**Collaborating Internal Collaboration**

**KEY CONCEPTS**

1. Identify and prioritize teams/offices for strategic collaboration.
2. Decide how to engage those teams/offices.
3. Collaborate with those teams/offices based on decisions reached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity Stages</th>
<th>NOT YET PRESENT</th>
<th>EMERGENT</th>
<th>EXPANDING</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT YET PRESENT</strong></td>
<td>- We are not yet collaborating with other teams/offices.</td>
<td>- We collaborate with other teams/offices in an <strong>ad-hoc</strong> fashion.</td>
<td>- We <strong>sometimes</strong> collaborate with other teams/offices.</td>
<td><strong>We usually:</strong></td>
<td>We <strong>consistently and systematically:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information silos are common.</td>
<td>- Inter-office collaboration is characterized by <strong>information exchange</strong>.</td>
<td>- <strong>Identify</strong> other teams/offices/individuals who could have the greatest impact on planning and implementation.</td>
<td>- Identify other teams/offices/individuals who could have the greatest impact on planning and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Make decisions</strong> about what form collaboration takes to increase synergies.</td>
<td>- Make decisions about what form collaboration takes to increase synergies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Collaborate strategically</strong> with those teams/offices/individuals based on the decision reached.</td>
<td>- Collaborate strategically with those teams/offices/individuals based on the decision reached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internal Collaboration
### Key Concepts
1. Source various types of knowledge from stakeholders.
2. Distill knowledge.
3. Share knowledge with stakeholders.

### Process
**Knowledge Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity Stages</th>
<th>Not Yet Present</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Institutionalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT YET PRESENT</strong></td>
<td>- Staff are not yet sourcing, distilling, and/or sharing knowledge.</td>
<td>In planning and implementation, staff rarely:</td>
<td>In planning and implementation staff sometimes:</td>
<td>In planning and implementation staff usually:</td>
<td>In planning and implementation staff consistently and systematically:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMERGENT</strong></td>
<td>- Source relevant technical, contextual, and experiential knowledge from key stakeholders.</td>
<td>- Distil knowledge to inform decisions.</td>
<td>- Distil knowledge to inform decisions.</td>
<td>- Distil knowledge to inform decisions.</td>
<td>- Distil knowledge to inform decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPANDING</strong></td>
<td>- Share knowledge strategically and in user-friendly formats to influence decisions within and outside USAID.</td>
<td>- Share knowledge strategically and in user-friendly formats to influence decisions within and outside USAID.</td>
<td>- Share knowledge strategically and in user-friendly formats to influence decisions within and outside USAID.</td>
<td>- Share knowledge strategically and in user-friendly formats to influence decisions within and outside USAID.</td>
<td>- Share knowledge strategically and in user-friendly formats to influence decisions within and outside USAID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANCED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTIONALIZED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge Management
KEY CONCEPTS
1. Staff take time for learning and reflection.
3. Use of iterative approaches that enable continuous improvement.

NOT YET PRESENT
- Staff are able to focus on learning and reflecting only when working outside of regular working hours.

EMERGENT
- **Only with certain individuals**:
  - Make time for their own learning and reflection.
  - Use iterative approaches that enable continuous improvement.

EXPANDING
- A minority of mission staff:
  - Participate in learning and reflection opportunities.
  - Use iterative approaches that enable continuous improvement.

ADVANCED
- A majority of mission staff participate in learning and reflection opportunities.
  - Staff are **usually motivated to learn in order to grow professionally and improve organizational effectiveness**.
  - A majority of staff and implementing partners use iterative approaches that enable continuous improvement.

INSTITUTIONALIZED
- Staff mission-wide with the support of mission leadership participate in learning opportunities and capture how they contribute to the organization’s effectiveness.
  - Staff are **consistently** motivated to learn in order to grow professionally and improve organizational effectiveness.
  - Mission leadership **constantly encourages staff** and implementing partners to use iterative approaches that enable continuous improvement.
Continuous Learning and Improvement
KEY CONCEPTS
1. Sense of comfort sharing opinions and ideas.
2. Openness to hearing alternative perspectives.
3. Willingness to take action on new ideas.

CULTURE
Openness

NOT YET PRESENT
- Openness to sharing and hearing alternative perspectives or trying novel approaches is not yet part of mission culture.

EMERGENT
Only with certain individuals:
- Ask difficult questions or feel able to express unpopular viewpoints.
- Invite alternative perspectives.
- Are willing to explore untested or novel ideas.

EXPANDING
A minority of mission staff:
- Ask difficult questions or feel able to express unpopular viewpoints.
- Invite alternative perspectives.
- Are willing to explore untested or novel ideas.

ADVANCED
A majority of mission staff:
- Ask difficult questions or feel able to express unpopular viewpoints.
- Invite alternative perspectives.
- Are willing to explore untested or novel ideas.

