



Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening Support (SUCCESS) Programme



## Tools to Conduct the Institutional Maturity Index (IMI) Survey



**Sindh Union Council and Community Economic  
Strengthening Support (SUCCESS) Programme**

**Tools to Conduct the Institutional Maturity  
Index (IMI) Survey**

**December, 2017**

[www.rspn.org](http://www.rspn.org)

[www.success.org.pk](http://www.success.org.pk)

[www.facebook.com/successprogramme](https://www.facebook.com/successprogramme)

## **Project Management and Text**

Fazal Ali Khan, Programme Manager SUCCESS, RSPN

Khurram Shahzad, M&E Specialist, RSPN

Filza Nasir, M&E Officer SUCCESS, RSPN

© 2018 Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN). All rights reserved. Licensed to the European Union under conditions.



EUROPEAN UNION

“This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.”

## **More information about European Union is available on:**

Web: <http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/pakistan/>

Twitter: [@EUPakistan](https://twitter.com/EUPakistan)

Facebook: [European Union Cooperation in Pakistan](https://www.facebook.com/EuropeanUnionCooperationinPakistan)

## Contents

<b>How to Conduct the IMI Exercise?</b> .....	1
<b>Suggestions for the Users of the IMI</b> .....	2
<b>Institutional Maturity Index (IMI) Tool for Community Organisations (COs)</b> .....	3
<b>Institutional Maturity Index (IMI) Tool for Village Organisations (VOs)</b> .....	10
<b>Institutional Maturity Index (IMI) Tool for Local Support Organisations (LSOs) ...</b>	18

## How to Conduct the IMI Exercise?

- a. **The IMI facilitator (s):** The IMI exercise will be facilitated by partner RSPs field teams including the Social Organizers and later on by trained community activists.
- b. **Facilitator's Understanding of the Project:** It is important to ensure that the RSPs field teams (or people who would conduct the IMI exercise) have fully understood the SUCCESS Programme's context (including goals and objectives and the activities), especially the purpose of community institutions' (CIs) formation, activation and strengthening in the context of Sindh province.
- c. **Facilitation skills for exercise:** The RSPs and/or community facilitators must follow a step-by-step approach that allows for greater understanding and participation. All participants should be encouraged to participate. Facilitators should clarify the objectives and methodology for the IMI exercise. Prior to the implementation of the IMI exercise in the field, a one-day session on IMI with SUCCESS M&E Managers and District M&E Officers of partner RSPs should be arranged.
- d. **First IMI exercise:** The first IMI exercise may be carried out by the RSPN team with a randomly selected sample of CIs. However, during the course of the programme IMI exercise needs to be carried out by the field teams for all the CIs that have been formed.
- e. **Participants in IMI exercise:** It is worthy to have full participation of CO/VO/LSO members (depending on what level is the exercise being carried out) in the IMI exercise; otherwise representatives from various segments of the community (15-20) should participate in the IMI exercise, in addition to CO/VO/LSO leaders. The format should not be filled up with the help of an individual only.
- f. **Place for IMI exercise:** It is preferable to conduct IMI exercise in a public building that is accessible to all. A school building is probably ideal for conducting the IMI exercise.
- g. **Timing of IMI exercise:** IMI exercise should be conducted at a time that is convenient to the community.
- h. **Duration of IMI exercise:** IMI should not take more than half a day. The actual time observed during the pre-testing for the exercise varies between 1.5 to 2.5 hours per CI.
- i. **Physical verification:** Facilitators must physically verify information before recording it in the tool, e.g. record books must be consulted for verification. The facilitator should not rely on **verbal explanations only**, principally if not recorded it will not be scored.
- j. **Open discussions:** After each indicator has been answered the facilitator should ask semi-structured questions that allow for participants to discuss and share their level of satisfaction regarding the performance indicators. It is very important that the facilitator notes these comments of participants and ensures broader participation; a few persons must not be allowed to dominate the discussions.

- k. **Action Plans:** Once the IMI form has been completed, facilitators should help the CI:
- Review their scores, noting their strengths and their weaknesses
  - Put together an Action Plan to improve their performance.

### **Suggestions for the Users of the IMI**

- a. While carrying out the first IMI exercise, be mindful of the date of formation of the CI. This is because, the IMI exercise could be conducted with a CI that has been in place *for a long time* (for example, 1-2 years), or with a CI that *is very new* (less than 1 year). A relatively new CI would not have the same results as an old one, and the maturity level results would be quite different.
- b. It is suggested that prior to the implementation of the IMI exercise the IMI facilitators (SOs and field teams) be given at least 2-3 days training on the objectives, methodology and processes of the IMI exercise. The need for properly trained SOs cannot be overstated as majority of them have not gone through such an exercise earlier.
- c. It is suggested for the programme staff to conduct this exercise NOT just once, but rather update this information as part of a continuous monitoring system, collate the information periodically and use it as a tool to gauge impact.
- d. The IMI indicators included in this current index are context specific. The users of the IMI (RSPN, NRSP, SRSO, TRDP, CIs, or any other organization) may revise and update the IMI indicators after each round of the exercise. With an increased level of institutional development in the programme area there may be a need to include higher level of indicators and remove the very low level indicators, which are based on the current institutional dynamics of the programme area.

**Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening  
Support (SUCCESS) Programme**

**Institutional Maturity Index (IMI) Tool for Community Organisations (COs)**

Section 1. CO Identification Data	
Q1.1. Assessment Date: DD   MM   YYYY	
Q1.2. CO Name: _____	MIS Code: ____
Q1.3. Date of formation: DD   MM   YYYY	
Q1.4. RSP (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.5. RSP SMT (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.6. Revenue Village (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.7. Settlement/Goth/Mohallah (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.8. UC (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.9. Tehsil/Taluka (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.10. District (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.11. Province (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.12. Bank A/C No.: _____ Bank & Branch Name _____ A/C Opening Date: _____	
Q1.13. Total number of participants at this meeting for assessment: __ __ (F____, M____, T____)	
Q1.14. Name of Associated VO (if any): _____	
Q1.15. Name of IMI Exercise Surveyor: _____	Code: __ __
Q1.16. Name of anyone else accompanying: _____	Code: __ __
Q1.17. Name of DMO: _____	Code: __ __

## Section 2: Organizational Motivation

### 1- CO Objectives (One option to be circled)

Q2.1. How well are the CO objectives conceived by the CO members.	Score
1. CO members do not have any idea about the CO objectives	0
2. CO members have a diverse opinion about the objectives of the CO (no clear written objectives)	1
3. CO members have clear objectives of the CO and these are written down. But not all members are fully aware about it	2
4. CO members have clear objectives of the CO and these are written down, and members are fully aware about it (members have same opinion as written in paper - verify from records and take a photograph)	3

