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### ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASALs</td>
<td>Arid and Semi-Arid Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community-Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Community Systems Strengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRC</td>
<td>Kenya Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP</td>
<td>Medium Term Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDMA</td>
<td>National Drought Management Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLW</td>
<td>People Living With HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This assessment was commissioned by UN Women to identify active women-led community-based organizations (CBOs) in 23 Arid and Semi-Arid (ASALs) Counties of Kenya, and evaluate their capacity, gaps, and challenges in implementing gender-sensitive Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Humanitarian work. The exercise would further provide key recommendations for appropriate entry points to building their capacities to effectively engage in the implementation of DRR and Humanitarian activities within their respective counties as well as at the national levels.

The key results of the overall assessment can be summarized as follows:

- Majority of the women-led CBOs in ASALs engage in one way or another in disaster risk reduction and humanitarian activities even though the organizations interviewed do not recognize or classify these activities as such. They largely see these activities as livelihoods and food security improvement activities. These activities largely fall under the realms of food security – livestock and crop farming, revolving funds, relief distribution, irrigation farming - horticulture, food for asset, reproductive health, livelihood improvement, girl child education, conflict and peace building, governance and advocacy, enterprise development and income generating activities, environmental management and conservation. 43% of activities under review fell under the prevention disaster phase, 38% in recovery, 11% in mitigation and only 8% in the response phase.

- Most of the CBO’s presently have very low capacity to undertake effective DRR and humanitarian work in all aspects including concept and practice, financial resources, skills and personnel, access to equipment and office space among others.

- All the CBOs were keen to learn new skills and techniques on disaster, drought and risk management and humanitarian related practices as well as on resilience building in the ASALs and understand the kind of activities they can undertake within this area that can make meaningful changes in their lives.

- Most of the women-led CBOs have low and or inadequate capacity to undertake financial management such as effective budgeting, auditing and reporting to donors. Only 58% of these institutions held a bank account with commercial banks.

---

1 UN Women are classifying as DRR and humanitarian activities as activities that are aimed at mitigating the effects of various hazards and disasters, responding to humanitarian needs and those that support communities to recover and prevent future disasters.
• While 36 or 90% of the sampled CBOs stated that they have a constitution only 3% indicated that this constitution was documented on paper and approved by the representatives of the organization. Secondly a majority of these CBOs largely lacked prerequisite skills on governance, strategic planning, leadership and conflict management relevant to programming and over 32% lacked any form of organization strategy, written or unwritten.

• While many of these organizations assessed have previously undertaken initiatives to source donor funds, most of them lack technical capacity in proposal writing and in engagement with donors as well as other stakeholders. Only 3% of the organizations have ever received funding from successful submission of proposals (proposals that were developed by hired experts).

• The issue of capacity building in proposal writing, project management, fundraising and legal and institutional management emerged prominently during the study as a key area where the CBOs required technical assistance.

• On DRR and humanitarian work, results revealed that 46% of the organizations interviewed had a few of their staff with basic facts, theories and concepts on DRR/M and humanitarian issues. 29% of the CBOs have human personnel who understand DRR/M and causes of disaster vulnerability in the community, though with very little understanding on the difference between disaster risk reduction and humanitarian work.

• Generally, few women led CBOs indicated to have received funding from the County Government (for example, it is only in Kilifi County where a CBOs is being supported to procure seeds, fertilizers and equipment’s by the county Government). Despite the availability of Uwezo funds and Youth Enterprise Development Fund (YEDF), majority of the CBOs seems not to be aware of the existence of these funding streams at the local level. The absence of CBOs representation at the county coordination mechanism /steering committee seems to have been the likely cause.

Other prominent issues that emerged throughout the assessment were lack of adequate financial resources and technical capacities to enable the CBOs undertake their roles effectively. Another notable issue was that a majority (close to 70%) of these organizations were quite small with memberships averaging between 5-50 members and thereby limiting the scope of these institutions to influence activities beyond their localized geographic areas of operation in their current form. In this case, it might be necessary to support a network at the county level to bring several CBOs together especially when it comes to advocacy issues. Their current activity set also basically involve activities where members
participate in revolving funds by loaning money to members through ‘merry-go-round’ as a key mechanism to raise money for their children’s education, start-up capital for small business and income generating activities. The large numbers of CBOs in one particular area however raise the prospect of enabling two or more CBOs coming together to upscale both the scope of activities and geographic influence. A promising disaster prevention and mitigation participation model further observed during the assessment was the one involving cash for assets and cash for work programme implemented by Kenya Red-Cross, WFP and other INGOs together with the community based organizations and that also targeted marginalized groups. The programmes are designed with skills transfers and capacity development components that ease the exit strategy for the UN agency and INGOs.

As a conclusion, there are numerous capacity gaps among women led CBOs working in DRR and humanitarian work in the ASALs of Kenya. The organizations need technical and financial assistance and collaboration with various DRR stakeholders including UN agencies to ensure effective engagement and contribution to DRR efforts in the ASAL counties of Kenya. Key detailed recommendations about what is required are presented in the report under the key thematic areas of capacity building, financial resources management and networking and community initiatives.
CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND

1.1 Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)
The “Community-Based Organizations” (CBOs) are commonly defined as public or private non-profits that is representative of a community or a significant segment of a community engaged in tackling issues that are pertinent to that community. They are essentially a subset of the wider group of non-profits civil societies. Like other nonprofits they are often run on a voluntary basis and are self-funding, while some of them are faith-based in nature. Within community-based organizations there are many variations in terms of capacity such as size, leadership, financial management and organizational structure or the level of knowledge and skills in running their projects. Gender disparity in leadership and management of CBOs is also another variation, with women not being equally represented in management of these organizations. Yet, women normally play a critical role when it comes to issues of gender equality and empowerment of women. More research suggest that without the full participation and contribution of women in decision-making and leadership, real community resilience to disasters cannot be achieved. Similarly, historical data signified that women led organizations have numerous roles in grassroots’ development since ancient time and these roles are critical with the increasing disasters and related crisis situations which have profoundly different impacts on women, girls, boys and men.

