

I. Capacity Needs Mapping (CNM) - (MASTER) – COS2

Enhanced capacity of BNGRC to effectively deliver timely, reliable and equitable quality emergency services and supplies that meet the essential needs of affected populations as a result of strengthened and better coordinated information-exchange across international (Mozambique, Malawi, Comoros, South Africa), national and local EPR networks to leverage surge support for emergency response and contribute to a shared knowledge base of best practices and lessons learned.

Pathway 1: Policy and législation

	Latent				Émergent				Modéré				Auto-suffisant			
1.1 Supply chain specific operational sector instrument																
1.3 Policy dissemination mechanisms.																
1.4 RRM/DRR International/Regional Partnerships																

1.1 RRM/DRR Sectoral policy

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

1.3 Policy dissemination mechanisms.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

1.4 RRM/DRR International/Regional Partnerships

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

Pathway 2: Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability

	Latent			Émergent			Modéré			Auto-suffisant		
2.1 Institutional mandate and recognition.												
2.2 Coordination mechanisms and accountability.												
2.3 Information management systems.												
2.6 Assets, platforms and infrastructure.												
2.7 National/local partnerships.												

2.1 Institutional mandate and recognition.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

2.2 Coordination mechanisms and accountability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

2.3 Information management systems.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

2.6 Assets, platforms and infrastructure.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

2.7 National/local partnerships.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

Pathway 3: Strategic Planning and Financing

	Latent			Emergent			Moderate			Self-sufficient		
3.1 Strategic planning.												
3.2 Value proposition.												
3.3 Sustainable financing.												
3.4 Financial management systems.												

3.1 Strategic planning.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

3.2 Value proposition.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

3.3 Sustainable financing.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

3.4 Financial management systems (MIS).

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

Pathway 4: Stakeholder Programme Design, Delivery and M&E

	Latent				Emergent				Moderate				Self-sufficient			
4.1 Logistics technical specifications etc.																
4.2 Stakeholder implementation capacity.																

4.1 Programme design and delivery.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

4.2 Stakeholder implementation capacity.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

Pathway 5: Engagement and Participation of Community, Civil Society and Private Sector

	Latent			Emergent			Moderate			Self-sufficient		
5.1 Engagement in programme design and delivery.												

5.1 Engagement in programme design and delivery.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

II. Summary CNM findings

	Latent	Émergent	Modéré	Auto-suffisant
Pathway 1: Policy and Legislation				
1.1 Supply chain specific operational sector instrument				
1.3 Policy dissemination mechanisms.				
1.4 RRM/DRR International/Regional Partnerships				
Pathway 2: Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability				
2.1 Institutional mandate and recognition.				
2.2 Coordination mechanisms and accountability.				
2.3 Information management systems.				
2.6 Assets, platforms and infrastructure.				
2.7 National/local partnerships.				
Pathway 3: Strategic Planning and Financing				
3.1 Strategic planning.				
3.2 Value proposition.				
3.3 Sustainable financing.				
3.4 Financial management systems.				
Pathway 4: Stakeholder Programme Design, Delivery and M&E				
4.1 Logistics technical specifications etc.				
4.2 Stakeholder implementation capacity.				
Pathway 5: Engagement and Participation of Community, Civil Society and Private Sector				
5.1 Engagement in programme design and delivery.				

III. CNM Guiding questions/elements defining capacity levels

For each sub-component under discussion, use the elements suggested below as a check-list against which to assess current capacity levels. Check those that apply to the context – you may select elements from different levels – then together with stakeholders, place four “Xs” in the boxes that you feel reflect the overall positioning of the capacity versus the four categories. “X”s may be adjacent, separated, more on one side or the other.