INSTITUTIONALIZED
Staff mission-wide, with the support of mission leadership, consistently:
- Ask difficult questions or feel able to express unpopular viewpoints.
- Invite alternative perspectives.
- Are willing to explore untested or novel ideas.
NOTES
Openness
**KEY CONCEPTS**
1. Development of trusting relationships.
2. Exchange of up-to-date information.
3. Use of networks across the system to expand situational awareness.

### NOT YET PRESENT
- Staff are not yet leveraging relationships and networks.

### EMERGENT
- **Only with certain individuals:**
  - Have strong internal and external relationships and networks based on mutual trust.
  - Consistently and transparently communicate with a wide range of stakeholders (as appropriate) to exchange up-to-date information and tacit knowledge.
  - Use relationships and networks to remain aware of development across the system that could impact, leverage, or streamline ongoing or future efforts.

### EXPANDING
- **A minority of mission staff:**
  - Have strong internal and external relationships and networks based on mutual trust.
  - Consistently and transparently communicate with a wide range of stakeholders (as appropriate) to exchange up-to-date information and tacit knowledge.
  - Use relationships and networks to remain aware of development across the system that could impact, leverage, or streamline ongoing or future efforts.

### ADVANCED
- **A majority of mission staff:**
  - Have strong internal and external relationships and networks based on mutual trust.
  - Consistently and transparently communicate with a wide range of stakeholders (as appropriate) to exchange up-to-date information and tacit knowledge.
  - Use relationships and networks to remain aware of development across the system that could impact, leverage, or streamline ongoing or future efforts.

### INSTITUTIONALIZED
- Staff **mission-wide:**
  - Have strong internal and external relationships and networks based on mutual trust.
  - Consistently and transparently communicate with a wide range of stakeholders (as appropriate) to exchange up-to-date information and tacit knowledge.
  - Use relationships and networks to remain aware of development across the system that could impact, leverage, or streamline ongoing or future efforts.
Relationships and Networks
- We do not yet have systems or processes in place to maintain institutional memory.

- Transition and onboarding processes are articulated but not implemented.

- Ad hoc knowledge transfer between incoming and outgoing staff depends largely on individual initiative.

- FSNs sometimes play a role in maintaining knowledge and continuity.

- Mission staff use a knowledge management system for daily operational needs and basic access to institutional knowledge.

- Departing and/or current staff usually transfer mission knowledge, understand of the local context, and key relationships to incoming staff.

- FSNs are usually valued as a source of institutional knowledge and encouraged to contribute to staff onboarding and transition processes.

- Mission staff and relevant stakeholders are able to easily access up-to-date information and knowledge in a timely manner.

- Departing and/or current staff systematically transfer mission knowledge, understand of the local context, and key relationships to incoming staff.

- FSNs are consistently valued as a source of institutional knowledge and encouraged to contribute to staff onboarding and transition processes.

**KEY CONCEPTS**
1. Access institutional knowledge.
2. Staff transitions.
3. Contributions of Foreign Service Nationals (FSNs) to institutional memory.
Institutional Memory
**KEY CONCEPTS**
1. Identify and prioritize key stakeholders for strategic collaboration.
2. Decide how to engage key stakeholders.
3. Collaborate with key stakeholders based on decisions reached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATURE STAGES</th>
<th>NOT YET PRESENT</th>
<th>EMERGENT</th>
<th>EXPANDING</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-We are not yet collaborating with stakeholders.</td>
<td>-Analysis of stakeholders is informal and undocumented.</td>
<td>-Planning processes sometimes include a stakeholder analysis.</td>
<td>We <strong>usually:</strong></td>
<td>We <strong>consistently and systematically:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-We collaborate with stakeholders in an <strong>ad hoc</strong> fashion.</td>
<td>-We collaborate with host government counterparts and/or implementing partners under specific agreements.</td>
<td>-We use <strong>stakeholder analysis</strong> to identify and prioritize stakeholders.</td>
<td><strong>Make decisions</strong> about what form collaboration takes to increase synergies which could include encouraging collaboration among partners when relevant.</td>
<td><strong>- Make decisions</strong> about what form collaboration takes to increase synergies which includes requiring collaboration among partners when relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Stakeholders are informed of USAID plans and/or interventions.</td>
<td>-Collaboration with additional stakeholders is limited to consultations/information gathering to inform USAID decisions.</td>
<td><strong>-Collaborate strategically</strong> with key stakeholders based on the decision reached.</td>
<td>-Collaborate strategically with those key stakeholders based on the decision reached.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Learning Technical Evidence Base**