In Kenya, the evolution of community-based organizations, especially in arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) counties has strengthened the view that these local level organizations would be more effective in addressing local needs and challenges in these complex contexts. This is because they have local knowledge, networks, understand the culture and context. Often what they lack is financial and other technical capacities. However, previous assessment indicates that a number of CBO's are faced with a myriad of challenges common to other local nonprofit agencies in Kenya. Some specific and unique challenges include but not limited to the following; most of the CBOs have a paucity of personnel with strong skills and knowledge in emerging global issues like gender, disaster risk reduction, and climate change adaptation across most of these organizations. Majority of the CBO's are often subject to financial constraints. Globally, there is a recognition that CBOs should be strengthened to play more central role on issues of DRR and humanitarian. Recognizing and strengthening women’s organizations and networks for improved capacity and participation in DRR and humanitarian programme with particular focus on building on community resilience efforts led by grassroots organizations is critical. However, this cannot be achieved without effectively evaluating the capacity of women led CBOs working in DRR and Humanitarian initiatives, especially in the disaster prone areas. It’s against this background that UN Women commissioned this study to assess the capacity of women led CBO in 23 ASALs Counties in Kenya, to ultimately promote women leadership, empowerment and participation in key decision making process on DRR and Humanitarian work.

---
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1.2 Kenya’s Disaster Situation
Statistics indicate that Kenya is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the Horn of Africa region. More than seventy per cent of disasters in Kenya result from extreme climatic events such as floods and droughts\(^3\). An estimated 3 to 4 million Kenyans are affected annually by natural and human-made disasters that disrupt livelihoods and draw gains achieved in human development. Between 1964 and 2004, Kenya recorded 11 major episodes of drought and 17 floods which affected an average of 1,482,964 and 70,795 people respectively. During the same period, 165 Kenyans were killed by drought and 524 by floods respectively. Collectively, the economic cost of floods and droughts is estimated to create a long-term fiscal liability equivalent to about 2.0 per cent to 2.4 per cent of GDP each year, or approximately US$500 million per year. According to research documents, recent major droughts occurred in 1991–1992, 1995–1996, 1998–2000, 2004–2005 and 2008-2011\(^4\). Droughts cost an estimated 8.0 per cent of GDP every five years. The drought of 1998-2000 was considered the worst in 40 years as approximately 4.4 million people required food assistance in the arid and semi-arid counties.

Major floods seasonally affect parts of Nyanza and Western provinces, especially around the Lake Victoria Basin, as well as the Tana River drainage basin and coastal settlements. The ASALs also periodically experience flash floods. Landslides occur mostly during the rainy season and are associated with floods. They are particularly a concern in regions of the country with steep slopes and annual rainfall of over 1,200 millimeters such as Western, Nyanza and the north Rift Valley regions. Kenya also faces a wide range of natural and human-induced hazards, such as human and animal disease, violent conflicts, earthquakes, and urban and forest fires, that impacts on the lives and livelihoods of communities areas. Like many crisis situations, women and girls are disproportionately affected by these disasters due to existing and underlying vulnerabilities.

1.3 Study Area
The capacity assessment study for women led CBOs working on DRR and humanitarian work was conducted in 23 Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL) counties in Kenya. The ASALs occupy 89% of the country and are home to about 36% of the population\(^5\). They are prone and vulnerable to frequent disasters such as drought, floods, violent conflicts, human and animal epidemics, and have some of the lowest development indicators and the highest incidence of poverty in the country.

The ASALs covers the following counties in Kenya; Turkana, Baringo, Kilifi, Kwale, Garissa, Tana River, Marsabit, Isiolo, Lamu, Taveta, West Pokot, Mandera, Kajiado, Narok, Wajir, Samburu, Kitui, Makueni, Embu, Tharaka Nithi, Laikipia, Meru and Nyeri (Figure 1) . In these counties where this study was also conducted, the communities are differentiated along gender and age lines. Key assets and resources critical for disaster management, such as land, livestock, water and finances are generally controlled by older men rather than by women or youth, reflecting the subordinate position of women and youth in

---

these communities. Men’s control over these assets obscures the important role that women and youth play in areas of disaster management and other livelihood activities.

![Figure 1: Map of ASALs Counties in Kenya](image-url)
1.4 UN WOMEN and Study Objectives

Established in 2011, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (UN WOMEN) is dedicated to gender equality, and attainment of the rights of women globally. UN WOMEN supports women’s equal participation in all aspects of life by working with UN Member States to develop and apply global standards and frameworks for achieving gender equality, and supports national governments and the civil society to design and develop laws, policies, programmes and services needed to implement these standards⁶.

In 2012, because of increasing humanitarian needs and crisis globally, UN Women established a Humanitarian Unit anchored within the Women, Peace and Security pillar that work to consolidate and support humanitarian work, including DRR- disaster risk reduction, preparedness, risk prevention and mitigation, at the global, regional and national levels. The engagement of UN Women in humanitarian action and DRR is to ensure consistency and sustainability in addressing gender equality concerns across humanitarian-development continuum. In Kenya, the UN Women’s Humanitarian and DRR work seeks to advance and support government’s efforts and priorities identified within Medium Term Plan two (MTP II) in the area of disaster risk reduction, humanitarian response and recovery. Specifically, UN Women focuses on support to government and key stakeholders in the development and implementation of gender responsive Humanitarian and DRR policies, strategies and programmes, to promote women leadership and participation in key decision making, build the capacity of key stakeholders including women led community based organization to ensure equal participation of women and men in the humanitarian and DRR work, strengthen and coordinate gender mainstreaming amongst different stakeholders including the UN system. This study was commissioned with an ultimate aim that the results will be used for developing capacity building programme for the identified Women led CBOs in 23 ASALs counties in Kenya. Specifically, this study report focused on objective 2 and 4, of the broader consultancy objectives:

