capacity assessment/strengthening methodologies for benchmarking purposes and internal Oxfam documents related to the CAT process and the sample projects. Annex D contains a list of references consulted during various desk review steps.

Informants for interviews and FGDs included OCA and Oxfam country office personnel who worked on the CAT or on projects using the CAT, CAT facilitators (internal Oxfam as well as external contributors), and representatives of CSOs/WROs using a CAT. Table 1 summarizes the final breakdown across informant groups and methods. The count for initial interviews does not include inception consultations and subsequent coordination discussions with PIU, though these were also invaluable for the evaluation team's contextual knowledge.

Table 1: Data collection summary

	Consultations		KIIs (including group interviews)		FGDs	
	Data collection events	Individuals (F/M)	Data collection events	Individuals (F/M)	Data collection events	Individuals (F/M)
CSO/WRO representatives	9	9 (8/1)	20	20 (15/5)	-	-
OCA personnel	5	8 (7/1)	2	2 (2/-)	3	10 (8/2)
Oxfam country office personnel	8	10 (9/1)	5	5 (5/-)	-	-
CAT facilitators (external)	-	-	1	3 (2/1)	-	-
TOTAL	8	27 (24/3)	27	30 (24/6)	3	10 (8/2)

Within the sample projects discussed above (CS, SHE, and WVL-Pakistan), sampling of partner organizations focused primarily on balancing experiences with different project contexts. This corresponded to a balance of experience with different versions of the CAT. In coordination with Oxfam country teams, the evaluation team also sought to balance organizational scope (national versus regional), structure (network or traditional), WROs versus mixed organizations, as well as geography and types of projects. Of the nine sampled organizations, four are national organizations and five are regional organizations; three are networks and six have a traditional structures; and seven are WROs and two are mixed organizations. Six of the nine organizations are women-led.

The evaluation team initially identified a list of organizations it wished to consult based on consultations and project documentation. After this, country teams connected the evaluation team with an appropriate point of contact at the partner organization to discuss logistics. Leadership of all originally selected partner organizations consented for representatives of their organizations to participate. The evaluation team coordinated with the executive director or project manager at each sample partner to identify two individuals to interview from among the organization's CAT workshop participants. Reflecting the aim in a CAT workshop to have diverse representation among participants, the individuals from a given partner organization had distinct functions within the organization, including one with a decision making role and one with implementation responsibilities. Individual informants also gave formal informed consent to participate in interviews. The team conducted a third KII with representatives of two organizations to clarify and triangulate information.

For non-partners, the team aimed to interview one Oxfam country project team member and one facilitator per target country. Ultimately the team interviewed five Oxfam project team members,

of whom three had also facilitated CAT workshops, and conducted a group interview with three external facilitators. OCA KIIs helped to provide context for the time and effort involved in producing the tools associated with the CAT process and implementation practices. For FGDs with OCA staff, PIU invited personnel with experience with the CAT to respond to a Doodle poll. The evaluation team scheduled the FGDs at times that worked for the majority.

Interview guidelines for partners and for non-partners appear in Annex E and Annex F respectively; for FGDs, the evaluation team lead presented three to five PowerPoint slides to prompt participants' reactions and a discussion of implications for OCA. In all cases, the evaluation team conducted data collection remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic, primarily over Zoom. The team conducted interviews in English, Indonesian, or Urdu depending on the informant. The evaluation team agreed with PIU that the evaluation team would not share notes and recordings with Oxfam or attribute quotes or information cited in the report in a way that identified a specific individual or organization. This information was conveyed to informants in gaining their consent to participate in the KIIs/FGDs.

The evaluation team used a hybrid framework and grounded theory approach to analysis. Each interviewer prepared interview notes in English according to a framework structured to capture important themes for the evaluation. Direct quotes were translated/back-translated as necessary. The lead evaluator conducted grounded analysis to identify sub-themes in the interviews with partner organization representatives. She then applied the codes grounded in partner interviews to analyze non-partner interviews, producing a findings and recommendations draft as a result. The drafts were shared with informants including a version translated into Indonesian. They were then supplemented and revised iteratively based on OCA FGDs, written feedback from informants, and review of internal Oxfam documents. Finally, the team benchmarked its findings against comparative models. The discussion and recommendations section provides additional detail on the benchmarking process.

Limitations

There were several limitations that the evaluation team attempted to mitigate in various ways. Regardless, the themes and findings were consistent across the three countries and projects from which the team interviewed partners. Based on OCA FGDs and the desk review, findings also resonated with other projects and geographies.

The timing of the evaluation was not appropriate to a core question posed in the evaluation TOR, whether or not the CAT was helping OCA partners to become more gender just. As described in the methods section above, the evaluation team and PIU agreed that for purposes of the evaluation, inquiries would focus on how and whether partner representatives themselves reported their organizations were becoming more gender just, according to their own definitions. PIU originally envisioned that the evaluation team would also speak to partners on EC to see

about long-term impacts of the CAT process. This ultimately was not possible based on the advice of program officers and weighing the time and effort that would be involved compared to the likelihood of gathering robust data. However, several Oxfam staff consulted had experience on EC and the team reviewed relevant documentation. (PIU had also envisioned that the team would speak with partners of Power Up, but this was not possible due to project timing.)

The COVID-19 pandemic presented limitations in data collection. The team mitigated the usual technological challenges by being responsive to informants' preferred platform and switching platforms as needed during interactions. Whenever possible the team used video to better establish rapport and capture body language, though connectivity issues often prevented this. Recordings were especially important; in two cases when recording failed, the team relied on written notes taken during the interview, reviewed and completed them immediately after, and in one case followed up with a third individual from the same organization to triangulate partner-level findings.

The layers of coordination necessary to organize interviews and challenges connecting to the internet for some individuals limited the feasibility of the validation focus groups the team had hoped to conduct. Instead of doing FGDs with partner representatives, the team shared recommendation drafts in writing with informants and focused its FGDs on operationalizing recommendations with OCA staff. The same layers led to confusion in one case about selection of a partner organization representative for a KII. The evaluation team learned after an interview took place that the informant had not participated in a CAT workshop and had instead been referring during the KII to an experience at another Oxfam-sponsored workshop. Insights from the interview were still useful, and in addition the evaluation team conducted a follow-up interview with the organization's project officer to triangulate partner-level findings.

The evaluation team was directly contracted to OCA rather than a third party, and partners on one of the sample projects had yet to sign funding agreements with Oxfam. This caused concerns about whether informants would speak freely about their experiences. The evaluation team agreed with PIU that the team would retain possession of any recordings and notes gathered during data collection, and keep identifying information on informants, including Oxfam personnel, out of any reporting. The team conveyed this to informants while obtaining consent to be interviewed and recorded, as well as making clear that the team is made up of independent consultants not employed by Oxfam. Based on the nuanced feedback and perspectives that informants gave the evaluation team, the team believes arrangements with Oxfam did not significantly influence feedback that informants shared.

Finally, the team was unable to provide estimated budget figures to respond to EQ5 as planned. The team successfully collected some cost data, including value of time data, related to development of CAT manuals, implementation of TOFs and CAT workshops, and building and

maintaining the online tool. The team was unable to analyze the numbers in the timeframe for delivering the report due to time pressures unforeseen during inception related to the COVID-19 pandemic. With or without these estimates from the evaluation team, OCA will need to plan and budget according to its own internal formulas and processes in order to proceed on any of the recommendations. To aid in this, the team provided guidance that will be useful to OCA in attempting to allocate resources for and budget for the recommendations, likely more useful than budget estimates based on historical data collected by the evaluation team.

Findings

This section provides findings related to the six evaluation questions guiding the evaluation's data collection. First it describes findings on the overall effects, impact, and sustainability of the CAT process (EQ1, EQ2, and EQ6). Next it discusses alignment of the CAT with other approaches partners have used (EQ4). Finally, the section examines feedback regarding the extent to which CAT tools and approaches are meeting partners' needs (EQ3).

Responses to EQ3 are divided into two sections, one on the capacity needs assessment itself and another on strategy, monitoring, and evaluation of capacity strengthening. These sections correspond to the organizational capacity strengthening cycle described in Oxfam's 2012 Toolkit and in the section above on the CAT process logic. The section ends with a summary of findings regarding OCA's overall management of the CAT process.

Partial responses to EQ5, providing an indication of resources required for a satisfactory CAT process, appear in Annex A rather than this findings section. The Annex provides guidance for OCA's action planning on the recommendations discussed in the following section. It includes estimations of level of effort required by OCA and external advisors to implement recommendations as well as an indication of whether costs associated with implementing a recommendation is project recoverable.

As described above, these findings centre the perspectives of the WRO/CSO partner representatives the evaluation team interviewed, complemented with partner feedback documented in internal Oxfam reports and data. Perspectives of Oxfam staff and workshop facilitators further complement and triangulate select information and opinions conveyed by partners, as well as provide insight into internal Oxfam systems and practices related to the CAT. Analysis, and therefore the recommendations discussed in the subsequent section, focus on findings that resonated across multiple projects, tools, and countries.

Unless otherwise noted, findings throughout this section are based on informant report during evaluation KIIs or FGDs. The evaluation team triangulated findings to the extent possible with other sources as described in the methodology section. While OCA may find it helpful to reflect

on how findings align with implementation plans or procedures in its current projects, the evaluation team was not tasked to assess this. The objective of the evaluation was to identify information, most notably perspectives of partner representatives, which would help inform future OCA programming related to the CAT process.

Strengthening partners as gender just organizations (EQ1, 2, 6)

The CAT process can potentially strengthen partners as gender just organizations based on positive effects from the workshop itself and, especially, positive effects of engaging in a full process that includes implementation of capacity strengthening activities. Partners have generally positive views of the CAT workshop and the potential for the process to positively affect their organizations in a sustainable way. Current projects and partners have not yet engaged in sufficient meaningful capacity strengthening activities to draw further conclusions.[15]

In the course of the semi-structured interviews, the evaluation team had the opportunity to directly ask about half of the CSO/WRO representatives whether the CAT was worth the time and effort, and all agreed that it was.[16] Informants valued the reflective, participatory nature of the workshop. With few exceptions, they reported equitable participation in the workshops they attended. It was unclear whether this aspect of the workshop led to more equitable participation in workplace discussions overall; however, several informants commented on how helpful it was for different people with different functions in the organization to come together to discuss their organization as a whole. This and participants' knowledge of and engagement with the concepts emerged as immediate effects of the workshop itself.

> - *"I see that the finance department is no longer indifferent to the success and failure of the program. For example about activities that have not been carried out. So they are*

---

[15] The only data available to the evaluation providing evidence regarding effectiveness of the tool over time are findings from the 2014 evaluation of Engendering Change (EC), in which OCA first used the original CAT. Findings suggest that the project successfully helped to build "transformative capacity" of partners, but there is no way to distinguish what role the CAT itself played in doing so. The CAT was accompanied by gender audits and other self-assessments and had responsive, flexible funding and "accompaniment" from Oxfam focused on organizational learning and capacity strengthening.15 In addition, the project had limited comparability to current project contexts. Except WVL, OCA projects since have not been focused on organizational capacity strengthening in the same way that EC was. Moreover, funding for EC was more flexible than current GAC projects.

[16] Further support for this comes from the WVL-Pakistan CAT workshop feedback form in which all 122 respondents said that, yes, the CAT4GJO is a useful tool to assess an organization's capacity strengthening needs (Consolidated report v.8 p.54) and 117 of 122 respondents agreed or strongly agreed on the capacity of the exercise to help them reflect on their organizational practices (p.57)

> *aware too, so they are not aware only of part of the field, some say that now they are aware and can provide input related to programs.”*[17]
> - *“Even for organizations that have long [done this work], it’s a very noble tool because it’s both programmatic and institutional. It actually generated immense unity in terms of the manager and the technical personnel for support for doing something - for the first time they were able to see they were able to re-imagine their [program] capacity.”*[18]

In addition, several CAT4SRHR and CAT4GJO users made special note of the importance of the values clarification and attitude transformation (VCAT) discussions included in the tools. The VCAT were capacity strengthening activities in of themselves, as well as being important to guide the capacity discussions. One said, “*Are we a feminist organization? We are growing into that process… I considered that part of the activity very critical in shaking our foundations and allowing us to be more open in assessing and sharing, where we need to improve.*”[19] Some informants report that their organizations are taking and adapting the information in the manual to their own purposes, particularly for training and discussion modules for staff and their own local partners.

Although none had started Oxfam-funded capacity strengthening activities within their organization at the time of the evaluation interviews,[20] partner organizations reported proceeding with some capacity strengthening activities on their own. Only one of the partners reported having access to other sources of funding to support their capacity strengthening priorities, so activities were mostly limited to what partners could do with existing, internal resources. Monitoring data from CS confirm this. The project does not have funding for individual partners’ capacity strengthening activities but some partners on the project are pursuing such activities. Overall the activities are limited and face delays against competing priorities.

> - *“The system still isn’t in place and the human resources also don’t have the ability.”*[21]
> - *“I think we are more conscious about what we are not ready to do yet. We need the training - we are in fact excited and ready to have that.”*[22]

---

[17] Non-partner interview 8 [56:01]. To preserve informant confidentiality, the evaluation team randomly sorted the list of partner organization representatives and the list of people not representing partner organizations (Oxfam staff and facilitators), and assigned each interview a number according to the random order.

[18] Non-partner interview 9 [47:46].

[19] Partner interview 7 [22:47].

[20] As of the evaluation data collection, the specific partners in the sample were either part of a project without capacity strengthening subgrants for partners, did not yet have signed funding agreements with Oxfam, or had only recently gotten budget approval for their capacity strengthening plans.

[21] Partner interview 11 [48:00].

- *"If the action plan is realized, it would help us improve our [agenda]. As for now, it's already a big change that we were able to discuss these things."[23]*
- *"There were some immediate benefits … However, the major needs that were identified we have not been able to work on."[24]*

Despite these limitations, two of the nine sample organizations integrated results into subsequent leadership and planning discussions, two publicly posted information and policies within the organization, one built a women's bathroom, and another introduced a safeguarding policy and began running more inclusive staff meetings. In addition, several have used the tools for awareness-raising among their staff and partners on different aspects of the technical and values clarification content. One informant mentioned being more strategic in her own portfolio of work, though this did not represent an organization-wide change.

The COVID-19 pandemic has presented challenges, though this did not arise frequently in interviews, likely because partners in the sample had already done their workshops and were waiting on budget for capacity strengthening activities.[25] One organization raised that the pandemic was preventing them from proceeding with activities they had selected as they were only possible in person. An Oxfam staff member described how related activities were largely on hold across one project's partner cohort, or de-prioritized as organizations coped with immediate pandemic adjustments and response. The way forward under the continued uncertainty of the pandemic was not yet clear.

In addition to capacity strengthening activities partners are implementing individually, Oxfam projects are managing some capacity strengthening activities directly for their full partner cohort. These are meant to be responsive to common or shared priorities partners identify during their CAT workshops. In the sample projects, these were one-off trainings. Facilitator feedback to Oxfam after the workshops in one case encouraged peer learning related to capacity strengthening needs, in which partners in a cohort teach and learn from each other, but this is not a focus of the projects.

Limited data was available to the evaluation team to suggest whether or not the trainings Oxfam has provided for full partner cohorts has had any effect. Informants on relevant projects either were not aware Oxfam had implemented training linked to the CAT, or assumed the topics were based on Oxfam's project priorities rather than linked to the partner self-assessments. In one

---

[22] Partner interview 3 [45:50].

[23] Partner interview 7 [1:12:50].

[24] Partner interview 18 [ca 40:00].

[25] The impact of the pandemic or mitigation strategies was not a specific area of inquiry for the evaluation. Except in a few cases, informants for the evaluation did not discuss the pandemic in terms of the impact on use of the CAT or capacity strengthening.

case, the latter was true even when the organization was taking action on the basis of the training:

> *"Oh that? That was also at Oxfam's request. ... Oxfam wanted to have a workshop [on this issue]. We just finished participating in the workshop. And Oxfam's plan is that after participating in the workshop we will want to prepare [a policy] internally, but this is still in process, it has nothing to do with the CAT. "[26]*

Alignment with other capacity strengthening approaches (EQ4)

Among informants who used or were familiar with other assessment methods, most preferred the CAT or saw it as complementary to tools in use at their organizations. Still others noted that organizational self-assessments are a common approach on which they were happy to be getting experience for the first time. These positive reactions centred mostly on the self-assessment methodology, holistic organizational focus, and/or action learning orientation of the CAT. Four informants familiar with other capacity self-assessment tools cited the overall gender justice focus and/or the specific technical content (EVAWG, SRHR) as unique.[27]

- *"The CAT workshop really opened our eyes to how much more we didn't know and how not capable, or not ready, not primed our staff are when faced with such situations in the field. It really jived. ... That's where we were first able to enumerate even more discreetly the kinds of training we would need."[28]*
- *"The feminist principles that are the foundation of this tool set it apart."[29]*
- *"There are several important elements in this tool, for example related to staff protection / safeguarding. Organizations in [this country] should have their awareness raised about that. Staff that work on ... women's issues face a wide variety of challenges including discrimination, threats and bullying when they push on sensitive issues. And not all organizations have a protection system when staff experience such situations. So I will continue to offer this to partners because the CAT process is good as a reminder and to care more for oneself as a woman activist."[30]*
- *"The tool is precisely the same [as the CAT] but not especially for violence against women, if the CAT can only be used for institutions that are concerned with violence against women meanwhile the [other tool] is more about organizational performance.*

---

[26] Partner interview 20 [clarified via team communications].
[27] This was not necessarily an endorsement; one of these informants said they would not recommend using the tool in the future unless it could be tailored to partners' contexts. (See more on this below).
[28] Partner interview 3 [14:32].
[29] Non-partner interview 5 [p.22 notes].
[30] Non-partner interview 4 [58:17].

> *So, [it] is stronger at looking at institutional development and there is one unit that discusses programs.''[31]*

Appropriateness to partners' needs and features (EQ3) - Capacity assessment

The evaluation also identified ways in which the CAT process is or is not meeting partners' unique needs and features related to specific aspects of the capacity assessment itself including the CAT manuals, workshop plans, facilitation, workshop documentation and the online tool. Overall, the team directly asked about half of partner representatives whether they would choose to use the CAT even if it was not required for funding, and the response was enthusiastic. This positive view was confirmed by a 2019 survey of 20 CS partners.[32]

> - *"[We] should do it even if it is not required. It was a very good activity. It helps us strengthen our capacity on how we run our organization and how we develop the organization. It's a very good activity."[33]*
> - *"If given the opportunity even without the budget we would still avail it."[34]*
> - *"Definitely - it is beneficial for us because we learn from it - we will do it with our heart."[35]*
> - *"Even if it was just this workshop without the project we would have definitely done it."[36]*

This came with caveats; several informants, including one with experience on other self-assessment methodologies, conveyed that their choice of whether to use the tool would depend on their ability to adapt it to specific organizational contexts: "*The question would be, should we do the whole package knowing that not everything is relevant for us, or should we focus on certain aspects of the tool.*"[37] Others would only choose to use it if the organization had the appropriate resources to carry out the workshop (e.g., time, facilitation support).

