



Beneficiary Communications and Accountability Baseline Assessment Grid Institutional Capacity for BCA in Response, Recovery and Development

Benchmark	Basic (1)	Intermediate (2)	Advanced (3)	Mature (4)
<p>Institutional Commitments and Human and Financial Resources</p> <p>Organizations demonstrate the political will, and accord appropriate human and financial resources to incorporate BCA into programs.</p>	<p>Institutional Knowledge: Management and staff have little to or very basic knowledge of BCA concepts. BCA activities that are realized are done de facto.</p> <p>Institutional Attitude: Attitude of management and staff can range from positive to negative, but little priority is given to implementing formalized BCA components in field.</p> <p>Human Resources: No staff is partially or fully dedicated to BCA.</p> <p>Financial Resources: Little to no budget is reserved for BCA activities.</p>	<p>Institutional Knowledge: Management and staff have basic to intermediate knowledge of BCA. It is a priority at a program level. BCA is formalized through a communications plan but it is not necessarily integrated in the program logframe.</p> <p>Institutional Attitude: Program staff and management recognize the importance of BCA and give some priority to its development and implementation. Measures are taken to involve beneficiaries (mostly through consultation) in program design and implementation. Community feedback is not necessarily incorporated into continual learning platforms.</p> <p>Human Resources: Some staff (HQ and or Field) are</p>	<p>Institutional Knowledge: Management and staff have a good knowledge of BCA practices. It is a priority for all programs and written into directional documents (LFTP or Country-Strategy). There could be a lack of depth of how to integrate BCA into general programming. Community feedback is taken up in a formal capacity at program level and complaints at a management level.</p> <p>Institutional Attitude: Program staff and management recognize the importance of BCA and seek to improve in this capacity. Beneficiaries are involved in program design and implementation.</p> <p>Human Resources: The necessary staff at HQ and</p>	<p>Institutional Knowledge: Management and staff have very good knowledge of BCA practices. BCA is integrated at both a country level (LFTP, Country-Strategy and possible with an Accountability Framework) and at the program level (integrated into program logframes and M&E frameworks). Community feedback is recognized and incorporated into institutional learning platforms.</p> <p>Institutional Attitude: Beneficiaries are involved in setting priorities and creating plans for programmes; the institution recognizes that affected populations 'own' the relief and recovery response.</p> <p>Human Resources: The necessary staff at HQ and Field is hired to execute BCA activities.</p>



		partially or fully dedicated to BCA. Financial Resources: Budget is accorded to realize limited BCA activities.	Field is hired to execute BCA activities. Financial Resources: Adequate budget is accorded to realize BCA activities.	Financial Resources: Adequate budget is accorded to realize BCA activities. Budget for training and development of BCA is also accorded.
Information Sharing: Information-sharing tools and mechanisms are developed that increase beneficiaries' capacity to make informed decisions and increase knowledge sharing.	Content: NGO staff provides project participants with basic information about the NGO and its goals and work. Most information is about project-specific aims and activities. Channel: Most information is provided verbally and/or informally in reaction to field needs. Frequency: It is generally provided at the beginning of projects, and may not be updated often. Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: No formalized communications strategy document. Information sharing is not included as an indicator in monitoring and evaluation framework.	Content: Information about the NGO and its work is made publicly available to stakeholders including contact details for NGO staff, programme aims and activities, timescales, selection criteria, and some budget information (where appropriate). Channel: There is one or more methods of sharing information chosen by the NGO (for example, meetings, information sheets, noticeboards, radio, posters, newspapers). Channels are identified for beneficiaries to give feedback to the organization (see feedback, complaints and response) and the organization integrates this feedback into its decision-making processes at the program level. Frequency: Information is	Content: Full information about the programme is made publicly available to local people and partners. It includes a budget, showing all direct costs. Thematic information is provided to complement specific programs (health, DRR, violence prevention etc.). Channel: A variety of methods are used based on community consultation. Languages used are easy for local people to access. Specific efforts are made to provide information to women and the most marginalized people (including people who are illiterate). Channels are identified for beneficiaries to give feedback to the organization (see feedback, complaints and response) and is integrated into	Content: Full programme and financial information is published. Thematic information is provided to the program complement specific programs (health, DRR, violence prevention etc.). Channel: Communication channels are agreed upon with communities in order to ensure accessibility and entertainment value for all members (including men, women, girls and boys). Channels are designated by the community to give feedback to the organization. Feedback is incorporated into decision-making process at both field and management levels (see feedback, complaints and response). Organization explores use of new technology to improve reach and scale of