Pathway 1: Policy and Legislation (examples)	Latent				Émergent				Modéré				Auto-suffisant			
1.1 Supply chain specific operational sector instrument				X	X	X	X									
1.3 Policy dissemination mechanisms.		X					X	X	X							
1.4 RRM/DRR International/Regional Partnerships	X	X	X							X						

Pathway 1: Policies and Legislation

1.1 FSN-sensitive sectoral or multi-sectoral policy.

Self-sufficient

- A relevant RRM/DRR policy/regulatory instrument exists and has been endorsed by competent authorities.
- It has clear objectives that explicitly address the RRM/DRR needs of all segments of the population, including the most vulnerable.
- It is embedded in relevant national development plans.
- It is fully supported by required legislation and norms.
- It outlines institutional accountabilities and clarifies sectorial responsibilities (particularly in relation to RRM/DRR objectives).
- Recent, relevant and comprehensive RRM/DRR data was intentionally used to inform the instrument.
- Instrument evaluation occurs periodically, according to a pre-defined and well-documented schedule.
- Plans for evidence-based revision of the instrument are established, in force and supported by legislation and norms.

Moderate

- A relevant RRM/DRR policy/regulatory instrument has been developed but has not yet been endorsed.
- It has clear objectives that address the RRM/DRR needs of the largest groups/segments of the government.
- It does not explicitly identify vulnerable groups and their FSN needs.
- Key provisions are reflected in a few national development plans.
- Supporting legislation and norms are required and/or under development.
- It outlines high-level institutional accountabilities and clarifies most sectorial responsibilities (but not always for RRM/DRR).
- Some relevant RRM/DRR evidence (neither comprehensive nor recent) was used to inform the instrument.
- Instrument evaluation occurs periodically, but a documented schedule with clear roles and responsibilities does not exist.
- There are no specific legislations or norms in place to support evidence-based revision of the instrument.

Emergent

- A RRM/DRR policy/regulatory instrument is under formulation.
- It has objectives that addresses the RRM/DRR needs of the general population, without identifying specific groups.
- Key provisions have not been embedded in relevant national development plans.
- Supporting legislation and norms are not in place nor being developed.
- Objectives, accountability mechanisms and sectorial responsibilities are only superficially articulated, if at all.
- Relevant RRM/DRR evidence is not available.
- The instrument is not evidence-based.
- Instrument evaluations are rarely carried out; the need for evaluations is not explicitly acknowledged, so not formalised.

Latent

- National authorities have shown some commitment to addressing the RRM/DRR needs
- A relevant RRM/DRR sectoral policy/regulatory instrument is not yet under development.
- Key RRM/DRR provisions are not reflected in any national development plans.
- Key RRM/DRR objectives, accountability mechanisms and/or sectorial responsibilities have not been articulated.
- RRM/DRR evidence is not available.

1.3 Policy dissemination mechanisms.

Self-sufficient

- Formal and systematic mechanisms for disseminating RRM/DRR information are in place
- They are operational, and reach national, sub-national and local levels.
- They operate on a regular and reliable basis.

Moderate

- Formal mechanisms for disseminating RRM/DRR information are in place; they are not always systematic.

- They are operational, and generally reach national and sub-national levels.
- They operate fairly regularly, though interruptions in dissemination still occur occasionally.

Emergent

- Some mechanisms (often informal) for disseminating RRM/DRR information are in place, but they are not systematic
- They are generally operational at the national level.
- They are not always active/frequent nor reliable.

Latent

- There are no mechanisms (formal or informal) in place for dissemination of RRM/DRR information
- FSN information is spread in an ad hoc and opportunistic manner (when and where possible through other channels)

1.4 International/Regional Partnerships.

Self-sufficient

- Stakeholders spearhead South-South Cooperation and/or are recognised as leaders in RRM/DRR development and achievements.
- There is frequent and continuous engagement in – or partnership with - international and/or regional RRM/DRR players and fora.
- These engagements have led to intentional actions to enhance national RRM/DRR policies and/or programmes.
- These engagements have led to documented products and sustained changes in RRM/DRR -related behaviours and/or practices.

Moderate

- Stakeholders engage in RRM/DRR -related South-South Cooperation, though mostly as recipients of expertise.
- There is occasional engagement in – or partnership with - international and/or regional RRM/DRR players and fora.
- Some engagements have led to intentional actions to enhance relevant national RRM/DRR policies and/or programmes.
- Some engagements have led to documented products and some changes in RRM/DRR -related behaviours and/or practices.