The sample projects did not give partners a choice of whether or not to use the CAT. While leadership at almost all of the organizations sampled by the evaluation were actively engaged

---

[31] Non-partner interview 8 [30:01].
[32] All 20 respondents to a 2019 CS partners' survey reported that they would be interested in adopting the tool after the project ended and that the CAT was a useful tool to assess an organization's capacity building needs related to EVAWG and CEFM programming (CS CAT4EVAWG 2019 Partner survey data, responses to q18 and q19).
[33] Partner interview 17 50:40.
[34] Partner interview 8 85:00.
[35] Partner interview 19 35:21.
[36] Partner interview 18 58:00.
[37] Partner interview 7 [1:05:42].

and invested in the CAT process, this is likely due to the funding support associated with the CAT in two of the projects. An exception illustrates what can happen when organizational leadership does not have ownership over a self-assessment methodology. In this case, the previous executive had officially been present at a CAT workshop but spent most of the time attending to other matters. The current leadership had no knowledge of the CAT process or results: "*I received all CAT related documents from [the project officer], but I haven't looked through them and do not know what to do with the documents.*"[38]

Manual: Some informants found the CAT manual a useful reference document while others reported wishing that the language/concepts were simplified and contained more visuals. Results from OCA's 2019 survey of CAT4EVAWG users further supports the latter view: "*Some respondents did highlight that simplifying the tool would improve its effectiveness.*"[39] In places where English fluency is not common, informants reported that the manual should be fully translated into the relevant national language, a view also supported in a 2017 CAT4EVAWG facilitator survey.

- "*When the first CAT happened, the tool was also shared with us, still in the English version, and then our side asked that it be translated to ease them to understand the process because not many of them can speak English*"[40]
- "*It is all in English - if there is an orientation manual with notes and it is in [our national language] then everyone can understand it.*"[41]
- "*Since it was in English we are trying to see how to translate it into [the national language] … for our staff and board and make it into a small booklet that they can study regularly.*"[42]

Partners have a wide range of needs and preferences for the capacity areas and programming-related domains they would wish to include in their organizations' self-assessment process. These needs/preferences were unique to each organization without a discernible pattern across tools or projects.[43] For instance, some informants valued the CAT4EVAWG and CAT4SRHR for their focus in specific technical areas while others using those tools wanted something that reflected their work on multiple, interlinked issues. Conversely, some using the CAT4GJO wished to introduce specific technical content, while others appreciated the broad focus. A number of informants across all three current CAT versions conveyed that the tool fit the needs of the Oxfam project rather than those of their organization.

---

[38] Partner interview 5 [clarified via team communications].
[39] CS annual report Y4 2020,p.54.
[40] Partner interview 11 [Ca. 39:00-46:00].
[41] Partner interview 8 49:00.
[42] Partner interview 10 19:00.
[43] No conclusions can be drawn based on size or scope of organizations either, particularly given the sampling limitations described in the methods section.

- *"When we were going into the workshop we didn't know it would be such a detailed and fruitful exercise. We gained more than we expected and we liked it and it helped us self-assess and understand where we stand on these international standards."*[44]
- *"The domains or organizational strategies are suitable … specifically for [the Oxfam project]. There's a hope that the CAT can be used for the institution in general not only for [the Oxfam project]."*[45]
- *"I would like to see how the CAT tool would fit into a theory of change for our context."*[46]
- *"Some of the questions didn't match the conditions of the partner institutions, our partners are already advanced, especially in the advocacy strategy section, they are already well advanced. Maybe it's best if OCA differentiates tools for new institutions and for established ones."*[47]
- *"I think we would have to look at all the indicators again and then decide which were the most relevant for us, and we would have the discussion on those areas. There were items there that were not a part of our mandate. So it would be mandate-mandated. That would be the process."*[48]

Relatedly, some informants saw the existing scoring scales/suggestions for "what capacity might look like" as inappropriate to the characteristics of specific organizations, particularly their scope, structure, or organizational maturity. One person said the scoring statements were "*too Northern biased.*"[49]

Document review supports these findings. Facilitator reflections following one workshop noted that the partner, with decades of relevant experience and activism, "*raised pertinent insights that can contribute to sharpening and calibrating the capacity areas.*"[50]A 2017 survey of CAT4EVAWG facilitators concluded that the tool should "*allow for customization for local contexts [and] add some capacity areas;*" one respondent noted that "*many of the assessment rating [sic] do not fit small grassroots organizations.*"[51] Analysis of a partner the same year reached similar conclusions, adding a recommendation to "*deal with multi-layered organizations … and account for differences whether organizations deliver services or not.*"[52] A survey of 20

---

[44] Partner interview 18 45:30.
[45] Partner interview 11 [36:00].
[46] Partner interview 1 [ca 1:00].
[47] Non-partner interview 8 [52:57].
[48] Partner interview 7 [1:09:26].
[49] Non-partner interview 4 [50:56].
[50] Workshop notes for SHE CAT process.
[51] CS CAT4EVAWG 2017 Facilitator survey results, p.5.
[52] CS CAT4EVAWG 2017 Partner survey results, p.11.

partners in 2019 confirmed the diverse preferences of partners and several commented that the tool was project-oriented rather than useful for their organization as a whole.[53]

Relevant informant feedback shows a preference for the scoring approach in the CAT4SRHR and CAT4GJO compared to that in the CAT4EVAWG. While there was little direct discussion of this in the evaluation sample, the finding is further directly supported by feedback in the 2017 CS CAT4EVAWG facilitator survey. One informant who used the CAT4EVAWG wished for a tool with more open-ended questions because the lack of flexibility in the structure discouraged discussion. Others, using a range of CAT manual versions, emphasized the importance of the discussion process over the scores themselves:

> *"What cannot be ignored is the discussion process that occurs when they discuss each statement point, so there is a dialogue, and the contents of the dialogue - the contents are reflection: 'oh,' they think, 'oh so we better be like this.' ... That process is the added value of this tool, not just the results of the assessment."[54]*

In addition, as described above, several CAT4SRHR and CAT4GJO users made special note of the importance of the VCAT discussions included in their manuals.

Workshop plans: According to both partner representatives and facilitators, partners had varying preferences and needs in terms of participants, timing, venue, scheduling, pacing, and other logistics for their workshops. This was based on a combination of factors including organizational structure, geographical reach, lines of accountability, varying levels of knowledge on key discussion topics, cultural context, and timing against major holidays or the organizational calendar. Despite this, Oxfam projects established workshop timing, schedule, participant caps and in some cases venue. When there was adaptation to partners' needs and preferences, this was based on case-by-case "negotiation" (as several informants put it) initiated by the partners.

- *"I was not really privy to the processes for the CAT, beyond that I needed to have dates and find participants."[55]*
- *"We received emails and phone calls to explain what the exercise will be and its purpose but not the opportunity to make changes to it."[56]*

---

[53] CS CAT4EVAWG 2019 Partner survey data, responses to q20 on how the tool or exercise could be improved.
[54] Non-partner interview 8 [56:01].
[55] Partner interview 7 [51:55].
[56] Partner interview 10 [19:00].

As a result, some informants reported doing workshops in conditions that negatively impacted the workshop (e.g. long days during a fasting season, during an office move). Consolidated feedback from participants in WVL-Pakistan workshops notes that:

> *"The workshops were organized in their office premises. However, the offices [sic] spaces were mostly not well-equipped and spacious to facilitate such workshops … Workshops were conducted in extreme winter. In WROs, heating arrangements were mostly inadequate, eventually, participants faced difficulties in coping with weather."[57]*

Others reported not being able to involve key individuals or involve facilitators sufficient to the size of the group because of budget constraints for the workshop, while others on the same project reported under-spending their workshop budget. In some cases, facilitation approach and group structure had to change partway through a workshop for predictable cultural reasons not anticipated in facilitation guidance, such the need for women-only spaces. Some informants would have preferred a condensed work-into-evening schedule while others wanted to space discussions out.[58] Some liked doing the workshop at their office, while others preferred a conference centre to allow them to focus without distractions. Some informants regretted that workshops were not timed to feed into organizational planning and decision making cycles.

Individuals' and organizations' diverse baseline understanding of concepts for discussion affected informants' preferences for the timing and pacing in the workshops. Some suggested a pre-workshop orientation on the approach and concepts to ensure a productive discussion. Others felt their second workshop was easier and more productive because they had not understood the material during the first workshop. At the same time, others reported needing less time than Oxfam had scheduled to grapple with the material, even on their first workshop round. According to desk review, one SHE partner skipped the VCAT entirely due to their long history in SRHR activism.

Facilitator qualifications: Informants were generally positive about the facilitation of their workshop. The importance of facilitators having knowledge of and trust with the organization emerged as the most important qualification of successful facilitators. Several informants mentioned it as a specific positive. Others critiqued facilitators' lack of organization-specific knowledge or alluded to a lack of trust between the organization and the facilitators. One informant from an organization that did not select its own facilitator shared a concern that the facilitators were being "*a bit dictatorial*" as representatives of a donor agency, which unsurprisingly reduced participation initially: *"We have to be careful because - donor is always*

---

[57] Consolidated report v.8, p. 50.
[58] In one project not in the evaluation sample, OCA staff shared that partners advocated going to a 5-day schedule for their workshops.

right."[59] Skills in managing participatory processes (and in some cases, difficult conversations) and an ability to explain the CAT process and concepts also emerged as important facilitator qualifications. (See additional points below on language skills.)

These themes were consistent across interviews with partner representatives and facilitators themselves. The WVL-Pakistan consolidated workshop report, prepared by the facilitation team, notes that only one of them was "*familiar about capacity assessment related to gender just organizational framework. Hence, without [TOF] it would not have been so easy to roll out the workshops.*"[60] From the small sample available for the evaluation, it did not appear to matter if a facilitator was Oxfam staff or external as long as the other qualities applied.

> - *"The facilitators were good, they understood the topic and also they already knew us. If there was something we didn't understand well or that was confusing from the concepts being discussed, the facilitators were able to clarify so that they were more easily understood."*[61]
> - *"She had a very good grasp of the topic but could have been better if we had a facilitator who had more knowledge of our organization."*[62]
> - *"The facilitators were not very well prepared in terms of the theory of change of the content and other relevant theories [related to women's rights/empowerment]."*[63]

Informants with specific feedback on the priority setting portion of the workshop commented on the challenge of reconciling the viewpoints of workshop participants with different functions in an organization. This was satisfactorily resolved for the organization that had a facilitator who knew the organization well, but remained a lingering concern for other organizations: **"***We were sort of left on our own.*"[64]

Facilitator training and development: Feedback from facilitators who had access to a TOF was positive. SHE, WVL, and HFHC TOF documentation reflect positive feedback from participants immediately following the training. The positive impressions held up during evaluation KIIs after multiple rounds of facilitation. This confirms OCA's internal lessons on the need for such a training based on experience and facilitator feedback following application of the CAT4EVAWG, for which facilitators only had access to a brief webinar-style orientation.[65] In

---

[59] Partner interview 8 [28:00].
[60] Consolidated report v.8, p.51.
[61] Partner interview 9 [p. 9 notes].
[62] Partner interview 16 [30:19].
[63] Partner interview 1 [33:20].
[64] Partner interview 3 [16:20].
[65] CAT Retreat slides; 2017 CS CAT4EVAWG facilitator survey results.

addition to attending the TOF, informants expressed the importance of individualized preparation for each workshop, which comes through in desk review of TOF feedback as well.

Projects capture feedback on the workshops and facilitation quality in different ways. CS used anonymous online surveys of partners. WVL-Pakistan and HFHC used individual participant workshop evaluation forms. For SHE and WVL-Guatemala facilitators solicited participant feedback directly, to a limited extent.[66]

Facilitation language: Facilitation in national languages is essential. In some contexts, there was also a need or preference for facilitators with relevant regional language skills. Facilitators' lack of regional language abilities became a barrier to effective workshop facilitation when participants did not speak the national language well. Even when the national language was mutually understood, facilitators' ability to explain concepts in regional languages aided participants' comprehension and discussion.[67]

- *"During the discussion we were also using [our national language], little bit of English, and using our local dialect. So it is easy to understand all questions and concepts presented to us."[68]*
- *"[Our local language] would be better since there are women who do not understand [the national language] in our organization."[69]*
- *"It helped a lot if we have some knowledge of the language spoken by the participants."[70]*

Facilitator engagement: Facilitator terms of engagement focus on one workshop cycle, and focus narrowly on the workshop itself with limited time for preparation and follow up. Facilitators were not aware of expectations to stay engaged for future workshops.[71] In practice, Oxfam contracted and set expectations for external facilitator engagement that only included the workshop and immediate reporting. Oxfam staff that served as facilitators did it as an add-on to their usual job responsibilities.

---

[66] For two other active projects, it was unclear whether any participant feedback was solicited. Responses to a request for participant and facilitator feedback netted workshop reports without this information included.

[67] According to desk review this came out in WVL-Guatemala as well, in which facilitation occurred in both Spanish and K'iche'.

[68] Partner interview 14 [20:12].

[69] Partner interview 4 [12:30].

[70] Non-partner interview 2 [ca 1:20:00].

[71] The CAT manuals call for, "if at all possible," organizations to "choose a facilitator who would be available for follow-up CAT4GJO workshops at later stages so that they can maintain their involvement over the course of several years." (p.22 CAT4GJO).

- *"The time allotted for planning was quite short, planning was done quite quickly and mostly on general issues only. And we had an understanding - and it's also clear in the manual - they would have to go back and plan -but my engagement was for the workshop only, I don't know if they were able to follow up."[72]*
- *"I think a good thing is that we had TOF and we had facilitators who would do those workshops - couldn't imagine giving it to [our office] and there's a lot of work. Really good idea to employ external facilitators."[73]*

Workshop documentation: Facilitators and Oxfam personnel emphasized the importance of documentation to capture the rich workshop discussions. Among other reasons, at least one current OCA project is using CAT workshop notes as qualitative data for its baseline, though participants were not aware of this requirement or the intensity of the notes template during preparations for the workshops. Relatedly informants pointed to a need for workshop documenters to possess relevant regional language skills and training on the documentation template, which is supported by desk review.[74]

- *"Some of the organizations were only comfortable in speaking in local languages ... for reporting especially this became an issue since the reporter needed to sit down separately with the group members to understand in [national language] what was discussed."[75]*
- *"We really had to rely on the documenter. ... And she helped me to translate tools into [local language]."[76]*

Online tool: Most relevant partner representatives had no specific memory of the online tool, as only their facilitators accessed it.[77] In addition, in most workshops in the evaluation sample, the online tool did not work due to connectivity or problems with the app itself. (This is not true for all partners or projects based on Oxfam staff interviews and document review; however, it was true for almost every individual in the evaluation sample with knowledge of the online tool.)

---

[72] Non-partner interview 2. [1:12:00].

[73] Non-partner interview 3 [Ca. 59:00].

[74] The WVL-Pakistan CAT4GJO training proceedings noted a discussion in which OCA staff suggested that "*the documenter could be local (if language questions), could be co-facilitation roles/ share documentation. It is best if the documenter can also be familiar with the CAT in terms of context*" (p.18). Feedback from participants for the same training included "*pre-determine the different reporting templates for the facilitators*" as an area for improvement (CAT4GJO TOT Summary of Evaluation responses, p.2).

[75] Non-partner interview 1 [ca 57:00].

[76] Non-partner interview 6 [1:16:32].

[77] However, CS 2017 facilitator and partners survey findings suggest that at least 80% of CS partners at that time had their own log in information to the CAT4EVAWG platform.

Some were frustrated that they could not get a hold of tech support during and after the workshop when the app itself was glitchy.

Informants anticipated the connectivity problems. In fact, one informant using the CAT4GJO expressed being glad that the tool did not require internet or computing equipment, so that it could be implemented anywhere. Some prepared for the workshop hoping to use the online tool but expecting it not to work. Some appreciated the potential of the visualization aspects of the tool as well as the ability to instantly and permanently store workshop results. However the problems accessing and using the tool did not materially detract from the workshop discussion.

Related to the importance of the workshop documentation, informants' concerns with the online tool included the lack of narrative content: *"In the online platform we only input numbers, while the richer records ... don't appear on the online platform.*[78] In addition, the tool is only available in English. It also lacks flexibility to skip or adapt domains/capacity areas that were irrelevant to the partner or provide contextual notes for the scoring: *"So, it's the partners that must follow the tool, not the tool that follows them."*[79]

Appropriateness to partners' needs and features (EQ3) - Strategy, monitoring, and evaluation

The evaluation identified a variety of ways in which stages of the process following the self-assessment itself met, or more often, did not meet partners' needs. Each project managed the transition from workshop priority setting, to full capacity planning, to activity implementation and self-monitoring differently. OCA communications to country teams and to partners about the process and plans post-workshop happened in a piecemeal way, if at all. Most informants including Oxfam country staff were unclear about what should be taking place outside the initial self-assessment workshop, why, and how best to support it: *"What was not considered was what happens after the workshop. This is where the majority of the work happens."*[80] This lack of clarity and communication had a range of negative consequences, ranging from delays and frustrations in finalizing and approval of capacity strengthening plans to damaging partners' trust in Oxfam to be responsive to partners' priorities.

Planning and budgeting: Oxfam provided partners with limited support in creating capacity strengthening plans or in identifying appropriate activities. This was challenging for partners that did not know how to go about identifying activities or providers that might be appropriate to meet their needs. The manuals only include a suggested, generic checklist of options. On one

---

[78] Non-partner interview 4 [ca. 50:56]. Both versions of the online tool focus on numeric scoring without process or context notes in the case of the CAT4EVAWG tool and with room for brief notes in the CAT4SRHR tools.

[79] Non-partner interview 4 [p. 17 notes].

[80] Non-partner interview 3 [Ca 13:12].

project Oxfam eventually engaged an external consultant with organizational development expertise to support a small group of partners to revise their plans:

> *"In the tool there are some sample activities, but looking at it now I think it is one of the gaps - it is one of the main challenges, translating the needs into specific activities ... During that time, we were discussing that we really need someone with that strong background in organizational development. Really someone who can drive them in their organizational development thinking. During the [workshop] - we need the [technical] knowledge - but then after the process, we needed the organizational development background."[81]*

Moreover, partners received guidance on budget limits, allowable items, and appropriate allocations only after the workshop priority setting activities -- or in some cases in response to fully drafted capacity strengthening plans. Some partners learned that Oxfam would not be providing funding for their capacity strengthening activities only after their CAT workshops took place. In part this raised concerns about whether Oxfam's capacity strengthening approach aligned with their needs, most notably in the area of organizational sustainability.

- *"The CAT has been carried out twice in [our] office, but afterwards there has been no follow up."[82]*
- *"In three years you will leave again and we will be in the same state. Then we will be looking again, and approaching a donor is also very difficult. Before they [donors] used to look at work, now they look at software or policies - even if the implementation of the policy isn't there."[83]*
- *"Within the Oxfam team, there was a difference, but it got lost in the tool - it wasn't part of the tool...And maybe that led to the expectation of partners - [the plan produced in the workshop] is the plan that will be funded. The work plan was an afterthought."[84]*

The lack of guidance on process and capacity strengthening activities and delayed budgeting guidance led to unexpectedly long approval processes for the projects with budget for activities, focused on meeting Oxfam expectations and compliance standards. In some cases partners had to revisit or abandon the initial priorities and plans that they had already agreed on internally during their workshops. Only one partner representative indicated that Oxfam provided support or guidance for organizations to think through how to support organizational priorities that Oxfam could not fund.

---

[81] Non-partner interview 3 [Ca 29:38].
[82] Partner interview 6 [p. 9 notes].
[83] Partner interview 10 [67:00].
[84] Non-partner interview 3 [Ca 35:55].