### 2- Procedures for Consolidation of Needs identified by member households(One option to be circled)

Q2.2. What systems/processes does the CO have for needs identification and prioritisation? (check resolution register, CO Resolution on Priority Needs, VDP)	Score
1. No MIP and CO Resolution on Priority Needs prepared for VDP or resolutions submitted	0
2. CO has prepared a MIP (member household development plans) and not prepared the CO Resolution on Priority Needs for VDP	1
3. CO has prepared MIP and prepared CO Resolution on Priority Needs for VDP, but has not submitted a resolution	2
4. CO prepared MIPs and CO Resolution on Priority Needs for VDP and submitted the resolution in the last one year	3

### Q2.3. How many resolutions has the CO passed related to MIPs and CO Priority Needs for preparation of VDP?

Submitted to RSP or any support organizations:      — | —

Approved by RSP or any support organizations:      — | —

### 3- Participation in need identification and planning in any activity (One option to be circled)

Q2.4. Does the CO ensure member participation in needs identification & planning?	Score
1. Less than 25% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of MIP and/or VDP and its objectives	0
2. 26-50% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of MIP and/or VDP and its objectives	1
3. 51-75% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of MIP and/or VDP and its objectives	2
4. Over 75% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of MIP and/or VDP and its objectives	3

### 4- Accountability - Election/Selection of CO Office holders (One option to be circled)

Q2.5. How were the CO president and manager chosen?	Score
1. Office holders appointed by RSP staff	0
2. Officeholders are appointed by important/influential member of the CO	1
3. President and Manager selected (by consensus) by CO member once only	2
4. CO is conducting annual elections/selection by consensus and its records being maintained (verify the record)	3

### Q2.6. How do the President and Manager lead the CO?

	Score
1. The CO Office Holders are not sharing the monthly progress of CO with their members and/or the VO it is a member of.	0
2. The CO Office Holders have an informal mechanism of sharing monthly progress of CO with their members and/or the VO it is a member of.	1
3. The CO has a formal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress only with its members (Check CO's Karwai register)	2
4. The CO has a formal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress with all of its members and the VO it is a member of (For example an agenda item in the VO monthly meeting) – Check CO's and VO's Karwai Register	3

### 5- Inclusion of poor households (Circle one Option)

Q2.7. What proportion of CO members are poor?	Score	Notes



1. CO does not have any poor household with PSC-SR 0-23 from the CO area	N/A	Total households in CO area:_____
2. CO doesn't have any poor household with PSC-SR 0-23 as its member	0	Total number of households as members of CO :_____
3. Less than 50% of all poor households (PSC-SR 0-23) are members of the CO	1	Total number of poor households (PSC-SR 0-23) in CO area:_____
4. 51-90% of the poor households (PSC-SR 0-23) are members of the CO	2	Number of poor households (PSC-SR 0-23) member of CO:_____
5. All poor households (PSC-SR 0-23) are members of the CO. (verify from record)	3	% of coverage of poor (PSC-SR 0-23) who households coverage in CO:_____

**6- Women's Issues and Benefits (Circle one Option)**

<b>Q2.8. What has the CO done about women's issues?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. CO has not done anything about women's issues.	0
2. CO members have discussed women's issues, implemented some activities benefiting <50% women members	1
3. CO members have discussed women's issues, implemented many activities benefitting 51%-75%)women members	2
4. CO members have discussed women's issues, implemented many activities and all (100%) women members have benefited (verify from records)	3

**Example of Women's Issues:**

---



---

**Section 3: Organizational Capacity**

**7- CO Management Training (Circle one Option)**

<b>Q3.1. Who, from the CO, has received community management training?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. None of the office holders received CO management skills training (CMST) since the CO was set up	0
2. Only president or manager of the CO received community management skills training (CMST)	1
3. Both, President and Manager received community management skills training (CMST)	2
4. The office holders (President and Manager) and some other CO members received community management skills training (CMST) (verify from records)	3

**8- CO Record Keeping - Records and Books (Complete the table detailing the records which the CO keeps.)**

<b>Record Details</b>	<b>Q3.2. Record Exists Yes No N/A</b>	<b>Q3.3. Date of Last Entry DD/MM/YYYY</b>	<b>Q3.4. Quality of Record Keeping Good Fair Not Good</b>	<b>Q3.5. Comments/ Remarks</b>
1. Proceedings/ Karwai Register				
2. Attendance Record				
3. Savings Record				
4. Member Saving Pass-books				
5. Micro Investment Plan				
6. CO Monthly Progress Report				
7. CO Resolution for Joining a VO				

<b>Q3.6. How well does the CO keep/maintain its records/registers? (check CO registers)</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. CO has no records of anything	0
2. Some records/registers of CO are available but there is a need for lot of improvement	1

3. All CO records/registers are available and there is a need for some improvement	2
4. All CO records/registers are available, being updated regularly and record is of good quality	3
<b>9- Conflict Resolution (Circle one Option) including women issues</b>	
<b>Q3.7. In the last 1-3 years, has the CO dealt with any internal conflicts?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. No internal conflict (including women issue) management system formed by the CO	0
2. Internal conflicts including women issues dealt informally by the CO	1
3. Internal conflicts including women issues dealt with through formal mechanism and procedures	2
4. CO has played an important role in resolving both internal and external conflicts including women issues through formal mechanism and procedures	3
<b>Q3.8. Summary of conflicts resolution by the LSO?</b>	
<b>Description/s</b>	<b>#</b>
No. of total internal and external conflicts arises	
No. of internal and external conflicts resolved	
No. of unresolved internal and external conflicts	

**Section 4: Organizational Performance**

**10- Frequency of CO Meetings (check records - one option is to be circled)**

**Q4.1. Where does the CO usually hold the meetings (location)?**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Q4.2. What is the planned frequency of CO regular meeting?**

**a.** In one year how many meetings were to be held: \_\_\_\_\_ (verify from record)

**b.** in past year, how many CO meetings actually held? \_\_\_\_\_ (verify from record)

**c.** % of actual CO meetings held: \_\_\_\_\_%

- Weekly.....1
- Fortnightly.....2
- Monthly.....3
- 2 monthly.....4
- 3 monthly.....5
- Other (Specify).....7

**Q4.3. How frequently does the CO think they should meet?**

- Weekly.....1
- Fortnightly.....2
- Monthly.....3
- 2 monthly.....4
- 3 monthly.....5
- Other (Specify).....7

**Q4.4. Out of the planned meetings, what percent of the meetings were actually held in the last 12 months?**

**Score**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Less than 25%                                      | 0 |
| 2. 26-50% of planned meetings                         | 1 |
| 3. 51-75% of planned meetings                         | 2 |
| 4. 76-100 % of planned meetings (verify from records) | 3 |

**11- Attendance (at last 3 meetings)**

**Q4.5. How many members attended the last three CO meetings? (This is to gauge the interest of the members)**

Sr.	Date	Total Members	Attendance %
1	DD   MM   YYYY	__ __	__ __
2	DD   MM   YYYY	__ __	__ __
3	DD   MM   YYYY	__ __	__ __
<b>Total</b>		__ __	__ __