Emergent

- Stakeholders have expressed interest in RRM/DRR -related South-South Cooperation, but few instances have concretised.
- There is ad hoc engagement in – or partnership with - international and/or regional RRM/DRR players and fora.
- Few engagements, if any, have led to intentional actions to enhance relevant national RRM/DRR policies and/or programmes.
- None of the engagements have led to documented products or changes in RRM/DRR -related behaviours and/or practices.

Latent

- Stakeholders have not engaged in any instances of South-South Cooperation.
- There is little or no engagement in – or partnerships with - international and/or regional RRM/DRR players and fora.
- None of the engagements have led to intentional actions to enhance relevant national RRM/DRR policies and/or programmes.
- The engagements have not led to documented products or changes in RRM/DRR -related behaviours and/or practices.

Pathway 2: Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability

2.1 Institutional mandate and recognition.

Self-sufficient

- The institution mandated (BNGRC/GSL) to lead on implementing the logistics coordination agenda is recognised by all key players.
- It has widespread convening power.
- It can spearhead dialogue and action related to the logistics agenda.
- Its accountability framework includes regular monitoring, progress reporting and auditing against logistics objectives
- It identifies blockages and obstacles to logistics progress on a recurring basis and regularly mitigates them in a timely manner.
- It determines, and has complete control over, the resources allocated to support the logistics agenda.

Moderate

- The institution mandated to lead on implementing the logistics agenda is recognised by most key players.
- It generally has convening power but sometimes needs to avail of high-level support to garner a wider audience.
- It can generally spearhead dialogue and action related to the logistics agenda in most fora.
- Its accountability framework does not explicitly include regular monitoring, progress reporting against logistics objectives.
- It generally identifies blockages and obstacles to logistics progress and mitigates them in a timely manner.
- In most cases, it determines and controls the resources allocated to support the logistics agenda.

Emergent

- The institution promoting the logistics agenda is not officially mandated to do so.

- It is generally not recognised by key players.
- Its convening power in this context is limited; it must avail of high-level support or champions to garner a wider audience.
- In general, it struggles to initiate dialogue and action related to the logistics agenda.
- It has little influence on the scope of the logistics agenda and generally receives the decisions made by other stakeholders.
- Monitoring and reporting of logistics progress is sporadic.
- Blockages and obstacles to logistics progress are not always identified nor mitigated in a timely manner.
- It has little influence or control over resources allocated to support the logistics agenda.

Latent

- There is no institution officially mandated to lead the logistics agenda, and none promoting it unofficially.
- There are no high-level champions or if present, they lack institutional support and recognition among other key players.
- No one is able to initiate dialogue or action around the logistics agenda.
- There is no monitoring or reporting on the logistics progress.
- Blockages and obstacles to logistics progress go unchecked.
- Few resources are allocated to the logistics agenda and they are controlled by various entities.

2.2 Coordination mechanisms and accountability.

Self-sufficient

- A multi-sectorial and multi-actor coordination mechanism critical to promoting relevant agenda is in place.
- It is functional at national, sub-national and local levels.
- It is effective and involves all relevant sectors, stakeholders and partners.
- Reporting lines between decentralised branches of the coordination mechanism are well-defined and functional.
- Accountability lines across all relevant stakeholders at national, sub-national, local and facility levels are clearly defined.
- Accountability lines are widely known by all stakeholders and fully functioning.
- As relevant, other sector-specific coordination mechanisms integrate related objectives into their agenda.

Moderate

- One or more coordination mechanisms that promote relevant agenda are in place.
- They are functional at national and sub-national levels.
- They generally engage all relevant sectors, stakeholders and partners.
- Reporting lines between decentralised branches of the coordination mechanism are defined and generally functional.
- Accountability lines across all relevant stakeholders at national and sub-national levels (but not local) are clearly defined.
- Accountability lines are generally known by all stakeholders and functioning.
- Some sector-specific coordination mechanisms integrate related objectives into their agenda.