- *"CAT means capacity self assessment and that's been done very well but now if I look at ... what we were dreaming about for capacity strengthening - given all our organization's work on project based models ... my fear is that we will do some random project activities and this project will also end without any significant change in our capacity. "[85]*
- *"As an organization we were very much consultative from the perspective of our members in terms of already setting the plans. We need to be accountable to this process and to the plans they propose. When we talk afterwards to Oxfam and they say, 'you need to prioritize only these things' we cannot just change down the recommendations that our leaders recommended to us. We have to be accountable."[86]*

Monitoring & evaluation: Existing CAT manuals lay out suggested timing for midline and endline CAT workshops as well as self-monitoring. However, none of the partners who should have completed or been about to complete a self-monitoring exercise as of July 2020 were aware this was an expectation. It may be that partners did not fully absorb the written manual, although Oxfam staff were also not clear about the expectation that partners self-monitor. In addition, representatives of at least one partner were unaware that there were plans to do another facilitated workshop in the future:

> "It's a good question actually because now I realized that it's somehow ours for the taking as well. It's not just Oxfam saying, you use this tool. It was not explicit that we can use that tool on our own. .... I'm not sure if it was mentioned that it could be regularly used."[87]

An informant with experience on other self-assessment processes expressed related concerns about the CAT timing and ownership of follow up:

> "[The other tool] was done every 6 months, and after that the partners could do it alone as a regular self assessment and we only reminded them and had the results sent to us. Whereas the CAT is done every two years, that's too long, it should be at least once a year so that it can be monitored. It can be inserted into routine institutional activities like annual meetings."[88]

OCA does not have a clear methodology for evaluating the effectiveness and impact of the CAT process. The final EC evaluation externally assessed partners' capacity using the same domains as in the original CAT through interviews, FGDs, and document review. Most current projects

---

[85] Partner interview 2 [53:00].
[86] Partner interview 7 [44:08].
[87] Partner interview 7 [1:05:42].
[88] Non-partner interview 4 [03:31].

report on related outcomes to a very limited extent, while both WVL Pakistan and Guatemala were still settling on approaches at the time of evaluation data collection. Partners and Oxfam country staff are not clear on or directly involved in this process. One partner, enthusiastic about the CAT as a self-assessment tool, thought their organization would continue using an external assessment to complement the CAT: *"We need to have external evaluators too but it can be a longer cycle."*[89]

Support systems for the CAT process

Partner representatives the evaluation team interviewed were not in a position to comment on the support systems in place, or not, at OCA/Oxfam for the CAT process. However, a few relevant findings emerged from interviews with non-partners, inferred based on themes in partner interviews, and/or confirmed in document review:
- OCA's attention is mainly on development and roll-out of tools for the CAT workshops (workshop manuals, online tool, TOF materials);
- The overall strategy or approach to capacity strengthening as a broader practice was last articulated in the 2012 Toolkit;
- There was partner feedback and piloting in development of the original CAT. OCA staff have developed subsequent CAT manuals and accompanying tools like the online platform without significant inputs from partners and without piloting or testing/iterating them before rolling them out with project partners;
- Some OCA and county team staff have experience implementing capacity assessments and technical capacity strengthening and/or have effectively facilitated CAT workshops; however, staff do not have specialized knowledge or experience in civil society/nonprofit sector capacity strengthening. Moreover while iterations of the CAT manuals have referenced other feminist assessment tools, OCA has developed and continues to implement its tools and approaches largely without integrating good practices of the broader organizational capacity strengthening field;
- If at all, lessons learned, useful materials, adaptations/translations of tools, and other knowledge and information potentially useful for other and future projects is maintained at a project or in some cases individual officer level. (For instance, the content of available workshop feedback aligns with many of this evaluation's findings, though it has not been centrally stored or analyzed until now.);
- OCA and country offices have not completed their own CAT processes.[90]

---

[89] Partner interview 7 [57:55].
[90] OCA may have started a CAT process once but did not complete it; different people gave the evaluation team different information on what occurred. Country offices are required within the Oxfam international consortium to carry out annual self-assessments though these are not gender justice focused.

Discussion & Recommendations

This section revisits the questions that prompted the evaluation, examining the findings from the evaluation's primary data collection in the context of relevant comparative models of capacity assessments and strengthening, described below. The series of focus groups with Oxfam Canada staff also served to contextualize findings and shape recommendations, as did a limited amount of feedback from informants.[91] Specific, actionable recommendations are highlighted throughout the section.

Recommendations are addressed to OCA, as the entity that commissioned the evaluation. The recommendations generally assume that IPD will continue to manage application of the CAT.[92] They also assume that IPD continues to rely primarily on Global Affairs Canada funding for project budgets but has some unrestricted funds at its disposal. As discussed in introducing the findings sections above, while the team anticipates that some recommendations may be usefully applied in current projects, they are not made with that intention. The evaluation team's task was to provide general recommendations for consideration in future OCA projects.

Benchmarking

Benchmarking is a process of comparing an organization or service model against others known to perform at a high level while pursuing similar objectives, with aim of identifying areas for improvement. As the evaluation team was familiar with a large number of overlapping tools and models that exist for organizational capacity assessments, it focused on using comparative models for the CAT relevant to Oxfam's and partners' own experience. The team first compared current practice with the ideal described by OCA itself in 2012's Toolkit, especially given that much of that knowledge and theory did not appear from interviews to be actively referenced by current projects. The team selected other models based on comparative tools that informants mentioned during interviews and citations in the 2012 Toolkit: the European Centre for Development and Policy Management (ECDPM) 5Cs framework; Pact's and Aga Khan Foundation's (AKF) Organizational Capacity Assessment and Organizational Performance Index (OPI) models; Management Systems International's (MSI) Institutional Development Framework (IDF); and Gender at Work's Analytical Framework and Gender Action Learning (GAL) methodology. The comparative models are summarized briefly below.

With the exception of the IDF, which acknowledged its own similarities to other tools that existed at the time, the comparative tools and related good practices have continued to evolve

---

[91] One informant provided detailed feedback that the evaluation team has used to revise the recommendations. Four others commented that they had nothing to add as the recommendations were thorough. There was no response from any additional informants.

[92] During EC, the CAT was adapted to and applied with humanitarian organizations though according to PIU this has not been repeated since, and was not an area of inquiry for the evaluation.

and adapt since they were first developed. The evaluation team considered the most recent guidance and information publicly available for each, as well where relevant with its own knowledge and experience of the approaches. In Pact's case, information was supplemented by USAID publications in direct dialogue with the Pact approaches. Unless quoting verbatim from a particular source, the discussion below refers generally to these models rather than one specific publication. The reference list in Annex D includes documents consulted during benchmarking.

- OCA's *Toolkit for Transformative Organizational Capacity Building* from 2012 contains the original CAT. It provides tools for a process of capacity strengthening that, in addition to assessment, includes development of the capacity building strategy, activation of a monitoring system, and evaluation leading again into needs assessment.

- ECDPM's 5Cs model developed in the early 2000s is the source for OCA's conception in the 2012 Toolkit of organizations as complex adaptive systems. At least one Oxfam staff member preferred its adaptability to the CAT. The 5Cs refers to the five interdependent "capabilities" that make up an organization's "capacity." The model provides broad guidance on how each organization should "calibrate" its capacity areas and indicators. It emphasizes the involvement of outside stakeholders, given the place of the organization within a system. The 5Cs was initially designed as a way to evaluate capacity development efforts but can also be used for planning purposes.

- Pact's and AKF's Organizational Capacity Assessment was first developed in the late 1990s followed later by the OPI. The Toolkit cites Pact's standards for capacity strengthening. The Pact/AKF capacity assessment comes with a standard set of tools and manuals that serve as a template for customizing the self-assessment to each organization. Pact/AKF use the self-assessment tool to spur ownership and action whereas the standardized OPI captures impact and allows for comparability across organizations.

- A researcher at MSI rolled out the IDF in 1996. Several Oxfam staff report using the IDF in previous roles. At least one preferred the IDF because of the customization process involved in using it with partners. The approach is no longer in wide usage. It has a similar rationale and is applied similarly to the Pact/AKF model, with some differences in its scoring system.

- Gender At Work's Analytical Framework and Gender Action Learning (GAL) approach first emerged in 1999. The Framework is included as a discussion tool in the 2012 Toolkit. It is also central to Oxfam's work on transformative leadership for women's rights.[93] The framework is a common reference for capacity tools and analysis of feminist organizations, the women's movement, and efforts at increasing gender equity within institutions. The

---

[93] Kloosterman, 2014.

Analytical Framework itself is a discussion tool, which Gender at Work applies in a multi-stage, facilitated GAL process within organizations or cohorts of organizations.

It is worth noting that Gender at Work's GAL is a much more open-ended approach than the CAT and the other models. It is also applied mostly outside a bilateral funding context, though Oxfam America has used it in past programming and recently undertook its own GAL process. However, based on the evaluation team's extensive searches in comparable programming and peer reviewed literature, there are few models and even less material publicly available on feminist self-assessment models in international development. In fact, one of the few relevant sources the evaluation team identified was a conference paper from 2009 focused on how "*gender equality is not explicitly addressed in the literature on capacity development.*"[94] Models the team was able to identify follow, and are referenced where possible in the discussion of recommendations below, though there was little to no guidance or implementation information publicly available on any of them:

- International Women's Development Association "Feminist Organizational Capacity Strengthening" (FOCS) tool combines the 5Cs approach with the Gender at Work framework, and is used on at least one DFAT Australian Aid-funded initiative.

- At least two implementing partners of GAC's global WVL window advertised for support to develop and apply self-assessment methodologies focused on women's rights organizations for WVL partners (Plan and Action Aid).

- AmplifyChange, a fund sponsored by the Danish government and several private foundations, supports self-assessments for partners working to EVAWG.

- What Works to Prevent Violence Against Women, a DFID-funded project, supports self-assessments and capacity strengthening for research organizations in the EVAWG field.

Use of the CAT moving forward

1. Continue to use the CAT, with modifications and while enhancing the capacity strengthening approach overall.

One question originally prompting the evaluation was whether OCA should continue to use CAT in its projects and projects. Informants' positive view of the tools and CAT workshops and its potential impact on partner organizations described above in the findings section suggest there is value in continuing to use the methodology. Moreover, benchmarking showed that capacity strengthening guided by feminist values is not common, particularly within an international

---

[94] Hambly & Sarapura, 2009, p.1.

donor-funded context. This suggests that OCA has potentially valuable contributions to make from continuing to pursue and refine its capacity strengthening approaches.

Modifications

Another question that originally prompted the evaluation was what modifications OCA should make in the CAT process. (This section also notes several aspects of the process that OCA should maintain based on positive feedback and/or alignment with good practice.) OCA's focus with relation to organizational capacity strengthening has been on the CAT manual and workshop. However, assessment workshops by themselves are not particularly useful outside of an effective capacity strengthening process. OCA's own 2012 publications describe a "transformative process," of which capacity assessments are one part. Pact and AKF will not proceed with self-assessments unless the organizations undergoing them have time and commitment to follow up, and unless there are resources to support this; similarly the IDF emphasizes action planning and regular follow up. The way that Gender at Work describes creating change is through the action learning process, not through reflections on their framework alone. The 5Cs was originally designed as a tool to assess the impact of -- rather than to inspire -- actions the organizations were taking.

As such, the evaluation was conducted and recommendations made with the importance of all elements of capacity strengthening in mind, not just the self-assessment. There are 39 modifications OCA should consider making to enhance its capacity strengthening approach overall. Discussion and the recommendations that emerged relate to the following topics: institutional knowledge and leadership, foundations of OCA's capacity strengthening approaches, ongoing learning, partner ownership, resources for capacity strengthening, managing the donor funding context, accessibility to participants, gender justice content, facilitation, workshop documentation, strategy & planning, capacity strengthening approaches, responding to specific capacity strengthening needs, and monitoring and evaluation.

While the number of recommended modifications may be initially difficult to reconcile with the recommendation above to continue using the CAT, thirty-one of the 39 recommended modifications below require low levels of effort to implement with any required funding expected to be project recoverable. Only five recommendations are likely to require some level of unrestricted funds. Annex A contains additional guidance to aid OCA's planning process and allocation of resources for implementation of the recommendations.

Institutional knowledge and leadership

2. Enhance internal knowledge of organizational capacity strengthening potentially through a focal point with relevant specialized background.
3. Assign an individual within OCA and country project teams with specific responsibility to track, oversee, and support capacity strengthening throughout the full process, ensuring they have dedicated time for relevant responsibilities. (This is likely not a MEAL officer function.)
4. Ensure country office project teams possess or have access to advisers with locally-specific knowledge of capacity strengthening and civil society. Working with local civil society strengthening institutions is advised when possible.

To support an update to its overall approach to capacity strengthening, OCA will likely need to enhance or supplement internal knowledge of the capacity strengthening field. As identified in the findings, OCA and country teams do not currently possess this background, except incidentally, and have not tended to draw on its decades of evidence and good practices. OCA staff directly pointed to the need for additional support in this area if the institution continues to focus on capacity strengthening as a core area of work, or "hang its hat" on the CAT process as proposed in the December 2019 reflection workshop.

Civil society capacity strengthening is a field of practice within international development that began to form in the late 1980s/early 1990s. There is a body of literature and an ecosystem of international and local institutions aimed at supporting it. Self-assessment/self-reflections are standard practice in the field, as are many of the specific recommendations below. Past missteps and many of the current areas for improvement reflected in the recommendations on modifications could likely have been avoided had OCA made use of the existing body of knowledge. For instance, the evaluation team and particularly the lead evaluator have worked extensively in civil society capacity strengthening. While the team focused on thorough and careful data analysis and benchmarking to support the recommendations included here, the team would have made many similar ones in response to its initial review of OCA's approach.

Recommendations below regarding partner ownership are particularly notable in this regard. "Nothing about us without us" is a central tenet of OCA's feminist values and was established by PIU as a central concern of this evaluation. Yet OCA has not been following common practices to ensure this in its capacity strengthening work. OCA's feminist values to "support knowledge for transformative change" and "honour context and complexity" also come to mind. Within project teams, individuals or institutions with a relevant background would be knowledgeable of local capacity strengthening providers, be able to anticipate common capacity needs and locally-appropriate approaches, and know how to facilitate planning and identify approaches in the case

of more unique or niche needs. The findings support the need for including such resources, including the case of a project team bringing some on in response to partners' challenges developing their capacity strengthening plans.

As development organizations that focus on capacity strengthening, Pact and AKF each employ one or more full time global capacity strengthening specialists and others in their country offices. They also include specialists on project teams as needed. One of AKF's principles for capacity assessments is to engage national certification or self-regulation bodies where they exist in order to work through rather than supplant local systems. In addition, a 2019 study of the effectiveness of capacity development in a DFID-funded EVAWG project found that the project's appointment of a "*dedicated capacity development manager … was critical as it meant capacity development had a champion*" to organize, communicate, and respond to partners regarding related activities.[95]

Foundations of OCA's capacity strengthening approaches

5. Update and clarify the internal rationale, principles, and process for engaging in capacity strengthening and the role of the CAT within that theory. Revisiting or updating the 2012 Conceptual Framework and Toolkit should be part of this process, but rather than focusing on doing so it would be beneficial for OCA to take a fresh look at what its ideal capacity strengthening approach should be.
6. Consider updating capacity strengthening approaches to current practices in the field, particularly better integrating capacity strengthening with OCA's existing work on systems change.[96]
7. Simply and consistently communicate the theory and approach to project teams, facilitators, local partners. On the suggestion of Oxfam staff, internal guidance should clarify responsibilities across project and MEAL functions.

As identified in findings on OCA's support for the CAT process, efforts related to capacity strengthening have been focused on tools and resources for the self-assessment workshop. This effort paid off in the positive partner feedback about the workshop itself. Tellingly, the findings about what happens beyond the initial workshop are less positive, e.g. unclear communications, no awareness of a self-monitoring process or of trainings for a partner cohort, concerns about whether OCA is responsive to partners' capacity priorities. In response to such findings, OCA

---

[95] Willan et al., 2019, p. 788.
[96] For example, one of WVL-Pakistan's immediate outcomes is "enhanced women's collective engagement and action for gender-sensitive policy change and implementation" and SHE aims in part for "improved capacity of the public and private health system." Quotes are from project implementation plans.

staff shared their experience about CAT workshops often being "a checkbox exercise."[97] OCA staff also noted challenges trying to orient new staff or partners to the approach without clear, concise communication about what it was and why OCA used it.

The Toolkit and comparable models emphasize the extent to which a self-assessment is a step in a process, rather than an end in and of itself. But although the 2012 Toolkit and Conceptual Framework are cited in CAT manuals, even OCA staff did not appear to actively refer to them. Oxfam country teams and partners also did not appear to have any knowledge of these older, foundational materials. In any case, the Toolkit and Conceptual Framework are not particularly helpful as programmatic guidance. Current workshop manuals are more practical, but only for facilitation of the assessment workshops themselves. Moreover, eight years have passed. In addition to evolution in knowledge and practices related to capacity strengthening, both within and outside of OCA, the funding context in which OCA projects are implemented has changed since EC. Given all this, it would be beneficial for OCA to step back from existing materials and take a fresh look at what its ideal capacity strengthening approach should be.

As part of revisiting the overall approach, it should be noted that current capacity strengthening good practices emphasize systems analysis and change, complemented with organizational-level assessments. A systems focus for capacity strengthening posits that strengthening organizational policies and procedures is insufficient for furthering social change goals. Social change requires organizations to effectively account for and interact with broader social, political, and cultural contexts as well as formal and informal networks. A 2018 publication described the evolution in the capacity strengthening field as follows:

> *"Historically, [capacity strengthening] has had a narrow focus: promoting the transfer of pre-determined knowledge and skills to improve the function of specific areas of an organization. Simply defined, traditional [capacity strengthening] rests on the premise that developing a requisite set of managerial, operational, and programmatic skills—and supporting organizations to achieve these skills—would lead to improved programmatic outcomes. However, ... [approaches have] shifted in recent years to a systems-based model, based on the assumption that 'increased engagement and communication between organizations, tailored to their context, generates more improvement.'"[98]*

The so-called "Capacity 2.0" models developed in the mid 2010s responded in large part to research by ECDPM on application of its 5Cs model. Gender at Work's framework and GAL inherently acknowledge and respond to systems of power, and related guidance points to system change theory as a way of understanding their approach. The Toolkit and Conceptual Framework acknowledge that organizations are part of broader systems. Yet despite the focus in OCA

---

[97] OCA staff FGDs.
[98] Jaffer et al., 2018., p6.

projects overall on systems change, they treat self-assessments and strengthening as separate to that work. Re-conceiving capacity assessment and strengthening as a systems intervention and broadening the available tools for that purpose would reduce the possibility it becomes a "checkbox exercise."

To incorporate systems thinking into OCA's approaches would mean incorporating new tools and approaches to complement the organizational self-assessment workshop. For instance, Pact's capacity strengthening tools include system mapping, network analysis and strengthening, collective impact frameworks, and use of political economy analysis in addition to organizational assessments. AKF also uses a considerable amount of systems and network mapping within its capacity strengthening work. This is also part of the thinking behind the inclusion of stakeholders from outside a given organization into their self-assessment workshops, described below. It also means use of appropriate capacity strengthening activities such as peer learning, coaching, and other active learning methodologies (see below) that help build strong networks and alliances, even as the focus may be skills within a specific organization.