\*Percentage = (Total attendance/Total members)\*100

**Q4.6. Percentage (%) of Attendance**

**Score**

	<b>(One score is to be circled)</b>
0%	0
1% - 50%	1
51% - 74%	2
75% and above	3

**12- Regular savings mobilisation (One option to be circled)**

<b>Q4.7. Does the CO have a regular savings programme?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. No savings programme	0
2. Few CO members are participating in savings programme and savings are NOT being utilised productively (verify from record)	1
3. Few CO members are participating in savings programme and savings are being utilised productively (verify from record)	2
4. Maximum CO members are participating in savings programme and savings are being utilised productively (verify from record)	3

**Total Amount of Savings (PKR):** \_\_\_\_\_

**13- Self-help Initiatives by the CO (One option to be circled)**

<b>Q4.9. Has the CO undertaken any self-help initiatives?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. No self-help initiative taken by the CO	0
2. CO has undertaken some (1-2) self-help initiatives informally and its record not available	1
3. CO has undertaken some (3-5) self-help initiatives formally and some of its record is available	2
4. CO has undertaken some (>6) self-help initiatives formally and its proper record is available with CO (verify from record)	3

**Section 5: SUMMARY OF THE SCORES AND THE FINAL CATEGORIZATION FOR CO**

Indicator #	Indicator Name	Maximum score	Actual
<b>Organizational Motivation</b>			
1.	Objectives	3	
2.	Needs Identification and Planning	3	
3.	Participation in Needs Identification and Planning in any Activity	3	
4.	Accountability of Office Holders	3	
5.	Inclusion of poor households	3	
6.	Women's Issues	3	
<b>Organizational Capacity</b>			
7.	CO Management Skills Training	3	
8.	Community Record Management	3	
9.	Conflict Resolution	3	
<b>Organizational Performance</b>			
10.	Frequency of CO Meetings	3	
11.	Attendance (at last 3 meetings)	3	
12.	Regular Savings Mobilisation	3	
13.	Self-help Initiatives	3	
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>39</b>	
<b>% of CO's actual score (Obtained Marks/Total Marks * 100)</b>			
<b>% Range</b>	<b>CO Institutional Development Category</b>	<b>CO Category (mark one)</b>	
<b>Less than 25%</b>	CO Institutional Development Category 1 (Inactive)		
<b>26% - 50%</b>	CO Institutional Development Category 2 (Institutional Infancy)		
<b>51% - 75%</b>	CO Institutional Development Category 3 (Institutional Development )		
<b>76% &amp; Above</b>	CO Institutional Development Category 4 (Institutional Independence )		
<b>14- RSP Staff visits to CO in last 12 months</b>			
<b>Q5.1. Number of visits made by Social Organizer (SO) in the last 12 months</b>		_   _	
<b>Q5.2. Number of visits made by other RSP staff in the last 12 months</b>		_   _	
<b>Q5.3. Do CO members have to visit the RSP office often?</b>		Yes.....1 No.....2	
<b>Q5.4. If yes in Q5.3, when was the last visit made?</b>		DD   MM   YYYY	
<b>Q5.5. What was the purpose of their visit to RSP office?</b>			
_____			
_____			
<b>Q5.6. CO members views about RSP support since date of formation</b>		Very satisfactory.....1 Satisfactory.....2 Inadequate.....3	
<b>Q5.7. Discussion/ any other point:</b>			
_____			
_____			
_____			
<b>15- Final Discussion</b>			

**Q5.8. General discussion among CO members, additional points they wish to add about the CO, CO assessment, reasons for activeness or inactiveness and future plans. etc.**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**CONFIDENTIAL – FACILITATOR ONLY**

**Q5.9. Rank the Quality of the CO members' discussion**

- a. Only one or two members spoke, all others silent unless directly questioned.....1
- b. One or two dominant but a minority of others also spoke up.....2
- c. Small group dominated discussion but most members involved.....3
- d. Fully open discussion with a majority actively involved.....4

Important Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

**Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening  
Support (SUCCESS) Programme**

**Institutional Maturity Index (IMI) Tool for Village Organisations (VOs)**

Section 1. VO Identification Data	
Q1.1. Assessment Date: DD   MM   YYYY	
Q1.2. VO Name: _____	MIS Code: _____
Q1.3. Date of formation: DD   MM   YYYY	
Q1.4. No. of COs in VO's catchment area: ____	Q1.5. No. of member COs clustered in VO: ____
Q1.6. RSP (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.7. RSP SMT (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.8. Revenue Village (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.9. UC (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.10. Tehsil/Taluka (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.11. District (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.12. Province (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.13. Bank A/C No.: _____ Bank & Branch Name _____ A/C Opening Date: _____	
Q1.14. Total number of participants at this meeting for assessment: __ __ (F____, M____)	
Q1.15. Name of Associated LSO (if any): _____	
Q1.16. Name of RSP Official & Code: Name: _____	Code: __ __
Q1.17. Name of Supervisor & Code: Name: _____	Code: __ __
Q1.18. Name of DMO & Code: Name: _____	Code: __ __

## Section 2: Organizational Motivation

### 1- VO Objectives (One option to be circled)

Q2.1. How well are the VO objectives conceived by VO members?	Score
1. VO Members do not have any idea about the VO mission and objectives	0
2. VO Members have a diverse opinion about the mission and objectives of the VO (no written objectives, mission and goals)	1
3. VO Members have same opinion about the mission and objectives of the VO (no written mission and objectives)	2
4. VO has broader missions and objectives written down, and members are fully aware about it (members have same opinion as written in paper - verify from records and take a photograph)	3

### 2- Procedures for Consolidation of Needs identified by Member COs (One option to be circled)

Q2.2. What systems/processes does the VO have for consolidation of needs identified and prioritized by member COs? (Check resolution register, VDP, etc.)	Score
1. No VDP developed or resolutions submitted	0
2. VO has prepared VDP on basis of MIP and not consolidated the CO Priority Needs	1
3. VO has prepared VDP on basis of MIP and CO Priority Needs and submitted at least one resolution to RSP or any supporting organizations	2
4. VO has prepared VDP on basis of MIP and CO Priority Needs, and an annual development plan and submitted more than one resolution in the last 1 year to RSP or any supporting organizations (verify from record)	3

Number of resolutions during the last one year	Submitted	Approved	Implementation Status
Number of self-help resolutions:			
Number of resolutions to RSP			
Number of resolutions to Government Departments			
Number of resolutions to Elected Representatives			
Number of Resolutions to other organisations/stakeholders			
Total			

### 3- Participation in needs identification and planning in any activity (One option to be circled)

Q2.3. Does the VO ensure member participation in needs identification & planning, in making of VDP?	Score
1. Less than 25% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of VDP and its objectives	0
2. 26-50% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of VDP and its objectives	1
3. 51-75% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of VDP and its objectives	2
4. Over 75% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of VDP and its objectives	3