**KEY CONCEPTS**

1. Track the technical evidence base.
2. Apply the technical evidence base in planning and implementation.
3. Contribute to/expand the technical evidence base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT YET PRESENT</th>
<th>EMERGENT</th>
<th>EXPANDING</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-We are not familiar with the technical evidence base.</td>
<td>-We <strong>informally</strong> track the existing technical evidence base.</td>
<td>-We primarily track and use <strong>previous evaluation reports</strong> to identify implications for programming.</td>
<td><strong>We <strong>usually:</strong></strong> Track the existing technical evidence base, including up-to-date research and subject matter expertise generated by USAID and others.**</td>
<td><strong>We <strong>consistently and systematically:</strong></strong> Track the existing technical evidence base, including up-to-date research and subject matter expertise generated by USAID and others.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-We have identified <strong>some knowledge gaps</strong>.</td>
<td>-We fill knowledge gaps using <strong>informal or ad hoc approaches</strong>.</td>
<td>-Use a <strong>mix of relevant knowledge</strong> types and sources to identify implications and inform strategy, projects, and/or activities.</td>
<td>-Use a mix of relevant knowledge types and sources to identify implications and inform strategy, projects, and/or activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Fill gaps and <strong>contribute new knowledge</strong> to the evidence base through a mix of knowledge synthesis, research, piloting/experimentation and evaluation.</td>
<td>-Fill gaps and contribute new knowledge to the evidence base through a mix of knowledge synthesis, research, piloting/experimentation and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theories of change typically describe activities already in place. We have not yet developed a theory of change. Logical theories of change are developed based on an understanding of existing technical evidence, and assumptions are identified. Some aspects of theories of change are tested through evaluations. Theories of change are shared and understood among a limited number of staff and key stakeholders.

Logical theories of change are developed based on an understanding of the context, relevant analyses, and technical evidence. We regularly test and explore prioritized theories and their assumptions using a variety of learning approaches beyond evaluations. Theories of change are widely shared and understood by the majority of staff and stakeholders.

We systematically:
- Develop logical theories of change with sufficient stakeholder input and based on an understanding of the context, relevant analyses, and existing technical evidence.
- Test and explore theories of change and their assumptions to modify theories (as needed) based on results.
- Use and share learning from testing theories of change to inform USAID’s other stakeholders’ planning and implementation.

KEY CONCEPTS
1. Quality theories of change.
2. Testing and exploration of theories of change
3. Awareness among stakeholders about theories of change and the learning that results from testing them.

Learning Theories of Change

NOT YET PRESENT
- We have not yet developed a theory of change.

EMERGENT
- Theories of change typically describe activities already in place.

EXPANDING
- Logical theories of change are developed based on an understanding of existing technical evidence, and assumptions are identified.
- Some aspects of theories of change are tested through evaluations.
- Theories of change are shared and understood among a limited number of staff and key stakeholders.

ADVANCED
- Logical theories of change are developed based on an understanding of the context, relevant analyses, and technical evidence.
- We regularly test and explore prioritized theories and their assumptions using a variety of learning approaches beyond evaluations.
- Theories of change are widely shared and understood by the majority of staff and stakeholders.

INSTITUTIONALIZED
- We systematically:
  - Develop logical theories of change with sufficient stakeholder input and based on an understanding of the context, relevant analyses, and existing technical evidence.
  - Test and explore theories of change and their assumptions to modify theories (as needed) based on results.
  - Use and share learning from testing theories of change to inform USAID’s other stakeholders’ planning and implementation.

MATURITY STAGES
- NOT YET PRESENT
- EMERGENT
- EXPANDING
- ADVANCED
- INSTITUTIONALIZED

LEARNING THEORIES OF CHANGE

KEY CONCEPTS
1. Quality theories of change.
2. Testing and exploration of theories of change
3. Awareness among stakeholders about theories of change and the learning that results from testing them.

NOT YET PRESENT
- We have not yet developed a theory of change.

EMERGENT
- Theories of change typically describe activities already in place.

EXPANDING
- Logical theories of change are developed based on an understanding of existing technical evidence, and assumptions are identified.
- Some aspects of theories of change are tested through evaluations.
- Theories of change are shared and understood among a limited number of staff and key stakeholders.

ADVANCED
- Logical theories of change are developed based on an understanding of the context, relevant analyses, and technical evidence.
- We regularly test and explore prioritized theories and their assumptions using a variety of learning approaches beyond evaluations.
- Theories of change are widely shared and understood by the majority of staff and stakeholders.

INSTITUTIONALIZED
- We systematically:
  - Develop logical theories of change with sufficient stakeholder input and based on an understanding of the context, relevant analyses, and existing technical evidence.
  - Test and explore theories of change and their assumptions to modify theories (as needed) based on results.
  - Use and share learning from testing theories of change to inform USAID’s other stakeholders’ planning and implementation.
We informally ask big picture ‘what if?’ questions.