1. To identify active women led community based organizations (CBOs) in each of the 23 ASAL counties in Kenya and;
2. Identify their capacity gaps and challenges in implementing gender sensitive DRR and Humanitarian work,
3. Establish a database of these organizations and their physical contacts and;
4. Provide key recommendations towards building leadership and promoting their participation in DRR and Humanitarian work in their respective counties.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction
A number of mixed methods and approaches were used to obtain information for this capacity assessment exercise. The methodologies used were based on choice of qualitative and quantitative techniques that were the best in capturing information required for this study. The methods and approaches used include:

i. Desk Review of relevant documents
Extensive literature review on CBOs working on broader issues in Kenya was conducted to supplement the capacity assessment findings of this study. The literature review conducted was to understand leaderships, financing, administration and project management governance capacities and strategies used by CBOs in Kenya. Other stakeholders’ reports and documents produced on CBOs in the ASALs were retrieved and reviewed.

ii. Key Informant Interviews
Key Informant Interviews (KII) with key institutions such as County Governments, NDMA, Red Cross, Maendeleo Ya Wanawake and network of CBOs was conducted to undertake key capacity gaps for women led CBOs in ASALs.

iii. Questionnaire Interviews
The questionnaire interviews used pre-coded semi-structured capacity assessment questionnaires designed by the consultant and approved by UN Women technical staffs. Leaders, members and coordinators of Women led CBOs were interviewed in different counties between April and July 2016. Some of the information obtained from the CBOs included; organizational profile, leadership, governance and strategy, finances, administration and human resources, project design and management, technical capacity, networking and advocacy, and community ownership and accountability (Annex 1).

2.2 Selection of CBOs for Interviews
In total, 40 active women led CBOs were randomly selected from a list of 321 CBOs identified during this exercise across ASAL counties. However, time constraints, county accessibility and resource availability influenced the number of CBOs interviewed. The randomly sampled counties where in-depth questionnaire interviews was conducted include; Baringo (3 CBOs), Embu (3 CBOs), Isiolo (3 CBOs), Kajiado (3 CBOs), Kilifi (2 CBOs), Kitui (4 CBOs), Kwale (2 CBOs), Laikipia (1 CBO), Makueni (3 CBOs), Marsabit (2 CBOs), Meru (3 CBOs), Narok (2 CBOs), Samburu (4 CBOs) and Turkana (5 CBOs).

2.3 Data Analysis
The data was analysed using Microsoft Excel. The questionnaires were both open and close ended. The key informant interviews were narratives that were used to supplement the questionnaire responses.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

3.1 Profile of Women-led CBOs

Results indicate that most (38%) of the women led CBOs working in DRR and humanitarian work were registered between 2012-2016, 25% of CBOs were registered between 2007-2011, while 23% of CBOs were registered between 2002 and 2006 by the Ministry of Gender and Social services. Results indicate that only 15% of the women led CBOs were registered earlier than 2001. Within the various women led CBOs assessed majority (68%) have membership numbers of 5 – 50 persons, 16% have above 201 members, while the rest (4%) of the CBOs have membership of 51 to 200 persons. However, all the CBOs interviewed form the ASALs counties are registered with the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development in Kenya. The registration process is carried out at the sub-county government offices within the County where the CBO operates.

Each of the women led CBOs has distinct objectives in the community where they operate, they all strive to improve the status of their members, and members of their communities. On the activities undertaken by the assessed women led CBOs in ASALs, they are broadly on the following; reproductive health, food security – livestock and crop farming, relief distribution, irrigation farming - horticulture, food for asset, livelihood improvement, girl child education, conflict and peace building, governance and advocacy, enterprise development and income generating activities, environmental management and conservation among others. Much as the distinction based on prevention, mitigation, response and recovery proved difficult in this survey. The study revealed that within the DRR realm, majority of the CBOs (43%) interviewed engage in disaster prevention and preparation activities, 38% of CBOs in recovery possibly because of the frequent disasters in ASALs, while a paltry 8% are engaged in saving life and livelihoods during disasters (Table 1).

Table 1: Proportion of CBOs with programme in DRR and humanitarian work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRR and Humanitarian programmes</th>
<th>Proportion of CBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mitigation (Lessening or limiting impact of hazards)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prevention and preparation (pre-impact)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Response (Emergency)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recovery (Rehabilitation &amp; reconstruction)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked on the CBOs coverage areas, most CBOs expressed inability to cover a wider geographical area due to inadequate technical and financial capacity. Out of the 40 community based organizations that responded, less than 2% of the organizations had capacity to being able to cover entire County. Some of the successes reported by the CBOs include; improved livelihood of members, improved nutrition/
food security/ water supply in some areas, enhanced peace among the community members, increased income for the members/communities, reduction in FGM cases, increased enrolment of girls in schools and reduction in the number of ARV’s defaulters and reduction of stigmatization.

3.2 Leadership, Governance & Strategy
Under leadership, governance and strategies theme, the respondents were asked how the leadership and governance structures in their CBOs are managed.

3.2.1 Constitution
The interviewer asked the respondents’ if their CBO have a written constitution accepted and approved by all the members of the organization. In total, 90% (36 CBOs) of the sampled CBOs stated to have written constitution approved by the representatives of the organization, 8% (3 CBOs) have some rules and principles written down but wasn’t widely approved by the members of the organization, while only 3% do not have written constitution (Figure 2).

3.2.2 Governing Committee and Board
On the CBOs governing boards and committees that meet to make decisions, 93% of the CBOs confirmed to have a governing committee (mostly the executive – chairperson, secretary and treasurer) that meets regularly to make decisions on behalf of the members. Result showed that only 3% of the CBOs had occasional meetings but rarely agrees on any decisions. Another 3% of the organisations revealed to have a committee established but it never meets, while 3% of CBOs have no committee in place to make decisions that guides the organizations development (Table 2).
Table 2: CBOs Governing committee and board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Scores</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No committee, no meetings</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee established, but it never meets</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional meetings, but rarely agree on any decisions</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings, with useful guidance and decisions made for the organization</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 Organizational Strategy

On organizational strategy, the respondents were asked if they have organizational strategy which was developed and approved by all the members of the organization. Finding show that out of the sampled CBOs, 45% stated to have a strategy agreed on by all members and are regularly used to guide projects and activities decisions of the CBO. 32% of the CBOs indicated to have no strategy at all; while 18% specified to have a draft strategy developed but has not been adopted for use. While 5% of the organizations interviewed observe to have an organization strategy written long ago, but few members were consulted or understood its application (Figure 3).