### 4- LSO Accountability - Election/Selection of VO Office Holders (One option to be circled)

Q2.4. How were the VO president and manager chosen?	Score
1. VO Office holders appointed by RSP staff	0
2. VO Office holders are appointed by, important/influential member of the VO	1
3. VO Office holders selected (by consensus) by VO member once only	2
4. VO is conducting annual elections/selection by consensus and its records being maintained (verify from record)	3

### Q2.5. How do the Office holders lead the VO?

	Score
1. The VO is not sharing the monthly progress with its member COs, and with the LSO it is a member of.	0
2. The VO has an informal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress with its member COs, and with the LSO it is a member of.	1
3. The VO has a formal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress only with its member COs. (For example an agenda item in the VO monthly meeting) – Check VOs' Karwai Register	2
4. The VO has a formal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress with its member COs, and with the LSO it	3

is a member of. (For example an agenda item in the VO monthly meeting) – *Check VOs' Karwai Register*

### Section 3: Organizational Capacity

#### 5- VO Leadership Management Training (Circle one Option)

Q3.1. What community leadership management training has the VO had?	Score
1. None of the office holders received VO leadership management skills training ( LMST)	0
2. Only one VO leader received leadership management skills training (LMST)	1
3. Both, President and Manager received leadership management skills training ( LMST)	2
4. Both VO leaders and (President and Manager) and some other VO members received leadership management skills training (LMST)	3

#### 6- VO Records (Complete the table detailing the records which the VO keeps)

Record Details	Q3.2. Record Exists - Yes - No - N/A	Q3.3. Date of Last Entry DD/MM/YYYY	Q3.4. Quality of Record Keeping - Good - Fair - Not Good	Q3.5. Comments/Remarks
1. Proceedings/ Karwai Register				
2. Attendance and Savings Record				
3. Village Development Plan				
4. Cash Book				
5. Ledger Register				
6. CIF Register				
7. Bank Receipts				
8. VO Resolution for joining LSO				
<b>CIF Records</b>				
1. CIF Appraisal form (of eligible households)				
2. Community Institution's CIF Beneficiary Approval Checklist				
3. CIF record register of disbursement and recovery				
4. CIF Passbooks issued to all clients				
5. Monthly CIF Progress Report				
6. CIF Beneficiary Tracking Sheet				
7. Income/profit from CIF				
8. <i>Processing fee record</i>				
9. <i>Basic Information about Government Offices/Buildings in UC</i>				
10. <i>List of CRPs</i>				
11. <i>Monthly report of CRP</i>				

#### 7- VO Proceedings and Financial Record Keeping (One option is to be circled)

Q3.6. How well the VO does keep/maintain its records/registers? (check VO registers)	Score
1. VO has no proceedings and financial records of anything	0
2. Some records/registers of VO are available but there is a need for lot of improvement	1
3. All VO records/registers are available but there is a need for some improvement	2
4. All VO records/registers are available and being updated regularly and quality is good (verify from record)	3

#### 8- VO Capacity in Managing Project Implementation (One option to be circled)

Q3.7. What systems does the VO have for implementation and maintenance of projects/activities?	Score
1. No activities were undertaken in the VO	0
2. Some activities have taken place in VO and VO has some informal procedures/systems for project management	1



3. Some activities have taken place in VO and VO has set up formal committees that are functional for some projects/activities	2
4. Some activities have taken place in VO and VO has set up functional committees for all projects and activities	3

Name of committee	Total members	Function of the committee

**9- Conflict Resolution (Circle one Option) including women issues**

Q3.8. In the last 1-3 years, has the VO dealt with any internal conflicts?	Score
1. No internal conflict (including women issue) management system formed by the VO	0
2. Internal conflicts including women issues dealt informally by the VO	1
3. Internal conflicts including women issues dealt with through formal mechanism and procedures	2
4. VO has played an important role in resolving both internal and external conflicts including women issues through formal mechanism and procedure, i.e. a committee has been set up and its active (verify from record)	3

Q3.9. Summary of conflicts resolution by the VO?		
Description/s	#	Comments
No. of total internal and external conflicts arises		
No. of internal and external conflicts resolved		
No. of unresolved internal and external conflicts		

**Section 4: Organizational Performance**

**10- Frequency of VO Meetings (check records - one option is to be circled)**

**Q4.1. Where does the VO usually hold the meetings (location):** \_\_\_\_\_

Q4.2. What is the planned frequency of VO regular meeting?	
1. In one year how many VO meetings were to be held: ____ (verify from record)	Weekly.....1 Fortnightly.....2
2. In past year, how many VO meetings actually held? ____ (verify from record)	Monthly.....3 2 monthly.....4
3. % of actual VO meetings held: ____ %	3 monthly.....5 Other (Specify).....7

Q4.3. How frequently does the VO think they should meet?	
	Weekly.....1 Fortnightly.....2 Monthly.....3 2 monthly.....4 3 monthly.....5 Other (Specify).....7

Q4.4. Out of the planned meetings, what percent of meetings were actually held in the last 12 months?	Score
1. Less than 25%	0
2. 26-50% of planned meetings	1
3. 51-75% of planned meetings	2
4. 76-100 % of planned meetings (verify from records)	3

**11- Attendance (at last 3 meetings)**

**Q4.5A. How many members attended the last three VO meetings? (This is to gauge the interest of the members)**

Sr.	Date	Total Members	Attendance
1	DD   MM   YYYY	__ __	__ __
2	DD   MM   YYYY	__ __	__ __
3	DD   MM   YYYY	__ __	__ __
<b>Total</b>		__ __	__ __

\*Percentage =(Total attendance/Total members)\*100

<b>Q4.5B. Percentage (%) of Attendance</b>	<b>Score (One score is to be circled)</b>
less than 25%	0
26% - 50%	1
51% - 75%	2
75% - 100%	3

**12- VO Performance in Undertaking Programme Implementation Activities (One option to be circled)**

<b>Q4.6. What systems does the VO have for implementation and maintenance of projects/activities?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. No activities were undertaken by the VO against VDP	0
2. Up to 25% activities have been undertaken by the VO against VDP	1
3. Between 26 % to 50% have been undertaken by the VO against VDP	2
4. More than 50% of planned activities have been undertaken by the VO against VDP	3

Name of activities under taken	Who supported (Self help/Government/RSP / other Specify	Estimated Cost	Number of households benefited	Remarks

**13- VO Supervision and Institutional Support to Member COs (One option to be circled)**

<b>Q4.7. Has the VO visited their member COs for institutional support and overall supervision of on-going activities like managing CIF &amp; other sub-grants, strengthening COs, etc. in last one year (verify from records)?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. VO members have never visited any member CO	0
2. VO members visited <50% COs for supervision of on-going activities and provided institutional support to strengthen COs	1
3. VO members visited >50% and <80% COs for supervision of on-going activities and provided institutional support to strengthen COs	2
4. VO members visited >80% COs for supervision of on-going activities and provided institutional support to strengthen COs	3