Related to updating the overall approach is communicating effectively about it. None of the existing materials provide easily digestible summaries of what capacity strengthening is or OCA's rationale and process for supporting it with partners. The CAT manuals do not even provide a clear definition of capacity strengthening. OCA staff reported in the FGDs being frustrated with their inability to succinctly describe the approach to partners, country teams, and new staff. Pact in particular has several one to two page overviews publicly available of their overall capacity strengthening approach and of tools such as their online platform.

Ongoing learning

8. Centrally store CAT versions and translations, monitoring tools, feedback surveys and other knowledge materials. This repository would ideally be open to Oxfam country offices/teams if not partners themselves.
9. Introduce consistent feedback mechanisms on CAT implementation and facilitation that do not depend on the facilitators to collect and record the feedback.
10. Commit staff time and resources for OCA (either overall or within IPD) and for interested country offices to undergo their own CAT process, capacity strengthening activities and ongoing monitoring of progress.
11. Internally discuss and share strategies for COVID-19 pandemic response and mitigation as it relates to the CAT process.

As identified in the findings, there is not a mechanism or point person within OCA tasked with learning and sharing of knowledge, good practices, and other resources related to capacity strengthening across OCA's projects. Only individual projects or staff maintain knowledge

related to CAT implementation and capacity strengthening. As a result, OCA project staff reported difficulties learning about the institution's past experiences and practices in capacity strengthening (an experience the evaluation team shared when trying to access desk review material). Unfortunately, projects also do not routinely apply feedback and learning mechanisms about CAT implementation or implementation of capacity strengthening plans. What is collected is not always fully analyzed or shared beyond immediate project staff. As clear in the CAT, learning and adaptation are important organizational capacities that is difficult to do without an institutional memory of useful practices and past lessons learned.

In contrast, Pact and particularly AKF centrally compile and make available numerous handbooks, versions of their tools customized for different organizational types and translated into different languages, and other related resources in addition to their joint blended learning course on facilitating capacity assessments. Moreover to aid in continual learning and adaptation of the process, as well as provide a meaningful channel for feedback, partners should consistently have the opportunity to comment on their experiences without going through their facilitators. The 2012 Toolkit was partially inspired by a survey of partners conducted by a third party focused on civil society feedback loops to international development funders.

For further understanding of what they are asking partners to undertake, and for Oxfam's own learning and reflection, OCA staff noted that OCA itself should commit to a CAT process. In one FGD, this arose unprompted by the evaluation team. Another group suggested the time to do so might be right, now that the organization has fully committed to operating by feminist values. Notably, Oxfam America was engaging in a Gender at Work GAL process as of late 2018.

In terms of pandemic response, there were few relevant findings that emerged from the evaluation interviews; however, given ongoing pandemic conditions it would be worthwhile to share knowledge internally. SHE is developing an online resource hub and WVL-Guatemala has successfully piloted a version of the CAT workshop that can take place remotely. Guidance and lessons learned for this could be a useful model for other projects or others outside OCA.

Partner ownership
12. Give partners the option not to use a self-assessment, to use another tool, or to use the CAT in a semi-autonomous unit within the organization/network.
13. While using existing materials as standard templates to aid in the process including a version of the EC network tool, support partners (individually or in a cohort) to tailor the CAT with capacity areas and statements relevant to their needs, context, size, scope, and maturity. Support facilitators to conduct pilot testing. (*continues*)

> *Partner ownership (continued)*
> 14. Work with each partner to design a CAT workshop experience that aligns with their needs and preferences. In addition to timing aligned with planning cycles, other factors include venue, pacing/schedule, and a participant list responsive to organizational structure and governance models.

As described in the findings, partners are not given a choice about whether to use the tool and are given little say in what it entails. The Toolkit makes clear that using the tool should be based on "*voluntary participation by partners based on an understanding that future funding will not be jeopardized by either participating or declining to participate.*"[99] This is also the understood practice in the comparative models for practical reasons as well as principle; as identified in the findings above, ownership by organizational leaders is necessary for self-assessments to be useful to organizations as a whole.

Adaptation or customization of the assessment tool for and by the organization(s) using it is also standard practice as is partner-led workshop planning. Any given 5Cs "tool" is entirely created by participants based on reflection about what the five capabilities mean to their organization. Organizations typically use a mix of "prototype pointers for each capability" provided in guidance materials and their own.[100] Similarly, Gender at Work starts with broad reflection and storytelling about the organization so participants arrive at an understanding of what is working and what could change. Pact, AKF, and IDF provide templates and suggested capacity areas as starting places, but advise that each tool and workshop should be customized to suit its "characteristics, personality, and sense of where it is and wants to be."[101]

Pact/AKF's "facilitated tool design" process takes between one to three days. 5Cs guidance recommends a process of at least a half-day. Pact tends to work with cohorts of partners to do this, similar to what WVL-Guatemala is doing with the CAT4GJO. Gender at Work works with cohorts of organizations as well for a GAL process. In the rare cases when Pact uses a pre-designed tool, "*capacity assessment expert facilitators and technical experts will design the tool per country program in consultation with CSOs with experience in the relevant technical area.*"[102] Gender at Work points out,

> "*Gender regimes differ according to context and those differences matter. Importing best practices from somewhere else assumes that local actors are passive participants awaiting transformation by an outside force. Our work demonstrates the importance of*

---

[99] Toolkit p.11.
[100] Keijzer et al., 2011, p.24.
[101] Renzi, 1996, p. 475.
[102] Pact, 2018.

agency, of analysis of local gender regimes and local actors making sense of these regimes and taking action in ways that they determine are most appropriate."[103]

On its Civil Society NET website, AKF makes available in English and Russian facilitation tools and self-assessment tool templates tailored to NGOs, networks, professional associations, thematic community groups (e.g. water users or school management committees) and representative community groups. In addition it makes available 19 versions of the self-assessment tools that had been used with specific organizations, available variably in English, Tajik, Portuguese, Kyrgyz and French.

A few additional points regarding workshop planning from the comparative models include the involvement of external stakeholders for relevant discussion topics. Pact, AKF, 5Cs, and Gender at Work all call for this, in recognition of their systems orientation. In addition, all the models except IDF suggest gaining inputs from an expanded group of organizational stakeholders via surveys or pre-workshop discussions; the Toolkit says some OCA partners at the time had "*taken a trial run at completing the CAT template with a larger group of staff members than are able to participate in the meeting itself, thus ensuring that a wider range of voices are heard.*"[104]

Some OCA staff had concerns about recommending adaptation or customization of the self-assessment primarily because of questions for how they would compare results across partners and report to GAC. Another concern raised in OCA FGDs was whether the CAT could still be marketed as a "tool" if partners had versions tailored to their contexts; in this case, OCA may choose to use the terminology "methodology" or "approach" and reference evidence regarding good practice in the field. These concerns lessened when the evaluation team raised the possibility of complementing the self-assessment with a standardized measurement tool; see below. Other OCA staff, supportive of this recommendation, emphasized that a self-assessment tool is only as effective as its alignment with an organization's context, and that OCA's feminist principles call for "*nothing about us without us.*" Pact is primarily a USAID implementing partner and AKF accepts bilateral donor funding from a variety of sources, yet partner-led tool design is standard practice for their projects.

Resources for capacity strengthening

15. If resources are not available from OCA projects or partners themselves for capacity strengthening activities, do not ask partners to carry out a self-assessment. (*continues)*

---

[103] Rao et al., 2016, p.197.
[104] Toolkit, p11.

Resources for capacity strengthening (continued)
16. Incorporate into preparation for the workshop and the workshop itself transparent messaging about limitations on budget and cost items, the reasons behind them, and alternative ideas, resources, etc.
17. Support partners in identifying alternative resources to meet capacity strengthening priorities that the Oxfam project will not cover.

In the evaluation findings, it was apparent that unclear communications to partners about the availability and limitations on support for capacity strengthening activities has damaged trust. Pact and AKF will not engage partners in a self-assessment unless they or partners themselves have a commitment to and resources for follow up. They begin identifying in the assessment workshop itself what possible resources exist, from where, to meet capacity priorities. Gender at Work GAL operates on a consulting model. The 5Cs and IDF were developed for donor-funded projects centred on capacity strengthening; they assumed resources existed for follow up.

Managing the donor funded context
18. Acknowledge and internally identify pragmatic strategies for mitigating the tension between projectized, bilateral funding and a partner-led capacity strengthening process. This might include supporting self-assessments before or as an early step in project development.

To carry out a number of the above recommendations on bilateral funded projects, it will be necessary to navigate tensions between projectized funding and long-term, participatory processes of deep organizational and social change.[105] 5Cs and Pact guidance points this tension out. Donors want clear, predefined outcomes and deliverables, set strict limits on what can be funded, and expect adherence to a preapproved set of activities and timeline. These tensions are apparent in OCA staff reactions to evaluation findings such as partners' diverse needs in regards to the tool domains and concerns about limitations on what OCA can fund in response to partners' capacity priorities. According to discussions with Oxfam staff, arguably one of the reasons that Engendering Change was successful was due to the flexibility of its funding source and design.

In addition to acknowledging the tension, OCA staff offered several suggestions for navigating areas where this may arise. These should be further discussed and clarified internally but initially include making strategic use of unrestricted funding in projects or to support self-assessment before writing proposals; building in use of the CAT and funding for follow up from the

---

[105] See also e.g. Denney, 2017, Esplen, 2016, Nishimura et al., 2020.

beginning of a project; "creative budgeting;" willingness to negotiate and advocate with GAC on using the methodology in a way that is partner-led; and framing of organizational capacity strengthening as a project outcome; setting project management framework indicators appropriate to the purpose of the CAT.

Accessibility to participants

19. Fully translate into national languages relevant background reading and materials participants will engage in advance of or during the workshop.
20. Create different materials for participants and facilitators, in which the participant version is simplified to focus on core concepts and includes ample visual aids.
21. Consider the differing levels of understanding of core CAT/technical concepts that may exist among organizations and workshop participants, and consider adding an orientation or pre-workshop training for organizations/individuals that would benefit.

In order for workshop participants to fully engage in the process, it is necessary for materials and concepts to be accessible to them. Several related challenges came through in the evaluation findings, particularly related to materials available only in English and the variety in workshop participants' comprehension of core concepts in the tool. In comparative models, Pact includes guidance throughout its facilitators guide on supporting participants with low literacy. AKF's website shares versions of tools and templates in six different languages, and 5Cs similarly emphasizes the use of local languages. Their models also include an in-person orientation to the tool and concepts in advance to select representatives of target organizations. The 5Cs, and the 2012 Toolkit, suggest an orientation activity in which organizations themselves define concepts through discussion, which inherently produces definitions of capacity that aligns with participants' comprehension. 5Cs also suggest that participants have a copy of the scoring template to study in advance.

Gender justice content

22. Consider using VCAT in projects, whether or not a project or partner is undergoing a full self-assessment.
23. Even while supporting partners to adapt the tool to their needs, continue providing advice on capacity areas and "what success might look like" according to international standards in technical areas of interest to partners. Within the small sample of the evaluation, there was interest in economic empowerment, youth empowerment, and community organizing in addition to the existing SRHR and EVAWG domains.

Findings suggest that the VCAT discussions included in the CAT4SRHR and CAT4GJO may serve as a valuable consciousness raising exercise in and of themselves. OCA's SHE already incorporates VCAT discussions in its main, technical programming. This is also in line with Gender at Work's approaches, and thus the FOCS tool mentioned above. A DFID-funded EVAWG project also encouraged "personal transformative work" as part of its capacity strengthening process.[106] This consciousness raising and personal reflection are not common in other (non-feminist) self-assessment tools, except as it may relate to a more general discussion of an organization's values.

Relatedly, in terms of technical content in the tool, OCA may want to continue to introduce international standards into partners' discussions of their own capacities. While emphasizing the importance of partner preference, Oxfam staff also expressed the importance of maintaining attention to international standards particularly around difficult topics like SRHR and a number of informants liked (or requested) technical content in the tool they used. Providing guidance on international standards does not preclude adaptation of the tools at the partner level; for example, Pact provides specific guidance in its facilitators guide for incorporating international standards into a customized assessment tool when appropriate to a given technical area.

Facilitation

24. Engage facilitators, whether Oxfam staff or consultants/firm, with relevant technical knowledge, knowledge of organizational capacity strengthening, relevant local language skills, and either existing relationships with or time to build rapport with the partner organization. Consider using existing local civil society-oriented capacity strengthening organizations for the role.
25. Continue to include hands-on training for facilitators, as well as time for them to familiarize themselves with conditions at and to coordinate with the partner organizations they will be facilitating.
26. Ensure facilitators have dedicated time for preparations as well as reporting on the workshop. If they are expected to follow up and support partners throughout other parts of the capacity strengthening process, ensure they have the time dedicated for this as well in their terms of engagement or job description.

The importance of the right facilitators for an effective organizational self-assessment cannot be overstated, based on the evaluation findings described above as well as the comparative models. Like the evaluation findings, the Toolkit itself emphasizes that that "*good knowledge of and relationships with the partner organization*" is critical for the facilitation role in addition to

---

[106] Willan et al., 2019.

"*good knowledge of … gender and organizational change.*"[107] Training and preparation is also emphasized in the comparative models. The potential for facilitators' role outside of the CAT workshop itself is also apparent, particularly if projects lack staff with knowledge of organizational capacity strengthening practices. In Gender at Work's model, the same facilitators who facilitate reflection stay engaged to support participants with coaching and support throughout their GAL process.

Workshop documentation

27. Ensure workshop documenters are highly qualified to follow and make sense of the proceedings, including possessing relevant regional language skills.
28. Train documenters on the specific methodology and clarify during workshop preparations what documentation will entail and what purpose it serves.
29. Suspend the existing online tool unless it can be operational offline, translated into relevant languages, and capture the process in narrative form. Instead consider providing scoring and visualization tools that can be used offline such as Excel.

As the Toolkit emphasizes, "*Good documentation of the workshop is essential,*"[108] and this becomes even more true if workshop notes are to be used as evaluation data. 5Cs is cautious about organizations using numerical scoring at all, as the interdependence of the capabilities is what defines overall capacity, rather than scores in a given area. While the idea of an online tool for visualization and storage of results is supported in the Pact, AKF, and IDF models, the findings show that OCA's online tool has fallen short in serving partners' needs. This is particularly true in light of the cost and effort required for development and maintenance. AKF, with its experience supporting self-assessments with informal and remote organizations, provides Excel tools for this purpose during workshops as does Pact.

Strategy & planning

30. Communicate well in advance to country offices and partners how the CAT/capacity strengthening process will work in practice, possibly creating standard operating templates at the OCA level. This should include the transition from workshop to planning/budgeting, responsibilities for selecting and implementing capacity strengthening activities, and expectations for self-monitoring and regular facilitated workshops. (*continued*)

---

[107] Toolkit p. 12.
[108] Ibid.

Strategy & planning (continued)

31. Enhance facilitation guidance for the action planning portion of the workshop to make grouping and prioritization more strategic; for example, using methods to rapidly pinpoint areas with or lacking consensus among participants; a pyramid or quadrant system to plot possible activities against factors like cost, effort, need for external support, urgency, and importance.

32. Identify providers with relevant local knowledge of capacity strengthening approaches to support partners in workshop follow up and capacity strengthening planning.

As discussed above, evaluation findings are clear about the need to plan and support partners through a process focused on strategy and action. This is a heavy focus of the comparative models, with the exception of 5Cs as it was originally conceived as a learning methodology. Gender at Work's GAL model is inherently action focused. Because of the emphasis they place on implementation of capacity strengthening activities rather than the assessment process itself, the capacity strengthening prioritization and planning stage of the workshop have central importance in the Pact, AKF, and the IDF guidance. They provide detailed facilitation guidance to support consensus building and strategic thinking among participants. Pact goes so far as to recommend two days' worth of structured consensus building on priorities and planning, though AKF has shortened this somewhat by developing a tool that helps calculate the level of consensus that already exists (or not) among workshop participants around potential priorities.

Pact notably also has a standard process for moving from workshop prioritization and initial planning to development of an Institutional Strengthening Plan following the workshop. Pact, AKF, and Gender at Work implement self-assessments only when they intend to provide guidance and support for the design and implementation of capacity strengthening activities as well.

Capacity strengthening approaches

33. Involve partners in the selection of capacity strengthening activities for the partner cohort, at a minimum transparently communicating with them about the process Oxfam has used for selection.

34. Encourage participation by partner personnel outside the OCA-funded project teams on capacity strengthening activities for the cohort of partners.

35. Introduce peer learning methodologies, coaching, and other forms of partner-centred capacity strengthening support.

As mentioned above, Pact, AKF, Gender at Work all emphasize peer learning, coaching, mentoring, and other forms of participant-driven action learning with ongoing support and

assistance. Women's funds like the Global Fund for Women, Mama Cash, and FRIDA emphasize peer learning and relationships among grantees as core to their model, along with grantmaking. A 2019 study of the effectiveness of capacity development in a DFID-funded EVAWG project found that key to its success were adaptive approaches focused on guided learning supported by technical experts that built on existing skills and knowledge. This included ongoing mentoring and technical assistance, and an online community of practice.

This contrasts with the one-off trainings for partner cohorts that OCA projects have provided, which did not register with partners according to the findings above. An action learning mindset could also help ensure that the CAT process is well-integrated into broader project approaches. Moreover, these are important adult learning methodologies in their own right.

When traditional training is called for, organizational leadership should be aware of and involved in deciding who should participate. Engaging only staff from a partners' project team is unlikely to have an effect at the organizational level. In the DFID-funded project, partners directly participated in the identification of topics for common workshops, which also took a "learning by doing" approach including by having participants lead sessions.

Responding to common capacity strengthening needs

36. Be prepared to respond to and provide guidance around common capacity needs. Consider including attention to common needs in project designs based on civil society sector assessments and other data, if not on partners' self-assessments.
37. Recognize that organizational sustainability is not usually a problem solvable at the organization level alone; explore and integrate appropriate support to partners.
38. When possible draw from flexible funding sources to respond to partner-identified needs.

While the CAT takes a holistic look at organizational capacities, there are certain areas of capacity strengthening that will predictably be priorities for a number of partners in almost any context, and were for evaluation informants. Financial sustainability is top among them. Responding to this has been a challenge for OCA since EC, the evaluation for which noted "*in quite a few cases … that while the CAT may have highlighted the need for a stronger focus on fundraising and sustainability, the engagement did not satisfactorily prioritize these needs.*"[109] Though traditional capacity strengthening approaches often emphasize preparing local organizations to access additional or new donor funding, in many environments and/or for many types of organizations, access to alternative traditional donors simply may not exist. The EC evaluation went on to say, "*Our perspective was that this was not for a lack of trying, but largely*

---

[109] Borgman-Arboleda et al., 2014, p.56.

due to the challenges in finding funders for the type of long--term, transformational work that was the trademark of" the project and Oxfam.[110] In addition, building long-term assets - such as owning rather than renting buildings and having an endowment fund - are good practice for organizational sustainability, yet donors rarely allow funding for such things. Nor will they support fundraising activities, as OCA staff pointed out.