3.3 Financial management

The survey focused on how the organization manages its finances and budget.
3.3.1 Finances
The CBOs leaders were asked if their organizations kept accounts of money that can be presented on demand. Survey results show that 44% of the investigated CBOs kept accounts of the money, the balances and statements were prepared quarterly, yearly and presented to external stakeholders’ or members for approval. The next 38% of the organizations reckoned to have up to date accounts and statements prepared yearly. It is only 10% of organizations that have records of money received and spent kept, but no clear accountability mechanism put in place to track the amount held at any time. The survey revealed that 8% of women led CBOs did not keep any records or account of money that can be presented on demand (Figure 4).

3.3.2 Bank Account
On Bank accounts, the respondents from CBOs were asked if their organization had a bank account from any commercial banks to hold funds. Findings show that 58% of the CBOs interviewed did have a bank account registered in organizations name with authorised signatories, 27% had manual records of all payments kept compared with all bank statements. The other 9% of CBOs interviewed had no bank account but managed all the funds in cash while the remaining 6% of the CBOs interviewed used a person’s account for all funds received (Figure 5).

![Figure 4: Financial Accounts](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of CBOs</th>
<th>No accounts kept</th>
<th>Records kept of money received and spent, but difficult to know much money is held at any one time</th>
<th>Accounts kept up-to-date and balances and statements are prepared at the end of the year</th>
<th>Balances and statements prepared quarterly. At year end, presented to external stakeholders for approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.3.3 Supporting Documents

On supporting documents, CBOs respondents were queried if their groups maintained supporting receipts and invoices for every payment, expenditure and funds received. Out of the appraised CBOs, 72% reported that invoices/receipts and other supporting documents are filed for three years, and regularly reviewed by authorized person. In total, 15% of CBOs recounted that no receipts/invoices are kept, but they are only asked for when claiming or using money to justify expenses, a while 13% of all the interviewed organizations reported that receipts/invoices are needed to justify any use of grant and the documents are kept on file, but are rarely reviewed by anyone (Table 3).

#### Table 3: Financial Supporting Documents from CBOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Scores</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No receipts/invoices are only asked for when claiming or using money to justify expenses</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts/invoices are needed to justify expenses sometimes but rarely kept on file</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts/invoices are needed to justify any use of grant money and these are kept on file, but rarely reviewed by anyone</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All receipts/invoices and other supporting documents filed for three years, and regularly reviewed by authorized person</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.4 Budgets and Cash Flow Planning

The CBOs respondents were asked whether the groups take part in preparation, monitoring, and review a budgets. Out of all the CBOs interviewed, 31% indicated that they prepare budgets that are used to decide how much is spend on projects costs and future plans. 26% of the appraised organizations revealed that they prepare budgets for every proposal developed but the budgets are not used for

---

**Figure 5: Bank Accounts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Series 1: Organization has no bank account but manages all funds in cash
Series 2: Someone’s personal account used for any funds
Series 3: Bank account registered in organization’s name which requires dual (or specific authorized) check signatories
Series 4: A manual records of all payments (cashbook) is kept and compared with all bank statements
anything else. In total, 23% of the CBOs evaluated indicated that budgets and money spent and planned cash flow are compared every six months to be certain that there will be enough money to keep the organization running, while 20% of the CBOs stated that budgets are prepared and presented annually for approval to a board or representative group of members (Figure 6).

![Figure 6: Financial budget and planning](image)

---

### 3.3.5 Financial Audits and Reporting Requirements

The study further investigated the organizations capacity in terms of weather their establishments had conducted audits over the last 3 years. Out of the CBOs interviewed, 43% indicated that they do not conduct any financial audits; 37% undertakes financial audits only when required by the donor, while only 20% of the CBOs do conduct audits regularly and reports availed to donors as required (Figure 7). This is a clear indicator of very weak financial management systems for over 80% of Women led CBOs in the ASALs working in DRR and Humanitarian initiatives.
3.4 Administration and Human Resources
This section assessed how the organisation manages, structured and organised its work in terms of human resources, office management and equipment’s.

3.4.1 Organization Staff and Volunteers
The study investigated the staff/volunteer, organization structures of the CBOs by asking its members the involvement of salaried staff and volunteers in different areas of the CBOs. In total, 45% of the CBOs have fewer than five volunteers running the entire organization. Out of those interviewed, 25% of CBOs have between one and two full time staff on salary with different roles and responsibilities. 18% of the organizations have 5-15 volunteers, of which some manages the organization activities, while 13% of the organizations have one full-time staff being paid a salary (Figure 8).
3.4.2 Office equipment

The members of respective organizations’ were asked about the office ownership, meeting space and equipment for handling administration and writing reports of the CBO. Result shows that 45% of the CBOs do not have an office or equipment to run the daily activities. In total, only 25% of the CBOs own an office and some equipment’s (computers, printers, table and chairs) for handling administration and reporting. According to the findings, 18% of the CBOs interviewed occasionally have an access to another office and equipment either from the nearby institutions or members’ private office. Result shows that 13% of the interviewed CBOs share office space and equipment’s with another organization or individual (Figure 9).
3.5 Project design and Management
In this section, the respondents were asked how CBOs’ manages their projects.

3.5.1 Project and Proposal Development
The organizations respondents were asked during the interviews if they have received any funding for the proposals developed over the last three years. In total, 46% of the CBOs had not received funding for any project proposal developed. From the survey, 28% of the CBOs have received funding for at least one proposal developed within the organization in the last three years, while 23% of the organisations reported to have received funding for at least two proposals developed internally in the last three years. Findings revealed that only 3% of the CBOs interviewed have received funding for one successful proposal developed by the outsider (Figure 10).