**14- VO Supervision and Monitoring of Bookkeeper (One option to be circled)**

<b>Description/s</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Options</b>
Maintenance of financial CIF/IGG records		Highly satisfactory (3), Satisfactory (2), Moderately satisfactory (1), Unsatisfactory (0)
Managing overall receipts and payments		
Assistance to LSO on households appraisals		
Quality of CIF/IGG records/registers		
Status on updating passbooks of CIF beneficiaries		

<b>Q4.8. How does the VO rank the quality of CIF implementation support provided by bookkeeper to VOs and member COs?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is unsatisfactory	0
2. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is moderately satisfactory	1
3. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is satisfactory	2
4. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is highly satisfactory	3

**15- VO performance in undertaking activities in education, health, social protection or mobilised resources (One option to be circled)**

<b>Q4.9. Has the VO undertaken activities in education, health, and social protection or mobilised resources (One option to be circled)?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. VO has not undertaken any activity in education, health, social protection or mobilised resources	0

2. VO has undertaken some (1-2) activities in education, health, social protection or mobilised resources, and kept some record (verify from records)	1
3. VO has undertaken (3-4) activities in education, health, social protection or mobilised resources and kept some record (verify from records)	2
4. VO has undertaken 5 or more activities in education, health, social protection or mobilised resources and kept some proper record (verify from records)	3
<b>CAT indicators</b>	<b>Total at the time of Assessment</b>
1. No of CRPs working with the LSO	
2. No of session taken by CRPs	
3. No. of deliveries took place through skilled birth attendant or at health facility (public or private)	
4. No. of CO member households that have vaccination cards for their children (0-23 months)	
5. No. of CO member households that have latrines in their homes	
6. No. of eligible (above 18 years of age) women and men from CO member households with CNICs	
7. No. of married couples from CO member households with marriage certificates	
8. No. of children (5-12 years) from CO member households enrolled in school	
9. No. of CO members who are aware of at least four basic human rights	
10. No. of children (boys and girls) from CO member households with birth registration	
11. No. of forest/fruit trees planted by CO member households	
12. No. of CO members registered as voters	
13. Total amount of LSO member COs Saving (Rs.)	
14. Total number of LSO members treated from Micro Health Insurance Cards	
<b>Q4.10 Based on the above assessment of CAT Indicators, the LSO has:</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. No record on progress against CAT indicators	0
2. Complete record of progress on up to three CAT indicators	1
3. Complete record of progress on more than three and up to six CAT indicators	2
4. Complete record of progress on more than six CAT indicators	3
<b>16- VO performance in mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind (One option to be circled - (verify from records)</b>	
<b>Q4.11. Has the VO undertaken activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind (One option to be circled)?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. VO has not undertaken any activity for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind	0
2. VO has undertaken some (1-2) activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind, and not kept any record (verify from records)	1
3. VO has undertaken some (3-4) activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind, and kept some record (verify from records)	2
4. VO has undertaken 5 or more activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind, and kept some record (verify from records)	3
<b>17- Celebration of Cultural Festivals and National Events (One option to be circled)</b>	
<b>Q4.12. Has the VO celebrated any cultural festivals and/or national events in last one year (One option to be circled – verify from record)?</b>	<b>Score</b>
1. VO has not celebrated any cultural festival and national event	0
2. VO celebrated one cultural festival or national event	1
3. VO celebrated some (2-3) cultural festivals and/or national events and kept some record	2
4. VO celebrated >3 cultural festivals and/or national events and kept some proper record	3

**Section 5: SUMMARY OF THE SCORES AND THE FINAL CATEGORIZATION FOR VO**

Indicator #	Indicator Name	Maximum score	Actual
<b>Organizational Motivation</b>			
1.	Objectives	3	
2.	Procedures for Consolidation of Needs identified by member COs	3	
3.	Participation in Needs Identification and Planning	3	
4.	VO Accountability - Election/Selection of VO Office Holders	3	
<b>Organizational Capacity</b>			
5.	Leadership Management Skills Training	3	
6.	VO Record Management	3	
7.	Proceedings and Financial Record Keeping	3	
8.	Capacity in Managing Project Implementation	3	
9.	Conflict Resolution	3	
<b>Organizational Performance</b>			
10.	Frequency of VO Meetings	3	
11.	Attendance at Last 3 Meetings	3	
12.	Performance in Undertaking Programme Implementation Activities	3	
13.	VO Supervision and Institutional Support to member COs	3	
14.	Supervision and Monitoring of Bookkeeper	3	
15.	Performance in Undertaking Social Sector Related Activities	3	
16.	Resource Mobilisation	3	
17.	Celebration of Cultural Festivals and National Events	3	
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>51</b>	
<b>% of VO's actual score (Obtained Marks/Total Marks * 100)</b>			
<b>% Range</b>	<b>VO Institutional Development Category</b>	<b>VO Category (mark one)</b>	
<b>Less than 25%</b>	VO Institutional Development Category 1 (Inactive)		
<b>26% - 50%</b>	VO Institutional Development Category 2 (Institutional Infancy)		
<b>51% - 75%</b>	VO Institutional Development Category 3 (Institutional Development )		
<b>76% &amp; Above</b>	VO Institutional Development Category 4 (Institutional Independence )		
<b><i>18- RSP Staff visits to VO in last 12 months</i></b>			
<b>Q5.1. Number of visits made by Social Organizer (SO) in the last 12 months</b>		__   __	
<b>Q5.2. Number of visits made by Community Resource Person (CRP) in the last 12 months</b>		__   __	
<b>Q5.2. Number of visits made by Community Book Keeper (CBK) in the last 12 months</b>		__   __	
<b>Q5.3. Number of visits made by other RSP staff in the last 12 months</b>		__   __	
<b>Q5.4. Do VO members have to visit the RSP office often?</b>		Yes.....1 No.....2	
<b>Q5.5. If yes in Q5.3, when was the last visit made?</b>		DD   MM   YYYY	
<b>Q5.6. What was the purpose of their visit to RSP office?</b>  _____			
<b>Q5.7. VO members views about RSP support since date of formation</b>		Very satisfactory.....1	

Satisfactory.....2  
Inadequate.....3

**Q5.8. Discussion/ any other point:**

---

---

---

**19- Final Discussion**

**Q5.9. General discussion among VO members, additional points they wish to add about the VO, VO assessment, reasons for activeness or inactiveness and future plans. etc.**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**CONFIDENTIAL – FACILITATOR ONLY**

**Q5.10. Rank the Quality of the VO members' discussion**

- Only one or two members spoke, all others silent unless directly questioned.....1
- b. One or two dominant but a minority of others also spoke up.....2
- c. Small group dominated discussion but most members involved.....3
- d. Fully open discussion with a majority actively involved.....4