This again validates the recommendation above to understand and pursue capacity strengthening in a systems context. For instance rather than focus on strengthening organizational capacities for proposal writing and managing bilateral/multilateral donor funds when this is unlikely to be a sustainable funding source, another approach to consider supporting is community philanthropy. Community philanthropy is an organizational practice that focuses on building community power through building financial and non-financial assets, trust, and capacities for collective action.[111] AKF supports partners to engage in community philanthropy as well as works on strengthening local philanthropy systems in its work with civil society work. Women's funds are a powerful example of community philanthropy in many parts of the world. Identifying and working with local philanthropy support organizations would likely yield other alternatives or at least a perspective on the landscape of funding alternatives for local organizations.[112]

The need to respond differently to common organizational capacity needs also validates the recommendation to troubleshoot internally about how to align donor funds with partner needs. For examples though USAID, like GAC, will not pay for fundraising activities, AKF's ongoing Yetu partnerships is USAID-funded and centres on CSOs engaging in community-based "asset mobilization" campaigns. Project indicators measure number of community supporters, positive media impressions of the issue area, and other ways to capture the increased accountability to communities that resulted from the CSOs' community engagements.

Monitoring & evaluation
39. Actively encourage and support self-monitoring of progress on the capacity strengthening plan.
40. Consider complementing the CAT with a standardized performance measurement tool for evaluation of impact.

As noted above, a capacity assessment is a step in a process of organizational capacity strengthening, a process which should thereafter be monitored and evaluated for progress and

---

[110] Ibid, p.58.
[111] See e.g. Jenny Hodgson & Anna Pond, 2018. The Global Fund for Community Foundations is a potentially useful resource; despite the name, the approach is not limited to community foundations, which may or may not have this orientation to changing systems of power.
[112] Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS) is a good place to start.

impact. All comparative models build in some form of progress monitoring and reflection, though with varying timeframes associated with them. The Toolkit describes a number of principles regarding the complexities of monitoring, learning, and evaluation of organizational change. For monitoring purposes, it recommends use of a shortened scoring template, monitoring against action plans, and most significant change (MSC) stories. It acknowledged that OCA had not fully piloted and tested methods for capacity strengthening evaluation, but referenced the EC Midterm Learning Review methodology that combined outcome mapping, outcome harvesting, and most significant change and also recommends a case study approach. How to evaluate impact continues to be an open question in OCA. As described in the findings, recent partners have not been aware of the expectation or approach for regular monitoring of any kind nor involved in decisions about evaluation.

The primary purpose of self-assessments is to increase commitment to and ownership of organizational strengthening. This action orientation should be reflected in the monitoring approach. The Gender at Work GAP centres on iterative, action-focused reflection workshops among cohorts of partners, and also uses MSC to reflect on impact. Pact and IDF recommend monitoring for progress against the capacity strengthening work plan at least annually. While Pact encourages self re-assessment, processes vary by organizational and project contexts. Pact, AKF (and others including USAID) strongly advise against using self-assessment scores for other purposes: "*the tool is co-designed and self-scored, thus inherently not a reliable or verifiable form of measurement.*"[113]

Instead, they use a standardized Organizational Performance Index (OPI) to measure effects and impact and compare across organizations. It focuses on performance rather than internal systems, reflective of the change goal of capacity strengthening. The OPI measures organizational performance according to eight areas: results, standards, delivery, reach, target population, learning, resources, and social capital.[114] Each area is given a score of 1 to 4, according to clearly defined standards. (It is structured similarly to the original CAT and CAT4EVAWG.) An external reviewer uses existing documentation to propose scores and reach an agreement with organizational representatives. The OPI comes in different versions for NGOs, community groups, professional associations, and networks (AKF) and informal groups and government entities (Pact). It can be used in combination with systems/network assessment tools. Pact suggests collecting baseline data during the initial self-assessment workshop, finding that it helped to complete the exercise at the same time as the assessment. In their experience this helps ensure "*the difference was clear to the participants and there was no resistance to doing two*

---

[113] Pact, 2018. The OPI manual can be accessed here. It builds on IDRC organizational performance domains, which the OCA Toolkit also references, in dialogue with ECDPM research related to the 5Cs. It was tested for reliability and validity for use in multiple country contexts, published in a peer-reviewed journal, and adopted by USAID.
[114] Pact, 2015.

assessment types together."[115] During baseline, the process takes about four hours and less during future monitoring.

Using a standardized tool to aid in comparisons across partners and in reporting on impact was also an acceptable solution to OCA staff who had concerns about allowing partners to adapt the self-assessment domains to their needs. It may be the approach that WVL Guatemala ends up using for its own evaluation. As noted in the findings, the EC evaluation used a similar approach, and at least one partner organization expects to combine regular external assessments with self-assessments in the future.

Marketing the CAT

> 41. Consider forming a learning community within Oxfam and/or with like-minded
>   organizations instead.
> 42. Complete a set of prerequisites suggested by OCA staff before attempting to market the
>   tool.

A final question prompting the evaluation concerned the value in re-branding and/or marketing the CAT as a tool for a wider development audience. From the evaluation team's point of view, developing a learning community within Oxfam and/or with other likeminded organizations that promote feminist organizational strengthening would be more appropriate at this stage. The use of self-assessments is a commonplace capacity strengthening approach and OCA itself relied on a number of external sources to develop its own tools. In addition there is notable room for improvement and updates to OCA's approach, as described above in the recommendations on modifications. Furthermore as described in the findings section, OCA cannot reasonably make claims about the impacts of the tools based on currently available data. As OCA identified in developing the original CAT and as described in the discussion section above, structured self-assessment tools with explicitly feminist values are uncommon -- but not unheard of -- within international development.

Should OCA decide to proceed to market the tools in some way, the team recommends making clear the emergent nature of OCA's methodology and lack of data on its effectiveness. Discussion with Oxfam staff identified several other prerequisites, all of which are included or overlap with modifications to the process already recommended in the above sub-section. Namely, OCA should –

- Complete its own CAT process. Oxfam staff saw it as hypocritical to promote an
  approach OCA itself has not carried out.

---

[115] Ibid.

- Clarify and develop clear and concise communication pieces about the methodology, its value, and its rationale.
- Name a point of contact to lead the marketing efforts with time and ability to communicate effectively about the tools, methodology, and the organization's experience applying and adapting the tools with partners.
- Develop case studies and lessons learned documentation to accompany manuals themselves, to ensure the public-facing materials are practical rather than theoretical. The 2012 Conceptual Framework included a number of illustrative case studies, though these are now outdated. 5Cs and Gender at Work materials also included substantial case studies.

ANNEXES

Annex A: Guidance for action planning

The first recommendation of the evaluation is that OCA continue to use the CAT with modifications and while enhancing the capacity strengthening approach overall. This Annex is intended to support OCA in acting on the 39 recommendations for modifications, prepared on PIU's request in response to a draft of the report and recommendations. Full discussion of recommendations is in the main body of the report; numbering from the report is included below for cross-referencing purposes.

The guidance is based on planning and budgeting practicalities that OCA may want to consider in moving forward. The evaluation team has limited knowledge of internal OCA resources and decision-making processes, as well as of GAC project budget rules. As such OCA may determine that certain recommendations are listed in the wrong category below. Regardless, the categorization structure should still be useful in guiding decision-making.

First the Annex discusses two recommendations/sets of recommendations for which OCA's choice of how to proceed will affect implementation of the remaining recommendations. Decisions about whether and how to proceed on these should be made first:

    A. Recommendation #2: Enhance internal knowledge of organizational capacity strengthening, potentially through a focal point with relevant specialized background;

    B. Recommendations #5-6 regarding foundations of OCA's capacity strengthening approaches. Five recommendations (#7, 18, 35, 37, and 40) that could be implemented in tandem with #5-6 are discussed under the same section. Discussion for each indicates whether they would fall under category C, D, or E if they were instead to be implemented separately.

Below that, remaining recommendations appear under the following categories of resource requirements associated with them:

    C. Unrestricted funding (#8, 10, 18/36, 38);

    D. Project-recoverable time/effort from OCA (#13, 16/17, 20, 21, 23, 27/28, 29, 31);

    E. Minimal effort/resources outside of project implementation (#3, 4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 34, 39).

Recommendations #41-42 regarding marketing are not considered individually below. However, a set of prerequisites as suggested by OCA staff before any marketing efforts overlap with the recommendations on modifications, and such overlaps are noted. In addition, *Recommendation #11: Internally discuss and share strategies for COVID-19 pandemic response and mitigation as it relates to the CAT process* is also not considered separately below. This is time sensitive, but requires no additional resources and minimal effort on the part of OCA staff.

A. ***Recommendation #2: Enhance internal knowledge of organizational capacity strengthening, potentially through a focal point with relevant specialized background***.

Connection to other modifications & Resource implications:
- How OCA proceeds with Recommendation #2 affects implementation of most other recommended modifications to varying degrees, noted throughout the remainder of the Annex. Resources required for this recommendation depend largely on how it is implemented, and what other recommendations below OCA overlaps it with.
- For each other recommendation or group of recommendations below, the evaluation team has indicated what a focal point with the relevant background, referred to as "capacity strengthening focal point" throughout the rest of the Annex, might take responsibility for. This assumes the individual is engaged part-time for approximately six to nine months.
- The team has also estimated what level of support may be necessary or useful per recommendation in the absence of a designated capacity strengthening focal point.
- Depending on how a capacity strengthening focal point or other short-term advisers are deployed, associated costs should at least partially recoverable from project budgets.
- Additional value add from a capacity strengthening focal point above and beyond supporting OCA's action on specific evaluation recommendations could be ongoing advice to projects and ongoing support on learning, adaptation, communications, and marketing relevant to OCA's capacity strengthening work. .

Connection to marketing:
- A capacity strengthening focal point could serve to meet the marketing prerequisite that OCA first "name a point of contact to lead the marketing efforts with time and ability to communicate effectively about the tools, methodology, and the organization's experience applying and adapting the tools with partners."
- They could also support development of communications materials including documentation of lessons learned and case studies.

B. ***Recommendations #5-6 (Foundations of OCA's capacity strengthening approaches):*** Update and clarify the internal rationale, principles, and process for engaging in capacity strengthening and the role of the CAT within that theory. While doing so, consider updating capacity strengthening approaches to current practices in the field, particularly better integrating capacity strengthening with OCA's existing work on systems**.**

Connection to other modifications:
- Several additional recommendations should be directly considered as part of the process to rethink OCA's overall theory and approach (noted below.)
- Updates and clarifications on OCA's overall capacity strengthening approach and theory of change would affect the specific implementation content of most other recommendations.

Resource implications:
- The evaluation team estimates 20 days LOE over 4-6 months for facilitation and support from the capacity strengthening focal point or an external adviser with up-to-date knowledge of capacity strengthening.
- Resources necessary for this work are likely not recoverable from donor funding.
- This work would also require participation from existing staff.

Connection to marketing:
- These recommendations relate to the marketing prerequisites to clarify and develop clear and concise communication pieces about OCA's capacity strengthening methodology, its value and its rationale, as well as developing case studies and lessons learned documentation to ensure public-facing documentation is practical.

➔ *B.1: Recommendations to include in the same process*

The following five recommendations are important to consider whether or not OCA chooses to rethink its overall theory and approach. However, if so, it would make sense to include work on the following as part of the same process. Note that Recommendations #35, 37, and 40 are closely related to Recommendation #6 regarding systems-focused capacity strengthening good practices.

A capacity strengthening focal point should be well positioned to facilitate and lead on OCA's work related to the below. If not, the evaluation team has provided estimated resource implications.

Requires project-recoverable time/effort from OCA [Category D below]

Rec#	Recommendation	Resource implications *If not assigned to capacity strengthening focal point*
7	Simply and consistently communicate the theory and approach to program teams, facilitators, local partners. On the suggestion of Oxfam staff, internal guidance should clarify responsibilities across program and MEAL functions.	OCA to develop concise communications materials and operational guidance regarding capacity strengthening.
18[116]	Acknowledge and internally identify pragmatic strategies for mitigating the tension between projectized, bilateral funding and a partner-led capacity	OCA to discuss and consolidate strategies internally.

---

[116] Recommendation #18 had two parts, each of which appears in a different place in the Annex. The full recommendations is "Acknowledge and internally identify pragmatic strategies for mitigating the tension between projectized, bilateral funding and a partner-led capacity strengthening process. This might include supporting self-assessments before or as an early step in project development."

Rec#	Recommendation	Resource implications *If not assigned to capacity strengthening focal point
	strengthening process.	
35	Introduce peer learning methodologies, coaching, and other forms of partner-centred capacity strengthening support.	Development of relevant guidance and procedures based on international good practices that could be adapted to multiple projects would entail an estimated 4-5 days LOE as a standalone advising engagement, or could be researched and developed in-house. Beyond that implementation would be responsibility of country project teams, but would benefit from support from a knowledgeable external advisor during project planning and implementation as well as qualified facilitators (see Recommendation #4).
37	Recognize that organizational sustainability is not usually a problem solvable at the organization level alone; explore and integrate appropriate support to partners.	External advisor with estimated 4-5 days LOE to establish guidance and resources based on international good practices; beyond that implementation would be responsibility of the country project team but would benefit from support from a knowledgeable external advisor during project planning and implementation as well as qualified facilitators (see Recommendation 4).

Requires time/effort from OCA; to be determined if project recoverable [Category C or D]

Rec#	Recommendation	Resource implications *If not assigned to capacity strengthening focal point
40	Complementing the CAT with a standardized performance measurement tool.	An estimated 15 days of LOE including pilot testing and validation, though this might vary considerably depending on OCA's specifications and the direction work takes overall on Recommendations #5-6. Note that development and validation of the OPI was conducted internally by capacity strengthening specialists at Pact, with support with a Rockefeller Foundation grant of an unknown amount. See resource list to access additional information on their testing and validation process.

C. Remaining recommendations requiring use of unrestricted funding

Four of the remaining recommendations would require use of unrestricted funds, and thus may need special consideration. A capacity strengthening focal point could be responsible for or advise on these activities, if one is brought on. If not, engaging an external facilitator would be necessary for Recommendations #10. Indicative activities/LOE appear in the table.

Rec#	Recommendation	Resource implications
8	Centrally store CAT versions and translations, monitoring tools, feedback surveys and other knowledge materials. This repository would ideally be open to Oxfam country offices/teams if not partners themselves.	This depends on internal processes and procedures; the evaluation team is not able to provide estimates. Costs may be all or partially project recoverable.
10	Commit staff time and resources for OCA (either overall or within IPD) and for interested country offices to undergo their own CAT process, capacity strengthening activities and ongoing monitoring of progress.	A facilitator would need an estimated 8-10 days LOE to orient and prepare, facilitate modification of the tool, facilitate the self-assessment, and report on the work if brought on specifically for OCA's (or a country office's) CAT. Organization staff facilitating their own self-assessment is recommended. The capacity strengthening focal point could be an ideal facilitator assuming the individual engaged for the role has relevant qualifications and is not named to the role from within OCA.
18[117] and 36	Consider supporting self-assessments before or as an early step in program development. If not, include attention to common needs in project design based on civil society sector assessments and other data. (Be prepared to respond to and provide guidance around common capacity needs during a project.)	Resources to support partners/cohorts of partners to carry out self-assessments would be commensurate to those required for undertaking CAT workshops on projects, except the expenses would not be recoverable. Existing personnel and/or a capacity strengthening focal point could access civil society sector assessments and other relevant data during program development.
38	When possible draw from flexible funding sources to respond to partner-identified needs	Resources would be commensurate to those for donor-funded activities, except the expenses would not be recoverable.

D. Recommendations requiring project-recoverable time/effort from OCA

The cost of undertaking this subset of ten recommendations should be project recoverable; however, there would be some OCA effort upfront associated with building them into projects. This effort could be led by a capacity strengthening focal point. If not, an external advisor would likely not be necessary though could be beneficial on Recommendation #13. For all, OCA will need to establish operational procedures as relevant for application in projects.

---

[117] Recommendation #18 had two parts; see footnote 116.

Rec#	Recommendation	Resource implications
13	While using existing materials as standard templates to aid in the process (including some version of the network tool developed in EC), support partners to tailor the CAT with capacity areas and statements relevant to their needs, context, size, scope, and maturity. Support facilitators to conduct pilot testing of the adapted models.	OCA to establish core process and facilitator guidance; an external advisor would need an estimated 3-4 days LOE and additional time to support pilot testing to do the same. Beyond that, implementation would be the responsibility of the country project team/facilitators. Additional facilitation time associated with tool design on projects is up to 3 days per partner or cohort of partners.
16 & 17	Incorporate into preparation for the workshop and the workshop itself transparent messaging about limitations on budget and cost items, the reasons behind them, and alternative ideas, resources, etc. Support partners in identifying alternative resources to meet capacity strengthening priorities that the Oxfam program will not cover.	OCA to develop appropriate guidance/protocols for country teams and facilitators.
20	Create different materials for participants and facilitators, in which the participant version is simplified to focus on core concepts and includes ample visual aids.	OCA to draft and design documents and test with partners. Translation and implementation would be responsibility of the country project team.
21	Consider the differing levels of understanding of core CAT/technical concepts that may exist among organizations and workshop participants, and consider adding an orientation or pre-workshop training for organizations/individuals that would benefit.	OCA to establish core process and facilitator guidance. Translation and implementation would be responsibility of the country project team.
23	Even while supporting partners to adapt the tool to their needs, continue providing advice on capacity areas and "what success might look like" according to international standards in technical areas of interest to partners. Within the small sample of the evaluation, there was interest in economic empowerment, youth empowerment, and community organizing in addition to the existing SRHR and EVAWG domains	OCA to research and adapt relevant international standards (though this might be an appropriate function of a country-level advisor depending on the nature of the project, see Recommendation #4). Translation and implementation would be responsibility of the country project team.
27 & 28	Ensure workshop documenters are highly qualified to follow and make sense of the proceedings, including possessing relevant regional language skills. Train documenters on the specific methodology and clarify during workshop preparations what documentation will entail and what purpose it serves.	OCA to establish general terms of reference, core process and training materials, and possibly provide training support.

Rec#	Recommendation	Resource implications
29	Suspend the existing online tool unless it can be operational offline, translated into relevant languages, and capture the process in narrative form. Instead consider providing scoring and visualization tools that can be used offline such as Excel	OCA to prepare, or contract someone to prepare, appropriate scoring and visualization tools.
31	Enhance facilitation guidance for the action planning portion of the workshop to make grouping and prioritization more strategic; for example, using methods to rapidly pinpoint areas with or lacking consensus among participants; a pyramid or quadrant system to plot possible activities against factors like cost, effort, need for external support, urgency, and importance.	OCA to establish core process and facilitator guidance. Translation and implementation would be responsibility of the country project team.

E. Recommendations requiring minimal effort/resources outside of project implementation

The following sixteen recommendations require that OCA establish them as standard options/standard practices in new projects. Beyond this, no significant resources or level of effort should be required in advance of activity implementation as part of projects. Any costs associated with implementation should be project recoverable.

Coordination or development of protocols related to the below recommendations *could* be assigned to the capacity strengthening focal point if one is brought on; if not, existing project/program staff should be able to act on the recommendations without accessing outside advice or inputs.

Rec#	Recommendation
3	Assign an individual within OCA and country program teams with specific responsibility to track, oversee, and support capacity strengthening throughout the full process, ensuring they have dedicated time for relevant responsibilities. (This is likely not a MEAL officer function.)
4	Ensure country office program teams possess or have access to advisers with locally-specific knowledge of capacity strengthening and civil society. Working with local civil society strengthening institutions is advised when possible.
9	Introduce consistent feedback mechanisms on CAT implementation and facilitation that do not depend on the facilitators to collect and record the feedback.
12	Work with each partner to design a CAT workshop experience that aligns with their needs and preferences. In addition to timing aligned with planning cycles, other factors include venue, pacing/schedule, and a participant list responsive to organizational structure and governance models
14	Give partners the option not to use a self-assessment, to use another tool, or to use the CAT in a semi-autonomous unit within the organization/network.