3.5.2 Targeting
On targeting, the respondents were asked the type of people the CBOs reach with their disaster risk reduction and humanitarian interventions. Out of all the CBOs interviewed, 46% stated that they work with specific groups of vulnerable people in the community (women, orphans, widows or PLWHIV). Results indicate that 44% of the organisations reach the entire community with their programmes and activities, while 8% of the CBOs indicated that they work with whoever they can reach in the community. Only 3% of the women led CBOs in ASALs focused on internally displaced persons (IDPs) and ‘refugees’ (Figure 11).
**Figure 10: Proposals for Funding**

- **46%** No project proposal developed has been funded
- **23%** Funding has been received for one successful proposal mainly developed by an outsider
- **28%** Funding has been received for at least one successful proposal in the last three years written & developed within the organization
- **3%** Funding received for at least two proposals developed internally in the last three years, each with needs assessments, activity plans and budgets

**Figure 11: CBOs’ Target groups**

- **46%** reach the entire community
- **44%** work with whomever we can
- **8%** Work with specific groups of vulnerable people (e.g., orphans, women-headed households, people living with disabilities, HIV)
- **2%** Focus on internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees
3.6 Technical capacity, Networking and Advocacy
Under technical capacity, networking and advocacy, the questions where sub-dived into two sub headings; DRR/M knowledge and skills, and Gender and disasters.

3.6.1 DRR/M Knowledge and Skills
The respondents were asked the level of organisation staffs’ understanding on DRR/Management and humanitarian issues. Results show that 46% of the organizations interviewed indicated that a few of their staff know basic facts, theories and concepts on DRR/M and humanitarian issues. 29% of the CBOs have their human personnel who understand DRR/M and the causes of disaster vulnerability in the community. The study shows that 25% of the organizations have their staffs and volunteers knowledgeable and have been trained on DRR/M in the recent past (Figure 12). The respondents also suggested potential areas where training and support by external agencies is required.

3.6.2 Gender and Disasters
On Gender and Disasters, the respondents were asked what the staff and members understand about the relationship between gender and disasters. It was noted here that the response were evenly distributed across all the capacity scores. In total, 28% of the CBOs stated that they integrated gender concerns into their DRR and humanitarian work by simplify incorporating women into their daily activities and including them into key positions within the organisation. 26% of the organizations indicated to

---

**Figure 12: Knowledge and Skills on DRM**

- **25%** - DRR/M issues well understood, staff & volunteers trained for the work they do and often provide training and support to others. Staff & volunteers know the skills needed for DRR/humanitarian work.
- **29%** - DRR/M issues well understood such as causes of vulnerability, and intervention for humanitarian responses, preparation etc.
- **46%** - A few people know basic facts about DRR & Humanitarian such as preparation, response, recovery, reconstruction and mitigations.
understand how gender is integrated in the disaster cycle management, while 26% of CBOs do not have any idea and understanding on the relation between gender and disasters. Result also revealed that 21% of the CBOs knows that women are more vulnerable to disasters in ASALs but do not know what to do about it in the context of their work (Figure 13).

3.7 Networking & Advocacy
The respondents were asked on the relationship between the CBOs with other local, national and international players in DRR/Humanitarian work, and how they work together to influence others under Networking and advocacy.

3.7.1 Advocacy Strategies
Specifically, the groups were asked if they carry out advocacy activities to influence those in power to change conditions or policies that form barriers to their work in humanitarian and disasters work. In total, 48% of the CBOs disclosed that they do consultation with the community, mobilizing allies and using many different communication methods to reach other players in DRR/humanitarian work in the community and county. Findings indicate that 24% of CBOs have developed targeted activities for influencing certain groups, policies but lack community strength of numbers to advocate for policy change at the county. It was observed that only 19% of CBOs interviewed have mobilized the general public for awareness raising but do not target government institutions to review policies. Finally, 10% disclosed to have no ideas on existing local policies that influence their work (Figure 14).
3.7.2 Information, Education & Communication (IEC) Development and Utilization

Under IEC, the study asked the CBOs’ respondents on how they create messages to raise awareness on disasters or change people’s thinking on humanitarian work. Out of the CBOs interviewed, 35% of the organisations indicated that they use publicly materials or activities aimed at specific groups of people in the community with specific messages. For those interviewed, 29% of the women led CBOs working do not use any publicity materials for messaging in their work. It was reported that only 23% develops own publicity materials and ensure their effectiveness by pre-testing or involving targeted groups in the production process. Result show that 13% of CBOs use some printed pictures, T-shirts, cups or posters to illustrate messages (Figure 15).
3.8 Community ownership and accountability

On community ownership and accountability, the assessment wanted to know how the organization engages and communicates with the community.

3.8.1 Involvement of community in the activities of the organization

The sampled CBOs were asked whether the community members participate actively and fully in the activities of the organization. From the result, 38% of the CBOs revealed that the community members are fully represented in the project management cycle through community consultation and public barazas. These CBOs also indicated that the activities are driven by members need and desire to improve their community. It was observed that only 26% of CBOs are actively engaged as volunteers but not in decision-making roles of the organisation. The result also indicated that 26% of CBOs specified that some policies and training are in place in the organisation to prevent discrimination and to provide support to members of the organization. 10% of the CBOs have no community members actively involved in activities of the organization but they do receive the support and services of the organizations (Figure 16).

3.8.2 Involvement of Vulnerable people in the activities of the organization

The study assessed whether most vulnerable people that work with the CBOs fully participates in the activities, work and major decisions of the organization. Of the interviewed CBOs, 55% revealed that vulnerable people are fully involved in designing projects and are widely consulted on major decisions of the organizations. Results indicate that 18% of the CBOs work with particular vulnerable people as volunteers but they are neither paid nor are involved in decision-making roles. It is only 15% of the CBOs sampled that do not engage with the most vulnerable people in their activities and major decision making of the organizations. During the assessment, result revealed that 13% of the women led CBOs engage
people from specific vulnerable groups in the organisation activities as paid staff and also on the governing board or committee.

### Figure 16: Community Involvement in the CBO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No people are actively involved except to receive services</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>People actively act as volunteers but in no paid/decision-making roles</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>People fully represented in the project management cycle</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Some training and policies exist to prevent discrimination, and to provide support and benefits for positive members of the organization</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.3 Equal Gender Participation

In this section, the respondents were examined on how their organizations promote equal participation from people of all genders. Findings show that 62% of the CBOs indicated that their organizations develop and use approaches that promote equal respect and rights for both male and female. From the analysis, 21% of CBOs reported that management and decision making levels are from one gender through the gender balance exists at some level in the organisation committee or board. Only 13% of the CBOs have never promoted equal gender participation in its activities. Result also revealed that 5% of the CBOs have not more than 70% of one gender at all levels in its structure.
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the study provides key discussion, conclusions and recommendations based on the results and the analysis of data from the assessments.