Important Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

**Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening  
Support (SUCCESS) Programme**

**Institutional Maturity Index (IMI) Tool for Local Support Organisations  
(LSOs)**

Section 1. LSO Identification Data	
Q1.1. Assessment Date: DD   MM   YYYY	
Q1.2. LSO Name: _____	MIS Code: _____
Q1.3. LSO office address: _____	
Q1.4. No. of LSO executive body members: F _____ M _____ (Update Annex-I)	
Q1.5. No. of LSO general body members: F _____ M _____	
Q1.6. No. of Member VOs: _____	No. of Member COs: _____
Q1.7. Date of formation: DD   MM   YYYY	
Q1.8. Registration Status : Yes/No If yes Registration Type : DC Notification, Social Welfare, Other (specify) Date of Notification/registration DD   MM   YYYY	
Q1.9. Bank A/C No.: _____	Bank & Branch Name _____ A/C Opening Date: _____
Q1.10. RSP (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.11. RSP SMT (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.12. UC (Name): _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.13. No. of R-Villages: _____	Code __ __ __
Q1.14. Tehsil/Taluka (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.15. District (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.16. Province (Name): _____	Code __ __
Q1.17. Number of participants at this meeting for assessment: F__ M__	
Q1.18. Name of RSP Official & Code: Name: _____	Code: __ __
Q1.19. Name of Supervisor & Code: Name: _____	Code: __ __
Q1.20. Name of DMO & Code: Name: _____	Code: __ __

## Section 2: Organizational Motivation

### 1- LSO Objectives (One option to be circled)

Q2.1. How well are the LSO objectives conceived by the LSO members?	Score
1. LSO members do not have any idea about the LSO objectives	0
2. LSO members have a diverse opinion about the objectives of the LSO (no clear written objectives)	1
3. LSO members have clear objectives of the LSO and these are written down. But not all members are fully aware about it	2
4. LSO members have clear objectives of the LSO and these are written down, and members are fully aware about it (members have same opinion as written in paper - verify from records and take a photograph)	3

### 2- Procedures for Consolidation of Needs identified by member VOs and COs (One option to be circled)

Q2.2. What systems/processes does the LSO have for consolidation of needs identified and prioritised by member VOs and COs, and what actions are taken? (Check resolution register, VDPs, UCDPs, etc. and attached picture of UCDP if developed)	Score
1. No UCDP developed	0
2. LSO has prepared UCDP based on some VDPs but not identified clear activities for self-help, RSP support and government support as given in the PIM	1
3. LSO has prepared UCDP based on all VDPs, and clearly planned identified activities for self-help, RSP support and government support as given in the PIM	2
4. LSO has prepared UCDP based on all VDPs, and presented it in the Joint Development Committee (JDC) and/or submitted resolution (s) in the last one year to RSP or any supporting organisations	3

Number of resolutions during the last one year	Submitted	Approved	Implementation Status
Number of self-help resolutions:			
Number of resolutions to RSP			
Number of resolutions to Government Departments			
Number of resolutions to Elected Representatives			
Number of Resolutions to other organisations/stakeholders			
Total			

Remarks about Implementation Status:

---

### 3- Participation in needs identification and planning in any activity (One option to be circled)

Q2.3. Does the LSO ensure member participation in needs identification & planning?	Score
5. Less than 25% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of UCDP and its objectives	0
6. 26-50% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of UCDP and its objectives	1
7. 51-75% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of UCDP and its objectives	2
8. Over 75% of the participants during the IMI exercise were aware about the development of UCDP and its objectives	3

### 4- LSO Accountability - Election/Selection of LSO Executive Committee (One option to be circled)

Q2.4. How were the LSO executive committee members selected?	Score
1. LSO executive committee members appointed by RSP staff	0
2. LSO executive committee members appointed by, important/influential members of the LSO	1
3. LSO executive committee members elected or selected by LSO general-body member once only	2
4. LSO is conducting annual elections/selection by consensus of general-body and its records being maintained (Verify from record)	3

Q2.5. How do the Office bearers lead the LSO?	Score
5. The LSO is not sharing the monthly progress of LSO to their member VOs.	0
6. The LSO has an informal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress of LSO to its member VOs.	1

7. The LSO has a formal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress of LSO with some of its member VOs (For example an agenda item in the VO monthly meeting) – <i>Check VOs' Karwai Register</i>	2
8. The LSO has a formal mechanism of sharing the monthly progress of LSO with all of its member VOs (For example an agenda item in the VO monthly meeting) – <i>Check VOs' Karwai Register</i>	3

### Section 3: Organizational Capacity

#### 5- LSO Leadership Management Training (Circle one Option)

Q3.1. Who, from the LSO, has received Leadership Management Skills Training (LMST) and/or any other LSO Management Training?	Score
1. None of the office holders received LMST and/or other LSO Management Training	0
2. LSO leaders received LMST	1
3. LSO leaders received LMST and up to 50% other executive committee members received other trainings in need-based thematic areas (for instance, Gender, Disaster preparedness, Nutrition, Local governance, etc. organised by GoS/RSP/NGOs/INGOs/)	2
4. LSO executive committee members received LMST and more than 50% of all executive committee members received other trainings in need-based thematic areas (for instance, Gender, Disaster preparedness, Nutrition, Local governance, etc. organised by GoS/RSP/NGOs/INGOs/)	3

#### 6-LSO Records (Complete the table detailing the records which the LSO keeps)

Record Details	Q3.2. Record Exists - Yes - No - N/A	Q3.3. Date of Last Entry DD/MM/YYYY	Q3.4. Quality of Record Keeping - Good - Fair - Not Good	Q3.5. Comments/Remarks
<b>Proceedings and Financial Records</b>				
1. Attendance Record				
2. Proceedings/ Karwai Register				
3. UCDP				
4. LSO Monthly Progress Report				
5. Cash Book				
6. Bank Book				
7. General Ledger				
8. Bank Reconciliation Statement				
9. Trial Balance				
10. LSO Resolution for Joining LSO Network				
<b>CIF Records</b>				
12. CIF Appraisal form (of eligible households)				
13. Community Institution's CIF Beneficiary Approval Checklist				
14. CIF record register of disbursement and recovery				
15. CIF Passbooks issued to all clients				
16. Monthly CIF Progress Report				
17. CIF Beneficiary Tracking Sheet				
18. Income/profit from CIF				
19. Processing fee record				
20. Basic Information about Government Offices/Buildings in UC				
21. List of CRPs				
22. Monthly report of CRP				