		<p>provided at the beginning, and then sporadically throughout the program cycle.</p> <p>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: Documentation of communications activities or procedures exists (such as a communication plan) at the field level and perhaps at HQ.</p>	<p>decision-making processes</p> <p>Frequency: Information is regularly updated – for example, with reports of activities carried out, expenditure made, and changes to activities or budgets.</p> <p>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: Communications plan exists, as well as procedural documents. Programs include communications in their activities. Indicators for monitoring and evaluation may or may not be included in the M&E framework.</p>	<p>information sharing where appropriate.</p> <p>Frequency: Information is published systematically including an exit strategy. Budget and expenditure information for direct and indirect costs. Updates and progress reports are published regularly.</p> <p>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation: An integrated beneficiary engagement strategy exists. All program proposals have a section on communications. Regular monitoring (by NGO staff or beneficiaries) is carried out to ensure that the information is relevant and understood, particularly by excluded groups. Indicators for information sharing are included in the M&E framework.</p>
<p>Participation: Participatory structures are developed that improve beneficiary decision-</p>	<p>Information: Community mobilization is limited to information sharing (see above) in which participants are informed about the NGO's plans, throughout the project cycle. NGO must</p>	<p>Consultation: Participants provide information that NGO staff use to make key decisions about their work, at all stages of the project cycle. Programs more effectively target beneficiary needs; no</p>	<p>Partnership: Decisions are made jointly by NGO staff and project participants. Joint ownership over program process, program objectives are not community driven</p> <p>Community Profiling/Needs</p>	<p>Delegation: Community and partners take a lead in making decisions, drawing on the NGO's expertise, as relevant. Community takes on full responsibility for the continued implementation of</p>



<p>making capacity on key aspects of program delivery.</p>	<p><i>continue to lead in program implementation for program to maintain sustainability.</i></p> <p>Community Profiling/Needs Assessment: Participatory needs assessment for the purpose of getting information about the community. NGO staff assume that key informants represent poor and marginalized people. There is limited analysis of who holds authority in the local community and how power is distributed.</p> <p>Design and Planning: Proposals and plans are mostly written by senior/technical NGO staff. The goal of the project will be determined by the NGO based on a participatory assessment. The community is informed about the outcome of the NGO's design and planning process.</p> <p>Beneficiary selection: The selection criteria is determined by the NGO and affected population is</p>	<p><i>structure is developed to take on their implementation after organization pulls out.</i></p> <p>Community Profiling/Needs Assessment: Participatory assessment includes asking the community about their priorities. NGO staff consults women and men separately. They identify the main social groupings in the community, including the most marginalized, and consider their priorities. They identify the local institutions responsible for delivering services, and also discuss plans with them.</p> <p>Design and Planning: The community is asked to advise on the outcome of our design and planning process e.g. through committees.</p> <p>Beneficiary Selection: The community is asked to give advise on the selection of beneficiaries e.g. through committees.</p> <p>Implementation: The community is asked to give advise on the</p>	<p>Assessment: The assessment is carried out jointly between the community and the NGO.</p> <p>Design and Planning: Community members contribute equally to making key decisions about the programme, throughout the project cycle, including program objectives and budget. They reflect on their current situations and make sure they feel free to contribute to discussions and decisions.</p> <p>Beneficiary Selection: The selection criteria and process is developed jointly between the affected population and the NGO. NGO staff makes sure they work with individuals and organizations that truly represent the interests of different social groups, including the most marginalized people, and women as well as men.</p> <p>Implementation: The program implementation is a joint effort between the community and the NGO.</p> <p>M&E: The monitoring and</p>	<p><i>program/program goals are reached.</i></p> <p>Community Profiling/Needs Assessment: The assessment is carried out by the affected population itself for their programs. NGO staff check that the work truly reflects the priorities of the poorest and most marginalized people (including women as well as men). Conflicts between different interest groups in the local community are recognized and tackled using mechanisms that local people respect. The work strengthens connections between groups.</p> <p>Design and Planning: The design and planning process is carried out by the community for their programs</p> <p>Beneficiary Selection: The community develop their own selection criteria and process for their programs</p> <p>Implementation: The community implements their programs</p>
--	--	--	---	--