4.2 Discussion

Organization capacity is a key area in any project cycle management. Whether they are community based organization or international organizations implementing DRR and humanitarian activities, the organization needs to have adequate capacity in leadership, governance and administration, financial management, technical capacity in terms of project management which include but not limited to design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and advocacy and networking. This assessment has brought out some key concerns on the capacity of women led CBOs working on DRR and humanitarian work in ASALs of Kenya today. Several factors came out:

- Whereas majority of the women led CBOs in ASALs engage in disaster risk reduction (prevention, mitigation, response and recovery) phases in various degrees, many respondents were unaware that their organisation undertake risk reduction initiatives.
- The organizations interviewed indicated that a few of their staff have basic facts, theories and concepts on DRR/M and humanitarian issues which highlight inadequate skills presently available within women led CBOs in ASALs of Kenya.
- The CBOs assessed have low capacity in various areas, ranging from financial resources, skilled personnel, access to equipment’s and office space to undertake effective DRR related work.
- All the CBOs were keen to learn new skills and techniques on disaster, drought and risk management and humanitarian issues as well as on resilience building in the ASALs.
- Most of the women led CBOs assessed have inadequate capacity on financial management for effective budgeting, auditing and reporting to donors.
- Majority of Women led CBOs interviewed lack prerequisite skills on governance, strategic planning, leadership and conflict management relevant to ASALs’ programming.
- Even though many of the organisations interviewed have taken initiative before to source for donor funds, most of them lack technical capacity in proposal writing, and engaging donor and networking with other stakeholders which has hindered their efforts to receive financial support.
- The issue of capacity building on proposal writing, project management, fundraising and legal issues came out strongly during the study as some of the areas that the CBOs need technical assistance.
- However, opportunities exist for initiating CBOs networks for women organisation at the county level in the absence of any strong network once seen from the Maendeleo Ya Wanawake. This once vibrant women network organisation seems to be weak in some cases absent in most counties with the promulgation of the new constitution in Kenya.
Other most prominent issues that came out throughout the study was lack of adequate financial resources and technical capacity to enable the CBOs execute their roles effectively. Most of the organizations assessed were small in capacity i.e. membership, geographic scope and managerial capacity thus could not assist the majority of the needy that are vulnerable to disaster in ASALs of Kenya. The organisations assessed lacked skilled personnel to run the daily affairs of the organizations; and most of the staffs are volunteers from the community. Even with the existence of Uwezo Fund and Youth Enterprise Development Fund in Kenya, majority of the organisations were unaware on its existence and had not received any funding. As discussed, many respondents voiced their needs for external assistance on proposal writing and fundraising from the donors. Generally, all the recently registered CBOs interviewed were basically engaged in revolving fund and loaning to members through ‘merry-go-round’ which they viewed to be a key way to raise money for members children education, start-up capital for small business and income generating activities. A promising community disaster prevention and mitigation model observed during the assessment was through cash for assets and cash for work programmes implemented by Kenya Red-Cross, WFP and other INGOs together with the community based organisations. This is because the model restore the lost/destroyed community assets and empower the women led CBOs to continue in the absence of external agency. The model if replicated in other disaster affected areas is likely to strengthen the capacity of CBOs working through this framework.

4.3 Conclusion and Recommendations
The capacity assessment conducted revealed that there are a number of women led CBOs in ASAL counties working on various aspects of DRR and humanitarian interventions. For example, in Narok, Marsabit, Kajiado, Kilifi and Kwale counties, the capacity of CBOs on DRR and humanitarian activities was comparatively stronger compared with other counties in the ASALs. However, there are many capacity gaps among women led CBOs working on DRR and humanitarian work in the ASALs of Kenya. The organisations’ needs technical and financial assistance, and collaboration with various DRR stakeholders to ensure an effective execution of their duties. Key recommendations were raised by the CBOs respondents during this study, the issues are discussed below:

4.3.1 Capacity building
The programme implementation of any organization depends on its ability to run its programmes efficiently, organizational structures, and effective planning and staffing level capacity. It was suggested that the women led CBOs needs capacity building through training in several areas to raise their level of programme cycle management and implementation. It is recommended that the CBOs capacity be enhanced through trainings on gender, DRR, humanitarian work, financial management etc. Specifically the capacity building should focus on the following areas:-

- Technical backstopping on DRR/M disaster management cycle, humanitarian, reproductive health, girl child issues and first Aid
- Gender and contingency planning
- Livelihood diversification, livestock management and food preservation
- Project management, proposal writing, resource mobilization/fund raising
- Capacity building on Monitoring & Evaluation skills
- Governance, advocacy, strategic planning and human resource management
- Development of the constitution and conflict management plans
• Organizational restructuring and capacity building of the staff
• Financial management, auditing and budgeting
• Advocacy, information sharing and awareness creation on DRR and humanitarian work
• Strengthening peace building committees

### 4.3.2 Financial resources management

Project programming begins with the concept of effective implementation then accounting for resources used and finally reporting on the outcomes and impact to the targeted beneficiaries. It is therefore vital that an organization that plans to implement programmes has the financial resources capacity to implement them effectually and resourcefully. Most of the CBOs lack the resources to effectively run their planned programs. It is recommended that the resource base of the CBOs is strengthened by building their governance base and by restructuring the organizations’ management. There is also the need for the provision of financial management tools and equipment’s, filing cabinets, office space (buildings) and human resources management systems to enable the CBOs to do effective programming on DRR and humanitarian work.

Donor funding programs requires efficiency, transparency, accountability, and effective systems that would drive programming. These must be reflected in efficient use of resources, timeliness, directed implementation, distinct and discernible output/outcomes, and a clear channel for reporting and feedback. The study recommend that capacity building designed for CBOs should also include resource mobilization and partnerships development.