<b>7- LSO Proceedings and Financial Record Keeping (One option is to be circled)</b>		
<b>Q3.6. How well does the LSO keep/maintain its proceedings &amp; financial records/registers? (check LSO registers)</b>	<b>Score</b>	
1. LSO has no proceedings & financial records of anything	0	
2. Some proceedings & financial records/registers of LSO are available but there is a need for lot of improvement	1	
3. All LSO proceedings & financial records/registers are available but there is need for some improvement	2	
4. All LSO proceedings & financial records/registers are available and being updated regularly and of good quality	3	
<b>8- LSO Capacity in Managing Project Implementation (One option to be circled)</b>		
<b>Q3.7. What systems does the LSO have for implementation and maintenance of projects/activities?</b>	<b>Score</b>	
1. No activities were undertaken by the LSO	0	
2. Some activities have taken place in LSO and LSO has some informal procedures/systems for project management	1	
3. Some activities have taken place in LSO and LSO has set up formal committees that are functional for some projects/activities	2	
4. Some activities have taken place in LSO and LSO has set up functional committees for all projects and activities (verify from record)	3	
<b>Name of committee</b>	<b>Total members</b>	<b>Function of the committee</b>
<b>9- Conflict Resolution (Circle one Option) including women issues</b>		
<b>Q3.8. In the last one year, has the LSO dealt with any internal conflicts?</b>	<b>Score</b>	
1. No internal conflict (including women issue) management system formed by the LSO	0	
2. Internal conflicts including women issues dealt informally by the LSO	1	
3. Internal conflicts including women issues dealt with through formal mechanism and procedures	2	
4. LSO has played an important role in resolving both internal and external conflicts including women issues through formal mechanism and procedures	3	
<b>Q3.9. Summary of conflicts resolution by the LSO?</b>		
<b>Description/s</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Example of conflict resolved</b>
No. of total internal and external conflicts arises		
No. of internal and external conflicts resolved		
No. of unresolved internal and external conflicts		
<b>Section 4: Organizational Performance</b>		
<b>10- Frequency of LSO Meetings (check records - one option is to be circled)</b>		
<b>Q4.1. Where does the LSO usually hold the meetings (location)?</b>	_____	
	_____	
<b>Q4.2. What is the planned frequency of LSO regular meeting?</b>	Weekly.....1	
1. In one year how many LSO meetings were to be held: ____ (verify from record)	Fortnightly.....2	
2. in past year, how many LSO meetings actually held?____ (verify from record)	Monthly.....3	
3. % of actual LSO meetings held:_____%	2 monthly.....4	
	3 monthly.....5	
	Other (Specify).....7	
<b>Q4.3. How frequently does the LSO think they should meet?</b>	Weekly.....1	
	Fortnightly.....2	
	Monthly.....3	
	2 monthly.....4	
	3 monthly.....5	
	Other (Specify).....7	
<b>Q4.4. Out of the planned meetings, what percent of meetings were actually held in the last 12 months?</b>	<b>Score</b>	
5. Less than 25%	0	

6. 26-50% of planned meetings	1			
7. 51-75% of planned meetings	2			
8. 76-100 % of planned meetings (verify from records)	3			
<b>11- Attendance at last 3 meetings</b>				
<b>Q4.5. How many members attended the last three LSO meetings? (This is to gauge the interest of the members)</b>				
Sr.	Date	Total Members	Attendance	
1	DD   MM   YYYY	__	__	
2	DD   MM   YYYY	__	__	
3	DD   MM   YYYY	__	__	
<b>Total</b>		__	__	
*Percentage =(Total attendance/Total members)*100				
<b>Q4.6. Percentage (%) of Attendance</b>		<b>Score (One score is to be circled)</b>		
less than 25%		0		
26% - 50%		1		
51% - 75%		2		
75% - 100%		3		
<b>12- LSO Performance in Undertaking Programme Implementation Activities (One option to be circled)</b>				
<b>Q4.6. What systems does the LSO have for implementation and maintenance of projects/activities?</b>			<b>Score</b>	
1. No activities were undertaken by the LSO against UCDP			0	
2. Up to 25% activities have been undertaken by the LSO against UCDP			1	
3. Between 26 % to 50% have been undertaken by the LSO against UCDP			2	
4. More than 50% of planned activities have been undertaken by the LSO against UCDP			3	
Name of activities under taken	Who supported (Self help/Government/R SP / other Specify	Estimated Cost	Number of households benefited	Remarks
<b>13- LSO Supervision and Institutional Support to associated VOs in managing CIF and other sub-grants, strengthening COs, etc. (One option to be circled)</b>				
<b>Q4.7. Has the LSO visited their member VOs/COs for institutional support and overall supervision of on-going activities like managing CIF &amp; other sub-grants, strengthening COs, etc. in last one year (verify from records)?</b>				<b>Score</b>
1. LSO members have never visited any member VOs and COs				0
2. LSO members visited <50% VOs for supervision of on-going activities and provided institutional support to strengthen COs and VOs				1
3. LSO members visited ≥50% and <80% COs for supervision of on-going activities and provided institutional support to strengthen COs and VOs				2
4. LSO members visited ≥80% VOs for supervision of ongoing activities and provided institutional support to strengthen COs and VOs				3
<b>14- LSO Supervision and Monitoring of Bookkeeper (One option to be circled)</b>				
Description/s	Response	Options		
Maintenance of financial CIF/IGG records		Highly satisfactory (3), Satisfactory (2), Moderately satisfactory (1), Unsatisfactory (0)		
Managing overall receipts and payments				

Assistance to LSO on households appraisals		
Quality of CIF/IGG records/registers		
Status on updating passbooks of CIF beneficiaries		
<b>Q4.8. How does the LSO rank the quality of CIF implementation support provided by bookkeeper to LSOs and member VOs?</b>		<b>Score</b>
5. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is unsatisfactory		0
6. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is moderately satisfactory		1
7. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is satisfactory		2
8. The overall performance of bookkeeper in implementation of CIF/IGG is highly satisfactory		3
<b>15- LSO performance in undertaking activities in education, health, and other CAT's cross-cutting themes (One option to be circled)</b>		
<b>CAT indicators</b>		<b>Total at the time of Assessment</b>
15. No of CRPs working with the LSO		
16. No of session taken by CRPs		
17. No. of deliveries took place through skilled birth attendant or at health facility (public or private)		
18. No. of CO member households that have vaccination cards for their children (0-23 months)		
19. No. of CO member households that have latrines in their homes		
20. No. of eligible (above 18 years of age) women and men from CO member households with CNICs		
21. No. of married couples from CO member households with marriage certificates		
22. No. of children (5-12 years) from CO member households enrolled in school		
23. No. of CO members who are aware of at least four basic human rights		
24. No. of children (boys and girls) from CO member households with birth registration		
25. No. of forest/fruit trees planted by CO member households		
26. No. of CO members registered as voters		
27. Total amount of LSO member COs Saving (Rs.)		
28. Total number of LSO members treated from Micro Health Insurance Cards		
<b>Q4.9 Based on the above assessment of CAT Indicators, the LSO has:</b>		<b>Score</b>
5. No record on progress against CAT indicators		0
6. Complete record of progress on up to three CAT indicators		1
7. Complete record of progress on more than three and up to six CAT indicators		2
8. Complete record of progress on more than six CAT indicators		3
<b>16- LSO performance in mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind (One option to be circled - (verify from records)</b>		
<b>Q4.10. Has the LSO undertaken activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind (One option to be circled)?</b>		<b>Score</b>
5. LSO has not undertaken any activity for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind		0
6. LSO has undertaken some (1-2) activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind, and not kept any record (verify from records)		1
7. LSO has undertaken some (3-4) activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind, and kept some record (verify from records)		2
8. LSO has undertaken 5 or more activities for mobilising resources from donations in cash and/or kind, and kept some record (verify from records)		3
<b>17- Celebration of Cultural Festivals and National Events (One option to be circled)</b>		
<b>Q4.11. Has the LSO celebrated any cultural festivals and/or national events in last one year (One option to be circled – verify from record)?</b>		<b>Score</b>
5. LSO has not celebrated any cultural festival and national event		0
6. LSO celebrated one cultural festival or national event		1
7. LSO celebrated some (2-3) cultural festivals and/or national events and kept some record		2
8. LSO celebrated >3 cultural festivals and/or national events and kept some proper record		3
<b>18- Sustainability of LSO (One option to be circled)</b>		
<b>Q4.12. Has the LSO prepared a sustainability plan?</b>		<b>Score</b>
1. The LSO members do not have any knowledge about sustainability		0
2. The LSO members know what sustainability is but the LSO does not have any sustainability plan		1