Emergent

- One or more coordination mechanisms that promote relevant agenda are in place.
- They are functional at national level; coordination efforts at sub-national level are not systematic nor effective.
- Not all key stakeholders, actors and/or relevant sectors are engaged.
- Reporting lines between coordination mechanisms at national and sub-national levels are lacking.
- Stakeholder accountability lines at national and sub-national levels are defined but not always transparent nor functional.
- Very few sector-specific coordination mechanisms integrate related objectives into their agenda.

Latent

- There are no formal coordination mechanisms in place to promote the relevant agenda.
- Coordination efforts are non-systematic and do not engage all key stakeholders, actors and/or relevant sectors.
- There are no coordination efforts at sub-national level.
- Stakeholder accountability lines are not clearly defined and therefore transparency and accountability are lacking.
- Other sector-specific coordination mechanisms do not currently integrate related objectives into their agenda.

2.3 Information management systems.

Self-sufficient

- A formal, digital information management system is in place.
- It captures critical and relevant logistics data.
- It is fully functional at national, sub-national and local levels as warranted by context.
- It captures data that supports reporting on institutional accountability, which is done regularly and systematically.
- Data quality control mechanisms and protocols are clearly defined, in place and functional; data quality is strong.
- End-users at all levels are equipped with the skills needed to use the system properly.
- End-users use the system on a regular basis, as an integral part of their daily operations.

Moderate

- A formal, digital information management system is under development.
- It captures some (but not all) critical and relevant logistics data.

- It is generally functional at national and sub-national levels as warranted by context.
- It captures basic data that supports reporting on institutional accountability, which is done on an as-needs basis.
- Data quality control mechanisms and protocols are not clearly defined; data quality need to be improved.
- There are gaps in end-user skills to use the system properly, particularly at the sub-national level.
- End-users do not always use the system on a regular basis.

Emergent

- A formal or informal non-digital information management system is in place.
- It captures some relevant logistics data.
- It has varying degrees of functionality at different levels.
- Provisions for data disaggregation and analysis are somewhat limited and/or not standardised.
- Data that supports reporting on institutional accountability is very limited; reporting is sporadic and qualitative.
- There are no data quality control mechanisms or protocols; data quality is poor.
- End-user skills to utilise existing systems require support/strengthening.
- Existing systems are inconsistently used.

Latent

- There is no information management system in place.
- No relevant logistics data is captured in this context.
- Obtaining evidence to report on institutional accountability is challenging. Reporting is not done regularly.
- End-user skills in data collection in any shape or form are very limited.

2.6 Assets, platforms and infrastructure.

Self-sufficient

- Assets, platforms and infrastructure supporting effective and efficient service implementation exist.
- They are in place at all levels (national, sub-national and local as appropriate).
- They are fully functional and accessible to all affected stakeholders, including vulnerable groups.
- End-users are equipped with the skills needed to maintain, manage, access and/or benefit from them over time.
- End-users access and use them on a regular basis, as an integral part of their ongoing activities.

Moderate

- Assets, platforms and infrastructure supporting effective and efficient service implementation exist.
- They are in place at national level, and sub-national level to some extent.
- They are generally functional and accessible to all affected stakeholders, including vulnerable groups.
- End-users are generally equipped with the skills needed to maintain, manage, access and/or benefit from them over time.
- End-users do not always access and use them on a regular basis.

Emergent

- Assets, platforms and infrastructure supporting effective and efficient service implementation are being developed.
- They are being developed at national level only (possibly with plans for decentralisation at a later stage).
- Those that are established are not yet fully functional nor accessible to all affected stakeholders.
- End-users do not generally possess the skills needed to maintain, manage, access and/or benefit from them.
- End-users rarely and inconsistently use them.

Latent

- Assets, platforms and infrastructure supporting effective and efficient service implementation are not in place.
- Related logistics services are therefore not available.