### 4.3.3 Networking and community Ownership

These are initiatives that contribute to the development and strengthening of community-based organizations capacity to improve knowledge on, and access to their service delivery. The study observed a weak link among women led community organizations to implement the DRR and humanitarian programs. Thus community systems strengthening (CSS) is required if communities are to benefit from programmes targeting participation of community groups. Systems of Community Based Organizations should be strengthened and their roles and tasks within the communities where they are active defined, documented and are availed. The CBOs capacity should be strengthened to ensure that the CSS component operates within the framework of community institutions and strategies. The organisations could be supported in the following areas:

• Sensitize the communities to support women participation and leadership on DRR and humanitarian initiatives. This could also be through DRR training with a focus on preparedness, planning, response and recovery- given that most of these organization are engaged in this work.
• Build partnerships between Community Based Organizations, public institutions such as NDMA, Kenya Red-Cross, NGOs, UN agencies and county governments to improve coordination, enhance projects impact, and avoid duplication of service delivery.
• Facilitation on Information, Education & Communication (IEC) materials such as printing of T-shirts, caps, transportation, public address systems to enable the CBOs reach many people in their advocacy and awareness creation.
During the assessment the respondents also gave their suggestions on other key priorities for technical support grouped in the order of priority as indicated below:-

i) **Leadership, Governance and strategy**
   - Training on governance, strategic planning and human resource management
   - Development of the constitution, leadership and conflict management plans
   - Development of the organizations website
   - Organizational restructuring, funding and capacity building of the staff
   - Exposure and capacity building on horticultural farming, dairy & goat farming and grafting

ii) **Financial Management**
    - Record keeping, training on financial management, auditing and budgeting
    - Resource mobilization/fund raising
    - Office equipment’s such as computers, printers, projectors, cameras, photocopier and financial systems
    - Filing cabinet and data storage equipment’s

iii) **Administration**
    - Trainings on project administration
    - Financial support to finish office building and purchase of furniture and fittings
    - Logistical support (vehicles, motorcycles)
    - Funding for recruitment of more skilled additional staff
    - Facilitation for Office Power (Electricity or generator)

iv) **Project Management**
    - Training on proposal writing to enable the groups secure funding
    - Assistance in hiring Legal officers
    - Strengthening peace building committees
    - Capacity building on Monitoring & Evaluation skills
    - Guidance on sourcing for donors/ Fund raising
    - Financial support for construction of resource centre and clinic

v) **Technical Capacity**
    - Capacity building on new technology and technical backstopping on DRR/M disaster management cycle, reproductive health, girl child issues and first Aid
    - Capacity building on gender and contingency planning
    - Training on livelihood diversification, livestock management and food preservation
    - Involvement of men and other religious leaders on guidance & counselling

vi) **Networking and Advocacy**
    - Empowering women to take leadership positions, network and advocate effectively
• Facilitation on printing of T-shirts, transport, public address systems to enable the CBOs reach many people in advocacy
• Assistance on how to partner with health centres for the members
• Training on more effective advocacy channels and messaging techniques
• County governments urged to stop taxing of the CBOs on passage of information to the public.

vii) Community Ownership
• Capacity building on the development of sustainable projects that are easy to manage and enhance community ownership
• Capacity building on management of large CBOs (with many no of members)
• Assistance on coordination with the government line ministries to enhance community development
• Capacity building on effective ways of engaging with the community members.
Annex 1: Questionnaire

Women led CBOs working on DRR & Humanitarian Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization profile detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name of CBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When established?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-County:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Of Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Contact details of the CBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and contact details, including mailing address, telephone/fax numbers, and email, if available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the preferred way of receiving information?</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cell/telephone</th>
<th>postal mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Locations (sub-counties/wards) where the CBO works (List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Staff and structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many full-time, part-time staff and volunteers? What are their roles? Does it have an external advisor? If so, who? What is her role?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Overview of CBO’s work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With whom does the CBO work? What activities does it conduct around- Response, recovery, preparedness or early recovery?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Key achievements and main challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key highlights/successes of the CBO’s work; main challenges and problem it faces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Sources of funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial, material, or in-kind support received since inception. Who are some of your funders; list them indicate estimated amount received and when?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Future plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
What are immediate needs/priorities? Does the CBO have any plans to scale up? If so, how? If the CBO received more funding, how would they use it?