3. The LSO has developed a sustainability plan		2
4. The LSO has developed a sustainability plan and the LSO has taken steps towards sustainability in accordance with the plan ( <i>Check if there is a plan, attach picture for verification</i> )		3
<b>Sources of Income</b>	<b>Total Amount (<i>check LSO Bank a/c</i>)</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1. Members contribution		
2. CIF contribution		
3. Income from Projects		
4. Any other		

**Section 5: SUMMARY OF THE SCORES AND THE FINAL CATEGORIZATION FOR LSO**

Indicator #	Indicator Name	Maximum score	Actual
<b>Organizational Motivation</b>			
1.	Objectives	3	
2.	Procedures for Consolidation of Needs identified by member CIs	3	
3.	Participation in needs identification and planning in any activity	3	
4.	LSO Accountability - Election/Selection of LSO Executive Committee y	3	
<b>Organizational Capacity</b>			
5.	Leadership Management Skills Training	3	
6.	LSO Record Keeping	3	
7.	Proceedings and Financial Record Keeping	3	
8.	Capacity in Managing Project Implementation	3	
9.	Conflict Resolution	3	
<b>Organizational Performance</b>			
10.	Frequency of LSO Meetings	3	
11.	Attendance in Last 3 Meetings	3	
12.	Performance in Undertaking Programme Implementation Activities	3	
13.	Support to VOs in Management of CIF and other Sub-grants	3	
14.	Supervision and Monitoring of Bookkeeper	3	
15.	Performance in Undertaking Social Sector Related Activities	3	
16.	Resource Mobilisation	3	
17.	Celebration of Cultural Festivals and National Events	3	
18.	Sustainability of LSO	3	
<b>Total Score</b>		<b>54</b>	
<b>% of LSO's actual score (Obtained Marks/Total Marks * 100)</b>			
<b>% Range</b>	<b>LSO Institutional Development Category</b>	<b>LSO Category (mark one)</b>	
<b>Less than 25%</b>	LSO Institutional Development Category 1 (Inactive)		
<b>26% - 50%</b>	LSO Institutional Development Category 2 (Institutional Infancy)		
<b>51% - 75%</b>	LSO Institutional Development Category 3 (Institutional Development )		
<b>76% &amp; Above</b>	LSO Institutional Development Category 4 (Institutional Independence )		
<b>19- RSP Staff visits to LSO in last 12 months</b>			
<b>Q5.1. Number of visits made by Social Organiser (SO) in the last 12 months</b>		__ __	
<b>Q5.2. Number of visits made by Community Resource Person (CRP) in the last 12 months</b>		__ __	
<b>Q5.3. Number of visits made by other RSP staff in the last 12 months</b>		__ __	
<b>Q5.4. Do LSO members have to visit the RSP office often?</b>		Yes.....1 No.....2	
<b>Q5.5. If yes in Q5.3, when was the last visit made?</b>		DD   MM   YYYY	
<b>Q5.6. What was the purpose of their visit to RSP office?</b>			
_____			
_____			
<b>Q5.7. LSO members views about RSP support since date of formation</b>		Very satisfactory.....1	

Satisfactory.....2  
Inadequate.....3

**Q5.8. Discussion/ any other point:**

---

---

---

**20- Final Discussion**

**Q5.9. General discussion among LSO members, additional points they wish to add about the LSO, LSO assessment, reasons for activeness or inactiveness and future plans. etc.**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**CONFIDENTIAL – FACILITATOR ONLY**

**Q5.10. Rank the Quality of the LSO members' discussion**

- a. Only one or two members spoke, all others silent unless directly questioned.....1
- b. One or two dominant but a minority of others also spoke up.....2
- c. Small group dominated discussion but most members involved.....3
- d. Fully open discussion with a majority actively involved.....4

Important Notes: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

**Annex-I: List of LSO executive body members**

<b>Sr.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Cell Phone</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>PSC</b>
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							

SUCCESS Programme is based on the Rural Support Programmes' (RSPs) social mobilisation approach to Community-Driven Development (CDD). Social Mobilisation centers around the belief that poor people have an innate potential to help themselves; that they can better manage their limited resources if they organise and are provided technical and financial support. The RSPs under the SUCCESS Programme provide social guidance, as well as technical and financial assistance to the rural poor in Sindh.

SUCCESS is a six-year long (2015-2021) programme funded by the European Union (EU) and implemented by Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN), National Rural Support Programme (NRSP), Sindh Rural Support Organisation (SRSO), and Thardeep Rural Development Programme (TRDP) in eight districts of Sindh, namely: Kambar Shahdadkot, Larkana, Dadu, Jamshoro, Matiari, Sujawal, Tando Allahyar, and Tando Muhammad Khan.



EUROPEAN UNION

““This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.”

More information about the European Union is available on:

Web: <http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/pakistan/>

Twitter: [@EUPakistan](https://twitter.com/EUPakistan)

Facebook: [European Union Cooperation in Pakistan](https://www.facebook.com/EuropeanUnionCooperationinPakistan)



Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening Support Programme

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, IRM Complex, Plot # 7,  
Sunrise Avenue (off Park Road)  
Islamabad, Pakistan  
Phone: +92-51-8491270-99  
Fax: +92-51-8351791

Web: <http://www.success.org.pk>  
Twitter: @successprog  
Facebook: successprogramme