Rec#	Recommendation
15	If resources are not available from OCA programs or partners themselves for capacity strengthening activities, do not ask partners to carry out a self-assessment.
19	Fully translate into national languages relevant background reading and materials participants will engage in advance of or during the workshop.
22	Consider using VCAT in projects, whether or not a project or partner is undergoing a full self-assessment.
24	Engage facilitators, whether Oxfam staff or consultants/firm, with relevant technical knowledge, knowledge of organizational capacity strengthening, relevant local language skills, and either existing relationships with or time to build rapport with the partner organization. Consider using existing local civil society-oriented capacity strengthening organizations for the role.
25	Continue to include hands-on training for facilitators, as well as time for them to familiarize themselves with conditions at and to coordinate with the partner organizations they will be facilitating.
26	Ensure facilitators have dedicated time for preparations as well as reporting on the workshop. If they are expected to follow up and support partners throughout other parts of the capacity strengthening process, ensure they have the time dedicated for this as well in their terms of engagement or job description
30	Communicate well in advance to country offices and partners how the CAT/capacity strengthening process will work in practice, possibly creating standard operating templates at the OCA level. This should include the transition from workshop to planning/budgeting, responsibilities for selecting and implementing capacity strengthening activities, and expectations for self-monitoring and regular facilitated workshops.
32	Identify providers with relevant local knowledge of capacity strengthening approaches to support partners in workshop follow up and capacity strengthening planning
33	Involve partners in the selection of capacity strengthening activities for the partner cohort, at a minimum transparently communicating with them about the process Oxfam has used for selection.
34	Encourage participation by partner personnel outside the OCA-funded project teams on capacity strengthening activities for the cohort of partners.
39	Actively encourage and support self-monitoring of progress on the capacity strengthening plan.

Annex B: Evaluation team members

Megan McGlynn Scanlon served as team lead, report author, and OCA's primary point of contact. Ms. Scanlon is a civil society expert with 15 years of experience working on organizational capacity in 8 countries, including Pakistan and Indonesia, with a special focus on women's rights organizations and gender equality initiatives. She has conducted or led teams conducting 10 distinct interview-based evaluations and program reviews, including a review of gender outcomes in a national community development program in Indonesia. While Senior Program Officer at the Aga Khan Foundation USA, Ms. Scanlon oversaw a $14 million civil society strengthening portfolio. She has advised a number of institutions including Oxfam Novib on civil society initiatives. A longtime feminist activist in her personal life, she holds dual Master's degrees focused on organizational management and planning from Columbia University. Ms. Scanlon is a native English speaker and also speaks Indonesian and Spanish. She is based in North America.

Nelti Anggraini conducted consultations and interviews and contributed to design and analysis for the evaluation. She is an Indonesian social researcher with more than 12 years of experience. She has conducted field-based interviews and FGDs for almost 20 studies in numerous regions of Indonesia, and contributed to or led tool design, site selection, desk review, and analysis. Her experience includes studies on women's health and gender equity initiatives and an Oxfam Great Britain evaluation. She also worked directly for grassroots civil society organizations and community-based development initiatives. She is a graduate of the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex. Ms. Anggraini is a native Bahasa Indonesia speaker and speaks English. She is based in Indonesia but was located in Australia during the evaluation due to COVID-19 travel restrictions.

Muhammad Rahimuddin conducted consultations and interviews and contributed to design and analysis for the evaluation. He has over a decade of experience working in research and program implementation and has led country-level evaluations and project level assessments/evaluations with large development projects in Pakistan. He also led the development and implementation of a gender mainstreaming strategy for a $32 million Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation initiative that involved organizational capacity strengthening for gender transformative programming, and has engaged extensively with local gender justice and women's rights organizations. He is a graduate of the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex. Mr. Rahimuddin is a native Urdu and English speaker and can understand and speak basic Sindhi. He is based in Pakistan.

No team member had a conflict of interest relevant to conducting this evaluation.

Annex C: Terms of Reference for the evaluation

1.   **Duration of Contract**: 3 ½ months

2.   **Start Date**:   May 15th 2020   **End Date**: August 31st 2020

3.   **Job Title:** Evaluation of the Capacity Assessment Tool

4.   **Programme:** Program Impact Unit

5.   **Responsibilities:**

Overview

OCA is seeking an experienced and qualified consultant (individual or firm) to undertake an evaluation of OCA staff and partners' experiences with the CAT, including both the tools (off and online) and the process surrounding its implementation. The evaluation will generate important information on what OCA partners have achieved in organizational strengthening through their use of a CAT, and provide a basis for Oxfam Canada to decide whether to make this approach a part of its future projects, and additionally whether to re-brand and/or market the CAT as a tool for a wider development audience.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to help OCA determine whether the CAT has worked in achieving its original goal of organizational strengthening of partner organizations to become more gender just. More specifically,

1) Has the CAT supported organizational capacity strengthening of partner organizations, particularly in relation to gender justice?
2) If so, should OCA continue to use the CAT as a key programming tool in our projects and programs? What modifications could OCA make to strengthen the CAT tools and process?
3) Is there value in re-branding and/or marketing the CAT as a tool for a wider development audience?

Scope

The evaluation will be conducted over three and a half months, beginning in May 2020 and ending in August 2020 with the submission of the final report. While OCA partners across Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia have used the CAT, it will only be possible to interview partners from one region given the limited time and funding available for the evaluation. As such, we elect to focus the evaluation on our partners in Asia, specifically in the Philippines, Indonesia, and Pakistan. OCA has partners working on different projects in each of these countries which will enable the evaluation to consider different versions of the CAT currently in use. In the Philippines, the projects are Creating Spaces, which uses the CAT4EVAWG, and Sexual Health and Empowerment (SHE), which uses the CAT4SRHR. In Indonesia, the projects are Creating Spaces, which uses the CAT4EVAWG and Power Up, which used the original CAT. In Pakistan, the projects are Engendering Change, which used the original CAT, Creating Spaces, which uses the CAT4EVAWG, and Women's Voice and Leadership – Pakistan which uses the revised CAT4GJO.

Methodology

Given that OCA focuses on women's rights and gender equality in all of its work, the consultants should understand the context of feminist development programming implemented by locally-based women's organizations and other civil society organizations. The evaluation should also be learning and utilization-focused, enabling OCA to determine whether or not to continue to invest in the CAT in its programming and providing advice as to how the CAT might be modified to improve its effectiveness in strengthening the organizational capacity of partners.

The evaluation will entail:

1. a review of documents (e.g. the CAT manuals, online tools, previous monitoring and evaluation activities already conducted with facilitators and participants in relation to the CAT, etc.) and,
2. interviews with a sample of OCA staff and OCA's partners who have used the CAT.

Timeline

The timeline for the evaluation interviews is June 2020, with a draft evaluation report due by July 31st 2020 and the final evaluation report due by August 15th 2020. We anticipate that the evaluation will require a total of 15 days, including:

- Document review (all CAT tools, recent reports, evaluations, etc.) – 3 days
- Development of an evaluation plan, draft interview questions, and analysis strategy with OCA staff – 2 days
- Data collection (online interviews and focus group discussions) – 5 days
- Data analysis, validation, and reporting – 3 days
- Incorporating feedback and final report submission – 2 days

6.   **Reporting to:** Deborah Simpson

Annex D: Reference list

Oxfam Documentation

Resources marked with an asterisk are publicly available.

Overviews/Background

- *The Power of Gender-Just Organizations: Toolkit for Transformative Organizational Capacity Building (The Toolkit)
- *The Power of Gender-Just Organizations: A Conceptual Framework for Transformative Organizational Capacity Building (The Conceptual Framework)
- December 2019 CAT retreat presentation slides
- December 2019 CAT retreat notes
- Written input from a program officer into December 2019 CAT workshop

Capacity Assessment/Strengthening Tools

- Organization Capacity Self-Assessment Tool: Violence Against Women and Girls (CAT4EVAWG)
- Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool for SRHR Programming (CAT4SRHR)
- Organizational Capacity Self-Assessment Tool: CAT4EVAWG & CAT4SRHR Synthesis, Integrated Descriptions for Each Core Strategy, and Facilitator Guidelines
- *Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool for Gender-Just Organizational Strengthening (CAT4GJO)
- CAT4EVAWG - Indonesian language version
- CAT4GJO - Spanish language version, facilitator's guide, and participant handouts
- CAT4GJO WVL-Guatemala version, adapted for remote implementation

TOF materials

- CAT4EVAWG orientation workshop PowerPoint slides (two versions), written questions and answers, and background documents folder
- SHE CAT4SRHR TOF Facilitator Criteria
- SHE CAT4SRHR TOF Documentation
- HFHC CAT4SRHR TOT Agenda & session outlines
- HFHC CAT4SRHR TOT Notes
- HFHC CAT4SRHR Participant Evaluation Survey compiled responses
- WVL-Pakistan CAT4GJO Consultants Terms of Reference
- WVL-Pakistan CAT4GJO TOT Proceedings
- WVL-Pakistan CAT4GJO TOT Evaluation Survey Responses (originals and summary)

CAT workshop documentation, feedback, & assessment results

- Engendering Change original CAT workshop reports for two partners
- Creating Spaces survey of CAT4EVAWG workshop participants (raw Excel data for 2017 and 2019; summary report of findings for 2017) –
- Creating Spaces survey of CAT4EVAWG workshop facilitators (raw Excel data and summary report of findings for 2017)
- Power Up original CAT report summary - 2018
- SHE CAT4SRHR/hybrid workshop narrative reports for all partners
- SHE CAT4SRHR Facilitator feedback forms for all workshops
- SHE CAT4SRHR - Summary of results for pillar 1 partners (in Word) & results to date (in PowerPoint)
- HFHC CAT4SRHR workshop narrative report for one partner
- WVL-P CAT4GJO workshop narrative reports for all partners
- WVL-P CAT4GJO participant feedback forms for all partners
- WVL-P CAT4GJO Facilitator feedback forms for all CAT workshops
- WVL-P CAT4GJO Consolidated facilitator report including analysis of participant feedback (draft v8)
- WVL-Guatemala CAT4GJO workshop narrative report and aide memoire for each partner
- Camino Verde CAT4GJO workshop narrative report for each partner
- CAT4EVAWG - workshop scoring reports (generated online for all completed entries)
- CAT4SRHR - workshop scoring reports (generated online for all completed entries)

Project Documents

- Project Implementation Plans for Creating Spaces, Power Up, Amplify Change, SHE, HFCF, WVL-Guatemala, WVL-Pakistan, Camino Verde, and Securing Rights

- Engendering Change Midterm Learning Review & management response
- Engendering Change End of Program report & annexes
- Engendering Change Evaluation & annexes

- *Creating Spaces Midterm Learning Review, executive summary, and management response
- *Creating Spaces partner profiles
- Creating Spaces "CAT Update" action plan monitoring documents (India, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Nepal, Philippines)
- Creating Spaces Annual Report Year 4 (June 2020)

- Power Up Endline Study (March 2020)

- SHE project and partner review PowerPoint slides, partners and profiles Excel, partner organizational descriptions, project pamphlet

- SHE Annual Report FY2019-2020
- SHE Detailed Description of Stream 1210: Institutional Strengthening Grant

- WVL-Pakistan partner profiles, WRO dashboard (in Excel), WRO selection criteria, and financial and operational categories,
- WVL Pakistan - History and Evolution of Women [sic] Rights Movement, Mapping of Women Rights Organizations & Alliances and Women Rights Funding (draft v6)
- WVL Pakistan Annual Project Results Report FY2019-2020
- WVL Pakistan final capacity strengthening work plans and budgets for all partners

Benchmarking

OCA Toolkit

Oxfam Canada. (2012a). *The Power of Gender-Just Organizations: A Conceptual Framework for Transformative Organizational Capacity Building*. Oxfam Canada. https://www.oxfam.ca/publication/the-power-of-gender-just-organizations/

Oxfam Canada. (2012b). *The Power of Gender-Just Organizations: Toolkit for Transformative Organizational Capacity Building*. Oxfam Canada. https://www.oxfam.ca/publication/the-power-of-gender-just-organizations/

5Cs

Baser, H., & Morgan, P. (2008). *Capacity, Change and Performance: Study Report. Discussion Paper No 59B*. European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM). https://ecdpm.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/DP-59B-Capacity-Change-Performance-Study-Report-2008.pdf

Keijzer, N., Spierings, E., Phlix, G., & Fowler, A. (2011). *Bringing the invisible into perspective—Reference document for using the 5Cs framework to plan, monitor and evaluate capacity and results of capacity development processes*. ECDPM. www.ecdpm.org/5Cs

Pact/AKF

Aga Khan Development Network. (N.d.). *Analyse Capacity*. Civil Society NET. https://civilsocietynet.org/analyse-capacity/

DuBois, R., Bruce, K., Reeves, M., Vandelanotte, J., & Yakimakho, O. (2019). The Organizational Performance Index: A New Method for Measuring International Civil Society Capacity Development Outcomes. *Performance Improvement Quarterly; Silver Spring*, *31*(4), 381. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/piq.21282

DuBois, R. D., Yakimakho, O., & Reeves, M. (2012). *Pact Capacity Development Gold Standard Handbook: A Practical Guide to Operationalizing Our Principles, Approach,*

Methods, and Tools. Pact. https://www.pactworld.org/sites/default/files/GS%20Handbook_ext.pdf

Jacobstein, D. (2015, January 14). *Measuring Organizational Capacity* [Text]. USAID Learning Lab. https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/measuring-organizational-capacity

Pact. (2015). *Organizational Performance Index (OPI) Handbook*. Pact. OPI%20Handbook_final%20copyedited_V2_final.pdf

Pact. (2018). *Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA) and Action Planning: Facilitator's Guide*. Pact. https://www.pactworld.org/library/pact%E2%80%99s-organizational-capacity-assessment-facilitator%E2%80%99s-guide

Pact. (2019). *Capacity Development At Pact Factsheet*. Pact. file:///Users/meganscanlon/Downloads/CapacityDevelopmentAtPactFactsheet_28May19.pdf

Stenberg, L. (2017, December 21). *Capacity Development not Training: Context, Partnership & Data for Effective Capacity Development* [Text]. USAID Learning Lab. https://usaidlearninglab.org/lab-notes/capacity-development-not-training-context%2C-partnership-data-effective-capacity-developme-0

USAID. (2015). *Organizational Capacity Assessment* [Text]. USAID Learning Lab. https://usaidlearninglab.org/library/organizational-capacity-assessment

USAID Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning. (2017). *Local Capacity Development: Suggested Approaches*. USAID.

IDF

Renzi, M. (1996). An integrated Toolkit for institutional development. *Public Administration and Development*, *16*, 469–483. http://documents.reflectlearn.org/Offline%20OA%20Tools/IntegratedToolkitForInstitutionalDevelopment_MSI_Renzi_1996.pdf

USAID. (2011). *Performance Monitoring & Evaluation TIPS: Measuring Institutional Capacity*. USAID. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADW115.pdf

Gender at Work

Gender at Work. (2013). *Bringing Back the Heart: The Gender at Work Action Learning Process with Four South African Unions*. Solidarity Center, Gender at Work, USAID. https://www.solidaritycenter.org/publication/bringing-back-the-heart-the-gender-at-work-action-learning-process-with-four-south-african-unions-2013/

Kloosterman, J. (2014). *Transformative Leadership for Women's Rights: An Oxfam Guide*. Oxfam. https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/transformative-leadership-womens-rights-oxfam-guide

Oxfam America. (2016). *Gender Action Learning: Compendium of Most Significant Change Stories*. https://genderatwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ENG-GAL-Event-MSC-Stories-report.pdf

Oxfam America. (2018). *Communique from Peer Workshop #1 September 25th-27th, 2018, Gender Action Learning (GAL) process in Oxfam America*. https://www.scribd.com/document/391792675/Communique-GAL-in-OUS-PW-1-pdf

Rao, A., Sandler, J., Kelleher, D., & Miller, C. (2016). *Gender at Work: Theory and Practice for 21st Century Organizations* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Feminist self-assessments

Action Aid. (2019). *Women's Voice and Leadership Nigeria Project (WVL Nigera Project)—Call for Expression of Interest*. Action Aid. https://nigeria.actionaid.org/sites/nigeria/files/publications/WVL%20EOI%20JD.pdf

DANIDA. (2016). *Organisation Strategy Note for Denmark's support to AmplifyChange: 2016-2019*. DANIDA.

Hewlett Foundation. (n.d.). *MannionDaniels Limited—For support of capacity building and knowledge sharing*. Hewlett Foundation. Retrieved September 7, 2020, from https://hewlett.org/grants/manniondaniels-limited-for-support-of-capacity-building-and-knowledge-sharing/

International Women's Development Agency (IWDA). (n.d.). *IWDA's Feminist Organisational Capacity Strengthening (FOCS) Framework*. IWDA. https://iwda.org.au/assets/files/IWDA-FOCS-Framework-Summary.pdf

Plan International. (2019). *Plan International—Feminist Org Capacity Development Consultancy*. OpenIGO.com. https://www.openigo.com/vacancies/feminist-organizational-capacity-development-consultancy/

Tilbury, B. (2018, October 25). *FOCS at IWDA*. https://prezi.com/p/n_jjlymplayc/focs-at-iwda/

Willan, S., Kerr-Wilson, A., Parke, A., & Gibbs, A. (2019). A study on capacity development in the "What Works to Prevent Violence Against Women" programme. *DEVELOPMENT IN PRACTICE*, *29*(6, 786–797), 13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2019.1615410

Other Sources

Borgman-Arboleda, C., Drinkwater, M., & Ward, P. (2014). *Engendering Change Final Evaluation Report*. Wayfair Associates for Oxfam Canada.

Denney, L. (2017, July 6). *$15bn is spent every year on training, with disappointing results. Why the aid industry needs to rethink "capacity building"*. From Poverty to Power. https://oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/15bn-is-spent-every-year-on-aid-for-training-with-disappointing-results-why-the-aid-industry-needs-to-rethink-its-approach-to-capacity-building/

Esplen, E. (2016). *Donor support to southern women's rights organisations: OECD Findings*. OECD DAC NETWORK ON GENDER EQUALITY (GENDERNET). OECD-report-on- womens-rights-organisations.pdf

Hambly, H., & Sarapura, S. (2009). Ensuring gender equality in capacity development – opportunities for rural employment and sustainable development. *FAO-IFAD-ILO Workshop on Gaps, Trends and Current Research in Gender Dimensions of Agricultural and Rural Employment: Differentiated Pathways out of Poverty*, 23.