2.7 National/local partnerships.

Self-sufficient

- Strategic and operational partnerships that help operationalise the relevant agenda have been formalised.
- They have been formalised at national, sub-national and local levels.
- They involve a wide range of state, civil society, private sector and non-state actors pursuing shared logistics objectives.
- They have led to intentional actions to enhance relevant national programme implementation.
- They have led to tangible, documented products and sustained changes in logistics -related behaviours and/or practices.

Moderate

- Operational partnerships that help operationalise the relevant agenda have been formalised.
- They have been formalised at national and sub-national levels, but not at local levels.
- They involve a range of state and civil society players, but private sector and/or other key groups are not yet engaged.
- Some have led to intentional actions to enhance relevant national programme implementation.
- Some have led to tangible, documented products and some changes in logistics -related behaviours and/or practices.

Emergent

- Operational partnerships that help operationalise the relevant agenda are being established.
- They are being established as and where opportunity arises (no systematic coverage).

- Engagement with civil society is still limited. Private sector and/or other key groups are not involved.
- At present, they are not leading to specific actions to enhance national logistics programme implementation.
- No tangible, documented products are emerging for these partnerships.

Latent

- There are no formal partnerships that help operationalise the relevant agenda.
- Informal partnerships may exist at different levels, but these are not documented nor registered.
- It is unclear if and how they support relevant national programme implementation.
- It is unknown if they have led to tangible, documented products and changes in logistics -related behaviours and/or practices.

Pathway 3: Strategic Planning and Financing

3.1 Strategic planning.

Self-sufficient

- A Costed Action Plan/Roadmap/Implementation strategy to support the specific agenda exists.
- It reflects considerations for effectiveness, efficiency and economy of implementation.
- It reflects gender budgeting considerations and ensures inclusivity and comprehensive coverage.
- It addresses the support needs of the institution/s mandated with and accountable for its implementation.
- It addresses operationalising this support at national, sub-national and local levels.
- It includes plans related to acquiring, developing and retaining institutional resources (financial, human and material).
- It outlines implementation timelines, milestones and responsibilities.
- Where relevant, other sector-specific costed plans clearly identify financial implications of logistics integration.

Moderate

- A Costed Action Plan/Roadmap/Implementation strategy to support the specific agenda exists.
- It reflects considerations for effectiveness, efficiency and economy of implementation, albeit inconsistently.
- It reflects gender budgeting considerations but does not fully address inclusivity and comprehensive coverage.
- It superficially addresses the support needs of the institution/s mandated with and accountable for its implementation.
- It addresses operationalising this support at national level, and to some extent, at sub-national level.
- It includes superficial plans related to acquiring, developing and retaining institutional resources (particularly financial).
- It outlines high-level implementation timelines and general milestones. Responsibilities are not clearly defined.
- Where relevant, some sector-specific costed plans loosely acknowledge financial implications of logistics integration.

Emergent

- A preliminary roadmap/Implementation strategy to support the specific agenda exists.
- Considerations for effectiveness, efficiency and economy of implementation are very basic and not evidence-based.
- Gender budgeting was not integrated and inclusivity considerations are not consistently reflected throughout.
- It does not clearly address the support needs of the institution/s mandated with and accountable for its implementation.
- It outlines superficial implementation timelines, or articulates responsibilities but lacks clarity on timelines and milestones.
- A finalised Costed Action Plan has only partially been articulated (if at all), and only at the national level.
- It is unclear to what extent other sector-specific costed action plans identify financial implications of logistics integration.

Latent

- A Roadmap/Implementation strategy to support the specific agenda has yet to be developed at any level.
- There is no way of ensuring adequate and comprehensive coverage of the system or service implementation.
- The support needs of the institution/s mandated with agenda implementation are not formally acknowledged.
- Clarity around implementation timelines, milestones and responsibilities in relation to agenda implementation is low.
- There are few, if any, other sector-specific costed action plans; they do not reflect financial implications of logistics integration.