Interns of priority areas

10. Date and name of person completing the profile

How are the leadership and Governance structures within the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Constitution</td>
<td>No constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any written constitution accepted and approved by all the members of the organization?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some rules/principles written down</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written constitution exists but wasn’t widely approved</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written constitution approved by representatives of the community and organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Governing committee/board</td>
<td>No committee, no meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a committee/board that meet and make decisions that guide your organization’s development?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee established, but it never meets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional meetings, but rarely agree on any decisions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings, with useful guidance and decisions made for the organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational strategy</td>
<td>No strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have organizational strategy which was developed and approved by all the members of the organization. If so, how are they used?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A draft strategy was developed, but it has not been adopted for use.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy was written long ago, but few people were consulted or understand its applied</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy was agreed on by all stakeholders, and are regularly used to guide decisions about projects and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions for key priorities for technical support
## How does the organization manage its finances and budget?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Finances</strong></td>
<td>Does your organization keep accounts of money that can be presented on demand?</td>
<td>No accounts kept</td>
<td>Records kept of money received and spent, but difficult to know how much money is held at any one time</td>
<td>Accounts kept up to date and balances and statements are prepared at the end of the year</td>
<td>Balances and statements prepared quarterly. At year end, presented to external stakeholders for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization has no bank account but manages all funds in cash</td>
<td>Someone’s personal account used for any funds</td>
<td>Bank account registered in organization’s name, which requires dual (or specific authorized) check signatories</td>
<td>A manual record of all payments (cashbook) is kept and compared with all bank statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Bank account</strong></td>
<td>Does your organization have a bank account to hold its funds?</td>
<td>No bank account but manages all funds in cash</td>
<td>Receipts/invoices are needed to justify expenses sometimes, but rarely kept on file</td>
<td>Receipts/invoices are needed to justify any use of grant money and these are kept on file, but rarely reviewed by anyone</td>
<td>Every six months budgets are compared to money already spent and planned cash flow, to make sure there will be enough cash to keep the organization running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you maintain supporting receipts and invoices for every expenditure from the grant received?</td>
<td>No receipts/invoices are only asked for when claiming or using money to justify expenses</td>
<td>Receipts/invoices are needed to justify expenses sometimes, but rarely kept on file</td>
<td>Receipts/invoices are needed to justify any use of grant money and these are kept on file, but rarely reviewed by anyone</td>
<td>Every six months budgets are compared to money already spent and planned cash flow, to make sure there will be enough cash to keep the organization running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Supporting documents</strong></td>
<td>No audits conducted</td>
<td>No proper record to conduct audits</td>
<td>Audits undertaken only when required by the donor</td>
<td>Audits conducted regularly and reports available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Budgets and cash flow planning</strong></td>
<td>Does your organization prepare, monitor, and review a budget?</td>
<td>Budgets are prepared to decide how much to spend on all project and organization costs, to ensure there is enough money for all future plans</td>
<td>Budgets are presented annually for approval to a board or representative group of members</td>
<td>Audits conducted regularly and reports available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Reporting requirement</strong></td>
<td>Have you conducted any audits over the last 3 years?</td>
<td>No audits conducted</td>
<td>Audits undertaken only when required by the donor</td>
<td>Audits conducted regularly and reports available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggestions for key priorities for technical support**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Staff/volunteer organization</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does your organization involve a number of salaried staff and volunteers who have different areas of responsibility?</td>
<td>Fewer than five volunteers run the entire organization</td>
<td>Five to fifteen volunteers with different roles, some who lead/manage the organization</td>
<td>One full-time staff person is paid a salary and organizes all the other volunteers</td>
<td>One to two full-time staff and paid salaries, and volunteers all have different, fixed areas of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Office and equipment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Does the organization have its own office, meeting space and equipment for handling administration and writing reports? What equipment does the organization have?</td>
<td>No office, no equipment</td>
<td>Occasional access to another office and equipment</td>
<td>Office and equipment (computer plus printer) shared with another organization or individual</td>
<td>Own office and equipment (computer plus printer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggestions for key priorities for technical support**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Project and proposal development</strong>&lt;br&gt;Out of the proposals you’ve developed over the last three years, how and have been funded?</td>
<td>No project proposal developed has been by an outsider</td>
<td>Funding has been received for one successful proposal mainly developed by an outsider</td>
<td>Funding has been received for at least one successful proposal in the last three years written and developed within the organization</td>
<td>Funding received for at least two proposals developed internally in the last three years, each with needs assessments, activity plans, and budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Targeting</strong>&lt;br&gt;What type of people do you reach with your DRR/humanitarian interventions?</td>
<td>Reach the entire community</td>
<td>Work with whomever we can</td>
<td>Work with specific groups of vulnerable people (e.g. orphans, women-headed households, people living with disabilities, HIV)</td>
<td>Focus on internally displaced persons (IDP) and refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggestions for key priorities for technical support**

---

3 | **FINAL Report - Capacity Assessment of Women led CBOs**
### What experience does the organization already have in DRR/M & Humanitarian work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DRR/M knowledge and skills</td>
<td>What is the level of staffs understanding on DRR/M humanitarian issues?</td>
<td>A few people know basic facts about DRR &amp; Humanitarian such as preparation, response, recovery, reconstruction and irrigations</td>
<td>Staff and volunteers know the skills needed for DRR/humanitarian work</td>
<td>DRR/M issues well understood such as causes of vulnerability, and intervention for humanitarian responses, preparation etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender and disasters</td>
<td>What do staff and members understand about the relationship between gender and disasters?</td>
<td>No understanding</td>
<td>Know that women are more vulnerable to disasters but do not know what to do about it</td>
<td>Have integrated gender concerns into their DRR/Humanitarian work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Suggestions for key priorities for technical support

#### What relationship does your organization have with other local, national, and international players in DRR/Humanitarian work, and how do you work together to influence others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Advocacy</td>
<td>Do you carry out advocacy activities to influence those in power to change conditions or policies that form barriers to your work in humanitarian and disasters work?</td>
<td>No idea on existing local policies that influence or work</td>
<td>Have only mobilized general public for support or awareness raising, but nothing targeted at government or institutions to review policies</td>
<td>Have developed targeted activities towards influencing certain groups or policies but have lacked community voice, or strength of numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information, education and communication (IEC) development and utilization</td>
<td>How do you create messages to raise awareness on disasters, or change people’s thinking?</td>
<td>Do not use any publicity materials, tools or activities</td>
<td>Use some printed pictures, T-shirts, cups or posters to illustrate messages.</td>
<td>Use materials or activities aimed at specific groups with specific messages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Suggestions for key priorities for technical support
### How does the organization engage and communicate with the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Capacity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Involvement of community in the activities of the organization</td>
<td>Do community members participate fully in the activities of the organization?</td>
<td>No people are actively involved, except to receive services</td>
<td>People actively act as volunteers but in no paid/ decision-making roles</td>
<td>People fully represented in the project management cycle</td>
<td>Some training and policies exist to prevent discrimination, and to provide support and benefits for positive members of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Involvement of vulnerable people in the activities of the organization</td>
<td>Do the most vulnerable people (e.g. poor women, girls, PLWD, IDPS, refugees, elderly) that you work with participate fully in the activities, work, and major decisions of the organization?</td>
<td>No engagement with the most vulnerable people</td>
<td>Work with particular vulnerable people as volunteers but none are in paid/ decision-making roles</td>
<td>People from specific vulnerable groups are involved throughout the organization as paid staff and on the governing board/committee</td>
<td>Vulnerable people are fully involved in designing projects and are widely consulted on major decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>How does your organization promote equal participation from people of all genders?</td>
<td>Organization has never actively considered this in its work</td>
<td>While gender balance exists at some levels, management and decision-making levels are from one gender</td>
<td>No more than 70% of one gender at all levels</td>
<td>Organization develops and uses approaches that promote equal respect and rights for male and female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggestions for key priorities for technical support**