Jaffer, S., Lerner, E., Nelson, N., Pollock, A., & Satterwhite, A. (2018). *Capacity Development Interventions: A Guide for Program Designers*. FHI360, Social Impact, and USAID. https://www.ngoconnect.net/sites/default/files/2018-12/SCS%20Global_Capacity%20Development%20Interventions%20Guide_FINAL.pdf

Jenny Hodgson, & Anna Pond. (2018). *How Community Philanthropy Shifts Power: What Donors Can Do to Help Make that Happen*. Foundation Center GrantCraft. https://grantcraft.org/content/guides/how-community-philanthropy-shifts-power

Keijzer, N., Spierings, E., Phlix, G., & Fowler, A. (2011). *Bringing the invisible into perspective—Reference document for using the 5Cs framework to plan, monitor and evaluate capacity and results of capacity development processes*. ECDPM. www.ecdpm.org/5Cs

Kloosterman, J. (2014). *Transformative Leadership for Women's Rights: An Oxfam Guide*. Oxfam. https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/transformative-leadership-womens-rights-oxfam-guide

Miller, C., & Haylock, L. (2014). Capturing changes in women's lives: The experiences of Oxfam Canada in applying feminist evaluation principles to monitoring and evaluation practice. *Gender & Development*, *22*(2), 291–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2014.920980

Nishimura, A., Sampath, R., Le, V., Sheikh, A. M., & Valenzuela, A. (2020). *Transformational Capacity Building*. Stanford Social Innovation Review. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/transformational_capacity_building

Patton, M. Q. (2012). *Essentials of Utilization-Focused Evaluation: A primer*. Sage Publications. https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/essentials-of-utilization-focused-evaluation/book233973

Renzi, M. (1996). An integrated Toolkit for institutional development. *Public Administration and   Development*, *16*, 469–483.

http://documents.reflectlearn.org/Offline%20OA%20Tools/IntegratedToolkitForInstitutio
nalDevelopment_MSI_Renzi_1996.pdf

Willan, S., Kerr-Wilson, A., Parke, A., & Gibbs, A. (2019). A study on capacity development in
the "What Works to Prevent Violence Against Women" programme. *DEVELOPMENT
IN PRACTICE*, *29*(6, 786–797), 13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2019.1615410

Annex E: Informed consent and interview guide for partners

English language version (used in Pakistan and the Philippines)

Interview prep checklist:
- Be familiar with what tool the partner is using, how facilitation worked for the project, what language the workshop was in, and how the tool/concepts were translated]
- Confirm the number of workshops the partner has been through and the status of capacity strengthening activities
- Read any partner profile info, workshop reports, online data, capacity strengthening plan/budget; workshop evaluations.

Introduction and informed consent:
- Introductions
- Thank you so much for your time today. This interview is being conducted by an independent team on behalf of Oxfam Canada that funds x project. The purpose of the interview is get CSO/WRO feedback on the capacity assessment tools and approaches that Oxfam Canada uses in its programs. Oxfam Canada will use the results to improve the tools and approaches for future programs.
- We will not name you or your organization when we draw from what you say to describe our findings, If we use a quote or idea from you, we will describe the speaker and organization in general terms, for example [chose an example before the interview e.g., program officer from district-level WRO; executive director of national CSO]
- The purpose is *not* a performance evaluation of you or of your local Oxfam office. Rather it is a forward looking assessment helping Oxfam Canada to decide how to use capacity assessment tools and strengthening activities in future programs. It will have no impact on funding for your organization, the x project, or the local Oxfam office. Our team is also interviewing organizations on other projects in [list other countries].
- We will distribute a summary of our draft findings for your feedback before we submit them to Oxfam Canada.

- Before we begin, do you consent to our conversation being recorded? The only people who will have access to the recording are myself and two colleagues from the study team. The study is independent of Oxfam. No one else in your organization or in Oxfam will have access to the recording or to any of the notes. The recordings and notes will be stored on a secure cloud server. [Obtain consent and begin recording.]
- Any questions before we begin?
- Do you consent to the interview? *[This needs to be recorded, as we won't be collecting written consent.]*
- Confirm spelling of name, title, organization, project name, contact information for follow up

Guide

This interview is semi-structured; interviewers will follow the lead of informants in priority topics and thus may end up going through in a different order to the below. The goal should *be to touch on all* main *topics in the course of the interview;* however, if an informant feels the core premise of the approach is wrong, the discussion may stay more general (see Q2.1)

Topic	Sub topic (** = high priority)	Interview questions
Organiza tion's definitio n of a GJO		**1.** The main purpose of this interview is to understand whether and how the capacity assessment and strengthening approaches are helpful for your organization. To help us understand, **please describe what you believe an organization should be like in order to be effective in working for women's rights and gender equality [or - ending violence against women and girls; sexual and reproductive health and rights] (for ex: characteristics, features, staffing, ways of working).**
Effective ness (Achievi ng their own definitio n of GJO)		**2. In what ways has your experience with capacity assessment and capacity strengthening on [x] project so far impacted your organization becoming more or less a strong organization like what you just described? (EQ1)** 2.1. Can you provide examples of the changes (if any)? 2.2. *If* their response is highly negative or in other ways their experience doesn't relate significantly to achieving their definition of a strong organization - probe 2.2.1. to understand why not, 2.2.2. what feedback for improvement they would give overall, and specifically related to topics below. 2.2.3. to understand the difference between their vision and OCA's vision of a gender just organization [ask them this directly, or refer to definitions/domains reflected in the CAT tool that they used] 2.3. *Otherwise* - Respond to their cues on what topics (among the below) to probe ; the interview does NOT need to follow the order below.
CAT worksho p		**3. I would like to hear a little more about your experience in the CAT workshop itself.** 3.1. Optional probe, if necessary: Share general results (overall from all partners, rather than specific feedback given by the partner being

		interviewed) from workshop evaluations if available to prompt reflection. For example, "I noticed that many organizations using the tool gave positive feedback on x but not on y; how does that compare to your experience?"
		3.2. Alternative optional probe, if necessary: How many people attended the workshop? Who were they? [*Note this information is also available in workshop reports you will have read before; however, this can help set the scene from their perspective.*] *(EQ5)*
	Comparison - 1st/2nd workshops	Topics to probe: 3.3. [Creating Spaces] What was different, better, worse between the 2 workshops?
	**Facilitation quality	3.4. Facilitation quality (EQ3) - Was the facilitator able to explain concepts so you could understand? Was the facilitator able to help everyone to participate equally in the workshop? Was the facilitator able to help keep some individuals from dominating?
	**Online tool	3.5. Online tool (EQ3) [for CAT4SRHR/CAT4EVAWG only; the individual involved may or may not have directly used the tool as mostly facilitators have accessed]
	**Accessibility of language/concepts	3.6. Accessibility of language and concepts (EQ3)
	**Free/equal participation [this is largely but not entirely a function of facilitation quality]	3.7. How much was everyone able to speak up and participate? What about junior staff? Women and men? [other sub-groups that may be specially relevant in their organizational context] Who stayed mostly quiet? What should have been different for everyone to be able to freely participate? (EQ2)
	Unexpected workshop results	3.8. What organizational needs did you identify that hadn't been visible before? (EQ2)
	Mitigating factors	3.9. Any environmental factors that had a strong positive or negative impact on their experience (e.g. size or comfort of the workshop space, good/bad food, loud noises in the surrounding areas)
CAT manual		**4. I'm also wondering what feedback you have about the CAT manual.** What was helpful, what could have been improved? (EQ3) Topics to probe
	** Domains (manual-specific)	4.1. How did the domains align with your definition of an organization working for women's rights and gender equality [or EVAWG/SRHR]? Were the sections focused on EVAWG/SRHR helpful [if

	Self adjustments	relevant]; provide examples]? How did those compare to the other sections? (EQ3) 4.2. Did your organization make any adjustments in the CAT process so it would work better for your organization? (some examples might be adapting some of the questions, or changing the schedule and flow, or adjusting the facilitation approach, so that they match your organization context) What were they? Would you do it again? (EQ3)
Capacity strengthening action planning		5. **Were you involved in the capacity strengthening action planning and budgeting process?** [*replace with equivalent term depending on tool*] *If yes - probe -* 5.1. What was that like? What could Oxfam/the project do to improve it? (EQ3/5)
Capacity strengthening	****Strengthening organization as GJO** **General impacts** ****Suggestions for improvement**	[ask status for all; probe if relevant] 6. **What capacity strengthening activities has your organization done so far?** **[**be familiar with their individual plan/activities as well as the crosscutting activities at the project level, if relevant, as well the budget available for this within the project – use to prompt as necessary] *To probe -* 6.1. Have these activities impacted (*positively or negatively*) your organization's capacity to work effectively on women's rights and gender equality [or, EVAWG/SRHR]? If so, how? If not, what could be done differently? 6.2. Have they had other positive or negative effects on your organization? 6.3. What if any additional capacity strengthening activities or options would you like to see? What's preventing this? (EQ3/5)
Self-monitoring	****Online tool**	[ask status for all; probe if relevant] 7. **What is capacity strengthening self-monitoring like in your organization?** *To probe -* 7.1. How have you been using workshop results to self-monitor and track changes, if at all? (EQ2) 7.2. How have you been using the online tool (EQ3) [for CAT4SRHR/CAT4EVAWG only; the individual involved may or may not have directly used the tool]

Other tools/processes (Overlap)		**8.** As far as the CAT workshop, has your organization gone through a similar process for another donor project or on its own? (EQ4) – [Get name of the organization/sponsor and/or tool]
		    8.1. How did that experience compare to that on the OCA project? What was better/worse?
		    8.2. Which, if either, would you choose to do on your own and why?

Impact (Oxfam's theory of change)	**Equal participation in organization**
	
	Capacity strengthening strategy
	
	Learning and adaptation
		9. **There are a few specific changes that may or may not have occurred in your organization as a result of the CAT workshop and other processes. (EQ2) -**
		
		[these are NOT high priority questions that need a lot of probing - just need a sense of whether or not the partners self-report changes in these areas]
		
		    9.1. You said that in the workshop setting, individuals [were/were not] able to participate freely and equally? What about outside of the workshop – what changes have there been in staff being able to speak out about organizational challenges? (EQ2)
		    9.2. Another change might be that organizations are more strategic about capacity strengthening, including prioritizing activities based on needs and available resources. How well do you think the process has helped your organization with that? What is your organization doing differently compared to before? (EQ2)
		    9.3. Another change might be that organizations are better about learning and adapting when challenges arise. What if any changes have you observed related to learning and adaptation in the organization? (EQ2)

Side effects		**10.** **Has anything happened or changed in your organization that surprised you as a result of this process?** - can be positive or negative (EQ1,2)
Sustainability		**11.** **Do you think any of the positive changes you've experienced will last? (EQ6)** [Remind them of a few you've heard during the interview] 11.1. What will it take for them to last inside your organization? What if any outside support do you think will be necessary?

Partner choice		**12.** **Would you choose your organization to do the CAT if it wasn't required for the project? (EQ1)** 12.1. Why/why not? 12.2. If yes - would you do it if there wasn't outside funding available? 12.3. Would you say the time and efforts are worth it? Why or why not? (EQ5)
Costs		**13.** *[For ED/senior leadership]* This question of whether it's worth the time and effort is an important part of Oxfam Canada's questions for the research we are doing. So that we can get a sense of the resource required for your organization to participate, can I ask your assistance on a few estimates - 13.1.1. The value of everyone's time for attending? [*We will attempt to determine this information in advance from Oxfam; if not can talk them through it as homework; see below]* -- 13.1.2. Any other costs associated with it that your organization had to cover? (Such as: transportation to the venue; refreshments)

NOTE: Producing time value estimates -

*We only need the final total; we do *not* expect them to provide us with details of people's salaries.

If everyone who attend the CAT workshop is on annual salaries/stipends -
1. Sum the annual salaries/stipends of the people who attended the CAT workshop
2. Divide by 260
3. Multiply by 3.

-OR-

If everyone who attend the CAT workshop is on monthly salaries/stipends -
1. Sum the monthly salaries/stipends of the people who attended the CAT workshop
2. Divide by 20
3. Multiply by 3.

-OR, if people are paid based on different timespans -

1. Determine each person's daily rate as follows-
   a. Divide annual figures by 260

      b.   Divide monthly figures by 20

      c.   Divide weekly figures by 5

      d.   Keep daily rates as-is

      e.   Multiply hourly rates by 8

2. Volunteer Board members - use the equivalent of ED daily rate; volunteer program staff - use the equivalent of PO daily rate

3. Sum everyone's daily rate

4. Multiply by 3

Indonesian language version

Interview prep checklist:

- Be familiar with what tool the partner is using, how facilitation worked for the project, what language the workshop was in, and how the tool/concepts were translated]
- Confirm the number of workshops the partner has been through and the status of capacity strengthening activities
- Read any partner profile info, workshop reports, online data, capacity strengthening plan/budget; workshop evaluations.

Introduction and informed consent:

- Introductions
- Thank you so much for your time today. This interview is being conducted by an independent team on behalf of Oxfam Canada that funds x project. The purpose of the interview is get CSO/WRO feedback on the capacity assessment tools and approaches that Oxfam Canada uses in its programs. Oxfam Canada will use the results to improve the tools and approaches for future programs.

  Terimakasih banyak telah meluangkan waktu untuk interview ini. Kegiatan ini dilakukan oleh tim independen atas permintaan Oxfam Kanada yang mendanai project Creating Spaces. Tujuan dari interview ini adalah untuk mendapatkan masukan/umpan balik dari organisasi masyarakat sipil/organisasi yang memperjuangkan hak-hak perempuan terkait pendekatan dan alat/instrument Pengkajian Kapasitas Organisasi Mandiri (CAT tool) yang digunakan Oxfam Kanada dalam program-programnya. Hasil dari asesment ini akan digunakan oleh Oxfam Kanada untuk memperbaiki pendekatan dan Alat Pengkajian Kapasitas tersebut untuk program kedepan.

- We will not name you or your organization when we draw from what you say to describe our findings, If we use a quote or idea from you, we will describe the speaker and organization in general terms, for example [chose an example before the interview e.g., program officer from district-level WRO; executive director of national CSO]

  Kami tidak akan mengungkapkan identitas pribadi bapak/ibu termasuk organisasi asal ketika kami menggunakan informasi yang Anda sampaikan dalam wawancara untuk menjelaskan temuan-temuan kami, jika kami mengutip atau menggunakan ide Anda, kami hanya akan menyebutkan identitas informan dalam secara umum (misalnya Program officer dari WRO tingkat kabupaten/lokal; direktur eksekutif CSO nasional).

- The purpose is *not* a performance evaluation of you or of your local Oxfam office. Rather it is a forward looking assessment helping Oxfam Canada to decide how to use capacity assessment tools and strengthening activities in future programs. It will have no impact on funding for your

organization, the x project, or the local Oxfam office. Our team is also interviewing organizations on other projects in [list other countries].

Kegiatan ini tidak bertujuan mengevaluasi kinerja lembaga bapak/ibu atau Oxfam Indonesia. Sebaliknya, ini adalah asesmen "masa depan" untuk membantu Oxfam Kanada untuk membuat keputusan bagaimana menggunakan Alat Pengkajian Kapasitas Organisasi Mandiri (CAT tool) dan penguatan kegiatan pada program-program di masa mendatang.

- We will distribute a summary of our draft findings for your feedback before we submit them to Oxfam Canada.

  Kami akan menyampaikan kesimpulan dari draft temuan-temuan utama asesmen ini untuk mendapatkan masukan dari bapak/ibu sebelum diserahkan ke Oxfam Kanada.

- Before we begin, do you consent to our conversation being recorded? The only people who will have access to the recording are myself and two colleagues from the study team. The study is independent of Oxfam. No one else in your organization or in Oxfam will have access to the recording or to any of the notes. The recordings and notes will be stored on a secure cloud server. [Obtain consent and begin recording.]

- Sebelum kita mulai, apakah Anda memberikan izin jika pembicaraan ini direkam? Rekaman ini hanya dapat diakses saya dan 2 orang lagi konsultan independen anggota tim asesmen ini. Tidak satupun perwakilan dari Oxfam dan juga perwakilan organisasi Anda yang yang memiliki akses ke rekaman dan catatan wawancara. Rekaman wawancara dan catatan akan disimpan secara aman di layanan komputasi awan (cloud server).

- Any questions before we begin?

- Ada pertanyaan sebelum kita mulai?

- Do you consent to the interview? *[This needs to be recorded, as we won't be collecting written consent.]*
  Apakah Anda memberikan persetujuan untuk diwawancara? [Ini perlu direkam, karena kita tidak akan mengumpulkan persetujuan tertulis]

- Confirm spelling of name, title, organization, project name, contact information for follow up
- Konfirmasi pelafalan nama, gelar, organisasi, nama project, kontak informasi untuk tindak lanjut

Guide

This interview is semi-structured; interviewers will follow the lead of informants in priority topics and thus may end up going through in a different order to the below. The goal should be to touch on all main topics in the course of the interview; however, if an informant feels the core premise of the approach is wrong, the discussion may stay more general (see Q2.1)

Wawancara ini semi terstruktur; pewawancara akan mengikuti informasi dari informan dalam topik-topik prioritas dan dengan demikian dapat berakhir dengan urutan yang berbeda dari urutan di instrumen seperti di bawah. Tujuannya adalah untuk menyentuh semua topik utama selama wawancara; namun, jika seorang informan merasa premis inti dari pendekatan itu salah, diskusi mungkin lebih umum (lihat Q2.1)

Topic	Sub topic (** = high priority)	Interview questions
Organization's definition of a GJO **Definisi Organisasi terkait sebuah GJO**		**1.** The main purpose of this interview is to understand whether and how the capacity assessment and strengthening approaches are helpful for your organization. To help us understand, **please describe what <u>you</u> believe an organization should be like in order to be effective in working for women's rights and gender equality [or - ending violence against women and girls; sexual and reproductive health and rights] (for ex: characteristics, features, staffing, ways of working).** **Tujuan utama dari interview ini adalah untuk memahami apakah dan bagaimana pendekatan Pengkajian dan Penguatan Kapasitas membantu organisasi bapak/ibu. Untuk membantu kami memahami, dapatkah Anda menggambarkan semestinya organisasi itu seperti apa agar efektif bekerja untuk hak-hak perempuan dan persamaan gender [atau mengakhiri kekerasan terhadap perempuan dan anak; Kesehatan dan hak -hak reproduksi dan seksual] (contoh: karakteristik, fitur, staf/SDM, cara bekerja)**

Effectiveness (Achieving their own definition of GJO)
 	
Efektifitas (Mencapai defenisi mereka sendiri terkait GJO)
		2. **In what ways has your experience with capacity assessment and capacity strengthening on [x] project so far impacted your organization becoming more or less a strong organization like what you just described? (EQ1)**
		
		Dengan cara apa/bagaimana pengalaman Anda dengan pengkajian kapasitas dan penguatan kapasitas dalam creating spaces project berdampak pada organisasi Anda menjadi lebih atau kurang kuat seperti apa yang baru saja Anda gambarkan?
		
		   1. Can you provide examples of the changes (if any)? Dapatkan Anda menyebutkan contohnya (Jika ada)?
		   2. ***If*** their response is highly negative or in other ways their experience doesn't relate significantly to achieving their definition of a strong organization - probe
		     Jika respons mereka sangat negatif atau dengan kata lain pengalaman mereka tidak berkaitan secara signifikan
		       1. to understand why not,
		        Pahami mengapa?
		  2. what feedback for improvement they would give

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>

overall, and specifically related to topics below.

Apa umpan balik untuk perbaikan yang secara umum mereka berikan, dan secara khusus terkait topik di bawah.

3.   to understand the difference between their vision and OCA's vision of a gender just organization [ask them this directly, or refer to definitions/domains reflected in the CAT tool that they used]

Untuk memahami perbedaan antara visi mereka dan visi OCA terkait suatu GJO [tanya langsung pada mereka atau refer pada definisi/domain yang terefleksi pada CAT tool yang digunakan]

3.   **_Otherwise_** - Respond to their cues on what topics (among the below) to probe ; the interview does NOT need to follow the order below.