3.2 Value proposition.

Self-sufficient

- Support for the logistics agenda is multi-sectoral.
- There is a solid understanding of the value proposition of investing in logistics -sensitive systems/services.
- There is a widely and clearly articulated evidence-based analysis of context, needs and return-on-investment.

Moderate

- Support for the logistics agenda is strong in most relevant sectors.
- There is a growing awareness and understanding of the value proposition of investing in logistics -sensitive systems/services.
- An evidence-based analysis of context, needs and return-on-investment has been drafted/is being finalised.

Emergent

- Support for the logistics agenda is limited to a few relevant sectors.

- Understanding of the value proposition of investing in logistics -sensitive systems/services resides in specific individuals.
- There is no solid evidence-based analysis of context, needs and return-on-investment.
- There is generally a lack of understanding of the return-on-investment of logistics -sensitive systems/services across the board.

Latent

- Support for the logistics agenda is very low.
- There is a pervasive lack of understanding of the value proposition of investing in logistics -sensitive systems/services.

3.3 Sustainable financing.

Self-sufficient

- A relevant Costed Action Plan is fully funded through national budget lines, different sectors, partners or non-state actors.
- It can avail of various complementary financing mechanisms or models.
- The resource base is well documented, stable and reliable.
- A wide network of partners supply – or contribute – required human, financial and other resources.
- Budget lines and plans exist at relevant sub-national and local levels, and can cover all programme implementation costs.
- At all levels, budgets and plans reflect principles and practices of gender-responsive budgeting.

Moderate

- A relevant Costed Action Plan is largely funded through national budget lines, different sectors, partners or non-state actors.
- It can avail of some complementary financing mechanisms or models.
- The resource base is documented but fluctuates.
- There is a limited network of partners who can contribute to the supply of required human, financial and other.
- Budget lines and plans generally exist at sub-national levels, and can cover all programme implementation costs.
- Some budgets and plans (but not all) reflect principles and practices of gender-responsive budgeting.

Emergent

- A relevant Costed Action Plan is only partially funded through national budget lines.
- There are no other financing models or mechanisms in place; available funding cannot cover all implementation needs.
- The resource base fluctuates causing frequent significant funding gaps.
- There is a limited network of external partners; few national partners can contribute human, financial and other resources.
- Implementation relies heavily on external funding and support.
- There are no budget lines or plans at relevant sub-national levels.
- There is no evidence of principles and practices of gender-responsive budgeting in any of the plans and budgets.

Latent

- A relevant Costed Action Plan is entirely un-funded (or does not exist).
- There is a limited network of external partners who provide all human, financial and other resources.
- Implementation relies entirely on external funding and support.

3.4 Financial management systems.

Self-sufficient

- Funds are disbursed to national, sub-national and local levels for implementation.
- They are disbursed in a timely, effective and accountable/transparent manner.
- All implementers (at all levels) have the capacity to plan and budget
- They can request resources from the central level and do so freely on an as-needs basis.
- Systems allow users to record real-time expenditures and generate accurate disbursement and expenditure reports
- These can be aggregated at sub-national and national levels, and allow for multiple levels of information disaggregation.
- Users at all levels have the capacity to carry out accurate analysis of budgets versus actuals and do so regularly.

Moderate

- Funds are disbursed to national and sub-national levels for implementation.
- They are generally disbursed in a timely, effective and accountable/transparent manner.
- The ability of implementers to plan and budget (at all levels) may vary by implementer and/or context.
- Most, but not all, can request resources from the central level with relative ease/with some support
- Systems allow for central-level disbursement reports that can be aggregated at sub-national and national levels.
- These allow for some degree of information disaggregation.
- Most users have the capacity to carry out budget analysis.

Emergent

- Funds are only sometimes disbursed to national and sub-national levels for implementation.
- They are disbursed intermittently and not always in response to demands from implementers.
- Ability to budget at implementation level is very limited; implementers generally do not budget unless guided/supported.
- Systems are not predisposed to allow for central-level disbursement reports
- Users do not generally have the capacity to track expenditures and carry out budget analysis.