	<p>informed about the selection criteria and process. Implementation: The affected population is informed about the implementation of our programs. The NGO is responsible for the majority of project implementation. M&E: The affected population is solicited for information about the programs for M&E purposes.</p>	<p>implementation of our programs e.g. through committees. M&E: The community is asked to give feedback in our monitoring and evaluation of our programs.</p>	<p>evaluation is a joint effort between the community and the NGO.</p>	<p>M&E: The community monitors and evaluates their programs</p>
<p>Feedback and Complaints Handling: A community-based complaints and response mechanism is developed to reduce the risk of fraud and abuse and ensure quality program delivery.</p>	<p>No differentiation is made between feedback and complaints. Channel: Community feedback is provided verbally and/or informally. Informal opportunities are made during staff's day-to-day activities. There are no formal systems for encouraging feedback, or for recording and monitoring complaints. Response: Response to beneficiary feedback may or may not be addressed depending on the priorities of the personnel in place; it is not an institutional priority.</p>	<p>A differentiation is made between feedback and complaints. Channel: Staff make opportunities to hear feedback and complaints from project participants through formal systems for feedback and complaints – for example, complaints boxes, phone lines, feedback forms, meetings with managers, and written reports. Response: Complaints and feedback receive a formal response, but are not necessarily incorporated into the decision-making</p>	<p>A differentiation is made between feedback and complaints. Channel: The NGO actively encourages people to give feedback and make complaints. Formal systems for both feedback and complaints are designed in collaboration with the community and are safe, easy and accessible for project participants to use (including women and men). They are in local language(s), and are promoted to local people. The community is educated on the organization staff Code of Conduct.</p>	<p>A differentiation is made between feedback and complaints. Channel: Feedback is actively solicited through channels designated by the community. The community, building on respected local ways of giving feedback, designs the CMR. They encourage the most marginalised people to respond, and cover sensitive areas like sexual abuse and corruption. NGO staff is trained on how to manage sensitive complaints and there is an investigation policy and procedure in</p>



		<p>processes. Staff and managers spend time in local communities, and ask for informal feedback from local people and partners (including women and men).</p>	<p>Response: Feedback receives a formal response and is integrated into the joint decision-making process. Complaints are recorded by the agency and there is evidence that action is taken in response at a management level. The NGO regularly monitors how satisfied people are with the work (for example, using feedback forms, focus groups or surveys). Staff carefully creates informal opportunities to hear from different people.</p>	<p>place. Response: All feedback, complaints and responses are recorded, and there is evidence that they are systematically acted on and acknowledged with those that submitted them. Feedback and complaints are incorporated into decision-making procedures, captured into lessons learned and validated by senior management to be incorporated into future project design. Staff and managers set targets for the time they spend in communities and monitor their performance. They may employ staff to liaise with different social groups. The NGO regularly monitors satisfaction levels.</p>
--	--	---	---	---