Jika tidak- Tanggapi apa yang mereka sampaikan terkait topik (di bawah) untuk diprobing; Wawancara ini tidak mesti mengikuti urutan di bawah.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

CAT workshop

Lokakarya Pengkajian Kapasitas Organisasi Mandiri (CAT)

</td><td>

Comparison - 1st/2nd workshops
**Facilitation quality

</td><td>

3.   **I would like to hear a little more about your experience in the CAT workshop itself.**

Saya ingin mendengar lebih banyak tentang pengalaman Anda dalam mengikuti Lokakarya Pengkajian Kapasitas Organisasi Mandiri (CAT).

1.   Optional probe, if necessary: Share general results (overall from all partners, rather than specific feedback given by the partner being interviewed) from workshop evaluations if available to prompt reflection. For example, "I noticed that many organizations using the tool gave positive feedback on x but not on y; how does that compare to your experience?"

Pilihan probing, jika diperlukan: share general results (secara keseluruhan dari semua partner, ketimbang umpan balik spesifik dari partner yang di wawancara) dari kegiatan evaluasi workshop jika ada untuk memicu refleksi. Contoh, " Saya perhatikan banyak organisasi yang menggunakan alat tersebut memberikan umpan balik positif terkait X namun bukan Y; bagaimana dengan pengalaman Anda?"

2.   Alternative optional probe, if necessary: How many people attended the workshop? Who were they? [*Note this*

</td></tr>
</table>

	**Online tool	*information is also available in workshop reports you will have read before; however, this can help set the scene from their perspective.] (EQ5)*
		Alternatif pilihan probing, jika diperlukan; Berapa orang yang menghadiri Lokakarya? Siapa saja yang hadir? [Catatan: informasi ini juga tersedia di laporan lokakarya yang akan dibaca sebelumnya; meskipun demikian, pertanyaan ini dapat membantu menciptakan situasi dari perspektif mereka. (EQ5)
	Accessibility of language/concepts **Free/equal participation** [this is largely but not entirely a function of facilitation quality]	
	Unexpected workshop results Mitigating factors	Topics to probe: Topik-topik untuk diprobing: 3. [Creating Spaces] What was different, better, worse between the 2 workshops? [Creating Spaces] Apa yang berbeda, lebih baik, lebih buruk diantara 2 lokakarya? 4. Facilitation quality (EQ3) - Was the facilitator able to explain concepts so you could understand? Was the facilitator able to help everyone to participate equally in the workshop? Was the facilitator able to help keep some individuals from dominating? Kualitas Fasilitasi (EQ3)- Apakah facilitator mampu untuk menjelaskan konsep-konsep sehingga dapat dipahami? Apakah fasilitator mampu untuk membantu setiap orang untuk berpartisipasi secara sama dalam lokakarya tersebut? Apakah fasilitator mampu mencegah peserta yang mendominasi? 5. Online tool (EQ3) [for CAT4SRHR/CAT4EVAWG only; the individual involved may or may not have directly used the tool as mostly facilitators have accessed] Online instrument (EQ3) [hanya untuk CAT4SRHR/CAT4EVAWG; individu yang terlibat bisa jadi/tidak menggunakan instrument itu secara lansung karena kebanyakan fasilitator yang dapat mengakses] 6. Accessibility of language and concepts (EQ3) Aksesibilitas bahasa dan konsep (EQ3) 7. How much was everyone able to speak up and participate? What about junior staff? Women and men? [other sub-groups that may be specially relevant in their organizational context] Who stayed mostly quiet? What should have been different for everyone to be able to freely participate? (EQ2) Berapa sering setiap orang dapat berbicara dan berpartisipasi? Bagaimana dengan staf yang masih junior? Laki-laki dan perempuan? [Sub-grup lain yang

		khususnya relevan dengan konteks organisasi mereka] siapa yang biasanya lebih banyak diam? Apa yang semestinya dilakukan agar setiap peserta dapat berpartisipasi secara bebas? (EQ2) 8. What organizational needs did you identify that hadn't been visible before? (EQ2) Kebutuhan organisasi apa yang Anda identifikasi yang sebelumnya tidak terlihat/diketahui? 9. Any environmental factors that had a strong positive or negative impact on their experience (e.g. size or comfort of the workshop space, good/bad food, loud noises in the surrounding areas) Faktor lingkungan yang memiliki dampak positif dan negatif terhadap pengalaman mereka (misalnya, ukuran dan kenyamanan ruangan lokakarya, makanan enak/tidak enak, ribut/berisik di sekitar lokasi kegiatan)
CAT manual **Manual CAT**	**** Domains (manual-specific)** **Self adjustments**	**4. I'm also wondering what feedback you have about the CAT manual.** What was helpful, what could have been improved? (EQ3) **Apa masukan/umpan balik Anda terhadap CAT Manual.** Apa yang berguna? Apa yang dapat diperbaiki? (EQ3) Topics to probe Topik untuk diprobing 1. How did the domains align with your definition of an organization working for women's rights and gender equality [or EVAWG/SRHR]? Were the sections focused on EVAWG/SRHR helpful [if relevant]; provide examples]? How did those compare to the other sections? (EQ3) Bagaimana domain (strategi organisasional) sejalan dengan definisi ideal Anda mengenai lembaga yang bergerak memperjuangkan hak-hal perempuan dan keadilan gender (atau EVAWG/SRHR? Apakah bagian yang fokus pada EVAWG/SRHR membantu [jika relevan); berikan contoh]? Bagaimana hal itu jika dibandingkan dengan bagian lain? (EQ3) 2. Did your organization make any adjustments in the CAT process so it would work better for your organization? (some examples might be adapting some of the questions, or changing the schedule and flow, or adjusting the facilitation approach, so that they match your organization

		context) What were they? Would you do it again? (EQ3) Apakah organisasi Anda membuat penyesuaian dalam proses CAT sehingga itu lebih sesuai dengan kebutuhan organisasi Anda? (Contoh: penyesuaian dalam pertanyaan-pertanyaan, mengubah jadwal/alur, menyesuaikan/mengatur pendekatan fasilitasi, sehingga itu dapat lebih sesuai dengan konteks organisasi Anda? Apa saja itu? Apakah hal tersebut akan dilakukan lagi?

Capacity strengthening action planning
 	
Rencana Aksi Penguatan Kapasitas
		5. **Were you involved in the capacity strengthening action planning and budgeting process?** [*replace with equivalent term depending on tool*]
		       If yes - probe -
		              1. What was that like? What could Oxfam/the project do to improve it? (EQ3/5)
		
		Apakah Anda terlibat dalam proses penyusunan rencana aksi dan penganggaran?
		
		Bagaimana prosesnya? Apa yang dapat dilakukan Oxfam untuk memperbaikinya? (EQ3/5)

Capacity strengthening **Penguatan Kapasitas**	****Strengthening organization as GJO** **General impacts** ****Suggestions for improvement**	[ask status for all; probe if relevant] 6. **What capacity strengthening activities has your organization done so far? [**be familiar with their individual plan/activities as well as the crosscutting activities at the project level, if relevant, as well the budget available for this within the project – use to prompt as necessary] **Apa aktifitas-aktifitas penguatan kapasitas yang telah dilakukan organisasi Anda sejauh ini**? [Familiar dengan rencana/aktifitas individual juga aktifitas cross cuting di level project, jika relevan, juga budget yang available untuk ini dalam project tersebut. *To probe -* 1. Have these activities impacted (*positively or negatively*) your organization's capacity to work effectively on women's rights and gender equality [or, EVAWG/SRHR]? If so, how? If not, what could be done differently? Apakah aktifitas ini berdampak (baik secara positif dan negatif) terhadap kapasitas organisasi untuk bekerja secara efektif dalam isu hak-hak perempuan dan persamaan gender (atau, EVAWG/SRHR)? Jika iya, bagaimana? Jika tidak. Apa hal berbeda yang yang

		dapat dilakukan? 2.　　Have they had other positive or negative effects on your organization? Apakah ada efek positif dan negatif lain terhadap organisasi Anda? 3.　　What if any additional capacity strengthening activities or options would you like to see? What's preventing this? (EQ3/5) Apa (jika ada) aktifitas penguatan kapasitas tambahan atau pilihan-pilihan lain yang ingin anda lihat/lakukan? Apa yang menghambat ini? (EQ3/5)
Self-monitoring **Monitoring Mandiri**	****Online tool**	[ask status for all; probe if relevant] **7.　　What is capacity strengthening self-monitoring like in your organization?** **Seperti apa monitoring mandiri penguatan kapasitas di organisasi Anda?** *To probe* – Probing- 　1.　How have you been using workshop results to self-monitor and track changes, if at all? (EQ2) Bagaimana Anda menggunakan hasil lokakarya untuk melakukan monitoring mandiri dan melacak perubahan, jika ada? (EQ2) 2.　　How have you been using the online tool (EQ3) [for CAT4SRHR/CAT4EVAWG only; the individual involved may or may not have directly used the tool] Bagaimana anda menggunakan alat online (EQ3) [hanya untuk CAT4SRHR/CAT4EVAWG; individual yang terlibat bisa jadi/tidak terlibat langsung menggunakan alat tersebut]

Other tools/processes (Overlap) **Proses/alat lain (tumpang-tindih)**	**8.　　As far as the CAT workshop, has your organization gone through a similar process for another donor project or on its own? (EQ4) – [Get name of the organization/sponsor and/or tool]** Setelah lokakarya CAT, apakah organisasi Anda pernah menjalani proses serupa untuk untuk project donor lain atau proses yang sama tersendiri? (EQ4)-[dapatkan nama organisasi/sponsor/alatnya] 　1.　How did that experience compare to that on the OCA project? What was better/worse? Bagaimana pengalaman tersebut jika dibandingkan dengan OCA project? Apa yang lebih baik/buruk? 2.　　Which, if either, would you choose to do on your own and why? Apakah Anda lebih memilih melakukan sendiri dan mengapa?

Impact (Oxfam's theory of change) **Dampak (Teori Perubahan Oxfam)**	**Equal participation in organization**	**9. There are a few specific changes that may or may not have occurred in your organization as a result of the CAT workshop and other processes. (EQ2)** – **Ada beberapa perubahan spesifik yang mungkin terjadi di organisasi Anda sebagai hasil dari lokakarya CAT dan proses lainnya. (EQ2)-** *[these are NOT high priority questions that need a lot of probing - just need a sense of whether or not the partners self-report changes in these areas]* 1. You said that in the workshop setting, individuals [were/were not] able to participate freely and equally? What about outside of the workshop – what changes have there been in staff being able to speak out about organizational challenges? (EQ2) Anda mengatakan sebelumnya bahwa peserta (Dapat/tidak dapat) berpartisipasi secara bebas dan sama? Bagaimana ketika diluar lokakarya-perubahan apa saja yang terjadi pada staf agar dapat berbicara bebas terkait tantangan organisasi? (EQ2) 2. Another change might be that organizations are more strategic about capacity strengthening, including prioritizing activities based on needs and available resources. How well do you think the process has helped your organization with that? What is your organization doing differently compared to before? (EQ2) Perubahan lain mungkin organisasi lebih bersikap strategis terkait penguatan kapasitas termasuk memprioritaskan aktifitas berdasarkan kebutuhan dan ketersediaan sumber daya. Sebaik apa proses ini membantu organisasi Anda terkait hal itu? Apa hal berbeda yang dilakukan dibanding dengan sebelumnya? (EQ2) 3. Another change might be that organizations are better about learning and adapting when challenges arise. What if any changes have you observed related to learning and adaptation in the organization? (EQ2) Perubahan lain bisa saja organisasi lebih baik dalam belajar dan beradaptasi ketika tantangan muncul. Apa (jika ada) perubahan-perubahan yang Anda observasi terkait pembelajaran dan adaptasi di organisasi Anda? (EQ2)
	Capacity strengthening strategy	
	Learning and adaptation	
Side effects **Efek samping**		**10. Has anything happened or changed in your organization that surprised you as a result of this process?** - can be positive or negative (EQ1,2) Apakah ada sesuatu terjadi atau berubah di organisasi Anda

		yang mengejutkan sebagai hasil dari proses ini? Bisa positif atau negatif (EQ1,2)
Sustainability **Keberlanjutan**		**11. Do you think any of the positive changes you've experienced will last? (EQ6)** [Remind them of a few you've heard during the interview] **Apakah perubahan positif yang tadi Anda sebutkan akan bertahan? (EQ6) [ingatkan mereka beberapa prubahan yang didengar selama wawancara]** 1. What will it take for them to last inside your organization? What if any outside support do you think will be necessary? Apa yang diperlukan agar perubahan tersebut bertahan di dalam organisasi Anda? Menurut Anda, dukungan luar seperti apa yang akan dibutuhkan?
Partner choice **Pilihan organisasi mitra**		**12. Would you choose your organization to do the CAT if it wasn't required for the project? (EQ1)** **Apakah Anda akan memilih organisasi Anda untuk melakukan CAT jika tidak diperlukan untuk proyek? (EQ1)** 1. Why/why not? Mengapa/mengapa tidak? 2. If yes - would you do it if there wasn't outside funding available? Jika ya, apakah Anda akan melakukan itu jika tidak tersedia pendanaan/funding? 3. Would you say the time and efforts are worth it? Why or why not? (EQ5) Apakah Anda akan mengatakan bahwa waktu dan upaya itu sepadan? Mengapa atau mengapa tidak? (EQ5)
Costs **Biaya**		**13. *[For ED/senior leadership]*** This question of whether it's worth the time and effort is an important part of Oxfam Canada's questions for the research we are doing. So that we can get a sense of the resource required for your organization to participate, can I ask your assistance on a few estimates - ***Pertanyaan tentang apakah ini sepadan dengan waktu dan upaya adalah bagian penting dari pertanyaan Oxfam Kanada untuk penelitian yang kami lakukan. Agar kami dapat memahami sumber daya yang dibutuhkan organisasi Anda untuk berpartisipasi, dapatkah saya meminta bantuan Anda untuk memperkirakan beberapa hal.*** 1. The value of everyone's time for attending? [*We will attempt to determine this information*

		in advance from Oxfam; if not can talk them through it as homework; see below] – Nilai waktu semua orang untuk menghadiri kegiatan CAT? *[Kita akan berusaha menentukan informasi ini sebelumnya dari Oxfam; jika tidak bisa membicarakannya sebagai pekerjaan rumah; Lihat di bawah]* 2. Any other costs associated with it that your organization had to cover? (Such as: transportation to the venue; refreshments) Adakah biaya lain yang terkait kegiatan itu yang mesti ditanggung organisasi Anda? (Seperti: transportasi ke lokasi acara; minuman, dll)

NOTE: Producing time value estimates (was not translated; see English language version)

Annex F: Informed consent and interview guide for non-partners

[Note: KIIs with OCA staff were tailored to their specific experience/role; for informants with experience on Engendering Change a few questions were added to query their comparative experience on EC and current projects.]

Introduction and informed consent:

(adapt as relevant to previous interactions/the person's role; however, highlighted text is particularly relevant to setting the tone of the interview)
- Introductions
- Thank you so much for your time today. This interview is being conducted by an independent team on behalf of Oxfam Canada that funds x project. The purpose of the interview is to get country office [or CAT facilitator] feedback on the capacity assessment tools and approaches that Oxfam Canada uses in its programs. Oxfam Canada will use the results to improve the tools and approaches for future programs.
- **We will not name you individually when we draw from what you say to describe our findings; however, we will identify that you work for Oxfam [and/or facilitated CAT workshops for Oxfam]. It may be difficult to avoid sharing information that identifies the country and project that you work for, though we will try to do so.**
- The purpose is *not* a performance evaluation of your local Oxfam office. Rather it is a forward looking assessment helping Oxfam Canada to decide how to use capacity assessment tools and strengthening activities in future programs. It will have no impact on funding for the x project. Our team is also interviewing staff in [list other countries].
- We will distribute a summary of our draft findings for your feedback before we submit them to Oxfam Canada.

- Before we begin, do you consent to our conversation being recorded? The only people who will have access to the recording are myself and two colleagues from the study team. The study is independent of Oxfam. No one else in Oxfam will have access to the recording or to any of the notes. The recordings and notes will be stored on a secure cloud server. *[Obtain consent and begin recording.]*
- Any questions before we begin?
- Do you consent to the interview? *[This needs to be recorded, as we won't be collecting written consent.]*
- Confirm spelling of name, title, organization, project name, contact information for follow up

Topics (questions are indicative for reference only, adapt as appropriate!):

The topic guide/questions are also included in the notes template below. Adapt the specific topics and questions as relevant based on previous interactions/the person's role/your background reading).

Role & relationship w/ partners
1. **Their role.** Tell me about your role at Oxfam, on the x project and how your role relates to the CAT and capacity strengthening as well as to supporting partners more generally.
2. **Interactions with partners.** For some context - please describe how you interact with partner organizations. (in person at their offices or at the Oxfam office, through phone, through written communication; how often - for example in a typical month how many times would you interact with one specific partner?)

Organizational strengthening capacities

3.   **Experience - organizational capacity.** What other experience with organizational capacity assessment and strengthening do you have? How would you compare your other experience with that on the x project?

4.   **Resources - organizational capacity.** What organizational capacity expertise is available to you on the project team or within Oxfam? Do you have designated organizational capacity development specialists informing the project?

Capacity activities & tools

5.   **TOT:** *[if facilitated CAT]* Tell me about what preparation you had to facilitate. What worked well? What could have been different to make you more prepared?

6.   **Manual**: What feedback if any do you have on the CAT manual itself? How relevant is it to your partners' own context and needs? What works, what could change? (& Ask specifically about the EVAWG/SRHR focus)

7.   **Workshop:** *[if facilitated or directly observed CAT]* Tell me about the CAT workshop experience. What went well, what do you wish had been done differently? What kept you from changing it? What did you learn through the process that might help improve future implementation? Possible probes -

a.   Facilitation skill/preparation
b.   Adaptation of the tool to specific partner
c.   Translation
d.   Accessibility of concepts
e.   Equitable participation
f.   Unexpected findings

8.   **Action planning:** *[if facilitated/directly involved]* Tell me about the capacity strengthening action planning and budgeting process for capacity strengthening activities. What works well about the process, what could improve?

9.   **Online tool:** *[for Philippines, Indonesia, OCA]* Have you used the online tool? How has it been useful? What could improve?

10.   **Capacity strengthening activities.** Tell me about the activities that have taken place and are planned. What works well? What more would you like the project to do? What would you do differently if you could? What's preventing those changes? [*try not to get into the details of each specific activity, but rather focus on the "menu" of activities available to partners*]

11.   **Self-monitoring.** Have you been involved in partner self-monitoring? What feedback about how that process could be more useful or effective for partners?

General outcomes

12.   **Choice.** Would you choose to use the CAT with the partners on x project if it wasn't required by OCA funding? What other tool, if any, would you prefer to use? [get as much detail for desk review follow up] What about your preferred tool makes you say that?

13.   ***Impact/effectiveness: [if informant relates to the partners outside the CAT workshop itself]*** According to your observations and knowledge, what if any effect has going through the CAT process, capacity planning, self-monitoring, and capacity strengthening had on the project partners? These can be positive or negative. How do those effects relate to partners being more gender just organizations? What will it take for positive effects to be sustainable? Possible probes -

a.   More strategic about capacity planning
b.   Equitable participation within the organization
c.   Learning and adaptability

Cost data - *TBD with Megan per informant.*