Latent

- Mechanisms for controlled disbursement of funds to implementation levels are not yet in place.
- Ability to budget at all levels is non-existent or very limited so local budgeting is not done.
- There is no tracking of disbursements.

Pathway 4: Stakeholder Programme Design, Delivery and M&E

4.1 Programme design and delivery.

Self-sufficient

- System or service design is inclusive and gender-transformative and includes clear and appropriate logistics objectives.
- Delivery is effective, efficient and economic; all identified target groups receive what they are entitled to.
- Implementation meets key selected metrics for inclusivity, gender, protection and accountability to affected populations.
- All of the above are well documented and disseminated to all stakeholders and affected populations.
- Dissemination takes place through appropriate (diverse and accessible) communication channels
- There is clear evidence of integration and/or complementarity with other relevant national programmes.
- Programme procurement and logistics standards and processes are well documented, transparent, effective and efficient.
- They reflect proper analysis of production capacities, costs, food safety and quality, and guarantee service continuity.
- Functional contingency plans are in place to address unexpected pipeline breaks/shocks, emergencies, etc.

Moderate

- System or service design is inclusive and includes clear and appropriate FSN objectives.
- Delivery is generally effective and efficient; the largest identified target groups receive what they are entitled to.
- Implementation meets most metrics for inclusivity, gender, protection and accountability to affected populations.
- The above could be strengthened, but are generally well documented, though not actively disseminated to all stakeholders.
- Dissemination does not always avail of appropriate (diverse and accessible) communication channels
- There is some integration and/or complementarity with other national programmes in some geographic areas or activities.
- Programme procurement and logistics standards and processes are established, well-documented and effective.
- They could be improved through better analysis of production capacities, costs, food safety and quality.
- Service continuity is generally acceptable although functional contingency plans have not been developed.

Emergent

- System or service design is only partially inclusive and FSN objectives are not clearly articulated.
- Delivery is not always effective nor efficient; some identified target groups do not receive what they are entitled to.
- Implementation meets basic metrics for inclusivity and gender, but not protection and accountability measures.
- There is intention to align/complement other national plans, but how to do this in practice has not yet been defined
- Programme procurement and logistics standards and processes exist informally; they are not standardised nor documented.
- There has been some assessment relating to implementation and production capacities and costs, but little more.
- Service delivery is somewhat reliable in some areas, but others experience serious gaps on a regular basis.

Latent

- System or service design is not inclusive and logistics objectives and targeting criteria are not clearly articulated.
- Delivery is ineffective and inefficient; only specific pockets or groups receive what they are entitled to.
- Implementation does not meet basic metrics for inclusivity and gender, nor protection and accountability.
- There is no evidence of intention or plans for alignment or complementarity with other relevant national plans.
- Programme procurement and logistics standards and processes are ad hoc and lack transparency.
- There has been some assessment relating to implementation and production capacities and costs, but little more.
- Service delivery is irregular and has poor coverage.

4.2 Stakeholder implementation capacity.

Self-sufficient

- Implementers at all levels have staff, knowledge, guidance, procedures and equipment to be efficient and accountable.
- Implementers have access to pre- and in-service training for relevant staff at all levels.
- Institutional targets for internal capacity strengthening in specific areas/topics/practices are/have been met.
- Internal logistics -related capacity strengthening initiatives are widespread and comprehensive.
- A critical mass of knowledgeable representatives at all levels exists to mitigate impact of turnover/low retention.
- Relevant and comprehensive guidelines/national standards are available to guide programme implementers.
- They are easily accessible, easy to understand.
- They are flexible enough to adapt to local implementing partner needs, roles and responsibilities.
- They are widely disseminated at national, sub-national and local levels.
- Concerted efforts are made to verify programme implementers across the board comply with them.
- Compliance with guidelines and national standards is high.

Moderate

- Most implementers at central and sub-national levels have the resources they need to be efficient and accountable.

- Many but not all have access to pre- and in-service training for relevant staff at national and some sub-national locations.
- Not all institutional targets for internal capacity strengthening in specific logistics areas/topics/practices are/have been met.
- Specific efforts to meet targets are underway.
- Internal logistics -related capacity strengthening initiatives are not widespread nor comprehensive.
- A critical mass of knowledgeable representatives has not yet been fully established.
- The negative impact of turnover/low retention cannot always be mitigated across the institution.
- Relevant and comprehensive guidelines/national standards are available to guide programme implementers.
- In most cases, they are accessible but not always very easy to understand.
- They are generally flexible enough to adapt to most implementing partner needs, roles and responsibilities.
- They are widely disseminated at central and sub-national levels (but not at local levels).
- Some efforts are made to verify programme implementers across the board comply with them.
- Compliance with guidelines and national standards is fairly good, but there is room for improvement.

Emergent

- Some implementers at central (and possibly sub-national) level have the resources needed to be efficient and accountable.
- Only a few at central level have access to pre- and in-service training for relevant staff.
- Institutional targets for internal capacity strengthening have not even been established.
- Internal logistics -related capacity strengthening initiatives are not widespread nor comprehensive.
- The institution suffers the negative impact of turnover/low retention in many different areas of work.
- Some guidelines/national standards are available to guide programme implementers.
- They are fairly simple and do not provide in-depth guidance.
- They are not very flexible; adapting to different implementing partner needs, roles and responsibilities can be complicated.
- They are only disseminated centrally through direct training and contacts.
- There are no systems in place to verify compliance during implementation. Compliance levels are unknown.

Latent

- Very few, if any, implementers have the resources needed to be efficient and accountable.
- Access to pre- and in-service training for relevant staff is very low if available at all.
- The institution is very susceptible to the negative impact of turnover/low retention in all areas of work.
- There are no guidelines/national standards available to guide programme implementers.

Pathway 5: Engagement and Participation of Community, Civil Society and Private Sector

5.1 Engagement in programme design and delivery.

Self-sufficient

- All non-state actors (civil society, communities, private sector, etc.) are aware of relevant national initiatives.
- They actively engage and participate in their design, development and implementation as relevant to context.
- They identify with and take ownership of the initiatives and spearhead advocacy efforts to raise public awareness of them.
- They have access to periodic training (as/when needed) and have clearly defined responsibilities in these processes.
- A strong platform for dialogue between state and non-state actors exists.
- Formalised and documented systems are in place and fully functional, to facilitate their participation and engagement.
- Formal and transparent mechanisms for civil society and community monitoring and feedback at all levels are in place.
- Documented evidence of the regular usage of these mechanisms is available.

Moderate

- Many (not all) non-state actors (civil society, communities, private sector, etc.) are aware of relevant national initiatives.
- They engage and participate to some extent in their design, development and implementation, as relevant to context.
- Where engagement permits, they contribute to advocacy efforts to raise public awareness of them.
- Engagement in this regard may not be comprehensive in terms of coverage and/or messaging.
- Channels of communication between state and non-state actors are in place but information flow is not always timely.
- Informal systems are in place to facilitate their engagement, though participation could be broader/more inclusive
- There are informal mechanisms for civil society and community monitoring and feedback at the local level.
- Documented evidence of their usage of these mechanisms is not systematically available. Level of usage is not clear.

Emergent

- Some non-state actors (civil society, communities, private sector, etc.) are aware of relevant national initiatives.
- They have limited engagement in their design, development and implementation, as relevant to context.
- They are only marginally involved in advocacy efforts to raise public awareness of them.
- Channels of communication between state and non-state actors are limited and/or constrained.
- Informal systems are in place to facilitate their engagement, but participation is very low.
- There is no civil society and community engagement in monitoring and feedback at the local level.

Latent

- Non-state actors (civil society, communities, private sector, etc.) are generally not aware of relevant national initiatives.
- They do not engage in their design, development and implementation.

- They play no role in advocacy efforts to raise public awareness of them.
- There are few – if any – channels of communication between state and non-state actors.
- There are no systems or mechanisms in place to facilitate their engagement.