We have not yet participated in scenario planning.

We ask and document big picture ‘what if?’ questions.

We informally monitor trends related to those questions.

We usually develop scenario narratives to reflect on potential risks and opportunities.

We regularly monitor trends related to those scenarios.

Monitoring of scenarios often informs planning and implementation.

We consistently develop scenario narratives, identifying early warning signals for anticipated risks and opportunities.

We systematically monitor trends related to scenarios.

We use early warning signals to respond to context changes in real time.

KEY CONCEPTS
1. Identify risks and opportunities through scenario planning.
3. Respond to apply learning from monitoring.

NOT YET PRESENT
-We have not yet participated in scenario planning.

EMERGENT
-We informally ask big picture ‘what if?’ questions.

EXPANDING
-We ask and document big picture ‘what if?’ questions.
-We informally monitor trends related to those questions.

ADVANCED
-We regularly monitor trends related to those scenarios.
-Monitoring of scenarios often informs planning and implementation.

INSTITUTIONALIZED
-We consistently develop scenario narratives, identifying early warning signals for anticipated risks and opportunities.
-We systematically monitor trends related to scenarios.
-We use early warning signals to respond to context changes in real time.

Learning Scenario Planning

MATURE STAGES

MATURITY STAGES

NOT YET PRESENT

EMERGENT

EXPANDING

ADVANCED

INSTITUTIONALIZED
Monitoring data is generally disconnected from decision-making. Required evaluations identify new and relevant information. M&E efforts are implemented primarily for meeting reporting requirements.

Monitoring data is sometimes relevant and of sufficient rigor to inform decision-making. We use evaluation findings to inform future activities or projects. We usually develop scenario narratives to reflect on potential risks and opportunities. We usually identify and collect good-quality, credible monitoring data that informs decision making.

We regularly design and conduct evaluations to inform ongoing and future programming. We intentionally design M&E efforts so resulting learning can be aggregated across projects and/or activities to inform design and implementation decisions. We consistently prioritize and collect high-quality, credible monitoring data that informs decision making.

We design and conduct timely evaluations to inform ongoing and future programming. We intentionally design M&E efforts so resulting learning can be aggregated across projects and/or activities and feeds up to inform achievement of mission-level results.

**KEY CONCEPTS**
1. Relevance of monitoring data to decision making.
2. Design and conduct evaluations to inform ongoing and future programming.
3. Align monitoring, evaluation, and learning efforts across the strategy, project and activity levels.

**Learning M&E for Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT YET PRESENT</th>
<th>EMERGENT</th>
<th>EXPANDING</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E efforts are implemented primarily for meeting reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Monitoring data is <strong>generally disconnected</strong> from decision-making. Required evaluations identify new and relevant information.</td>
<td>Monitoring data is <strong>sometimes relevant</strong> and of <strong>sufficient rigor</strong> to inform decision-making. We use evaluation findings to inform future activities or projects.</td>
<td>We <strong>usually</strong> identify and collect <strong>good-quality</strong>, credible monitoring data that informs decision making. We <strong>regularly</strong> design and conduct evaluations to inform <strong>ongoing and future</strong> programming.</td>
<td>We <strong>consistently prioritize</strong> and collect <strong>high-quality</strong>, credible monitoring data that informs decision making. We design and conduct <strong>timely evaluations</strong> to inform <strong>ongoing and future</strong> programming. We intentionally design M&amp;E efforts so resulting learning can be aggregated across <strong>projects and/or activities</strong> to inform design and implementation decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Maturity Stages**

**NOT YET PRESENT**
- M&E efforts are implemented primarily for meeting reporting requirements.

**EMERGENT**
- Monitoring data is **generally disconnected** from decision-making.
- Required evaluations identify new and relevant information.

**EXPANDING**
- Monitoring data is **sometimes relevant** and of **sufficient rigor** to inform decision-making.
- We use evaluation findings to inform future activities or projects.

**ADVANCED**
- We **usually** identify and collect **good-quality**, credible monitoring data that informs decision making.
- We **regularly** design and conduct evaluations to inform **ongoing and future** programming.
- We intentionally design M&E efforts so resulting learning can be aggregated across **projects and/or activities** to inform design and implementation decisions.

**INSTITUTIONALIZED**
- We **consistently prioritize** and collect **high-quality**, credible monitoring data that informs decision making.
- We design and conduct **timely evaluations** to inform **ongoing and future** programming.
- We intentionally design M&E efforts so resulting learning can be aggregated across **projects and/or activities** and feeds up to inform achievement of mission-level results.
**KEY CONCEPTS**
1. Variety and purpose of pause and reflect (P&R) opportunities.
2. Timeliness of P&R opportunities to inform decision-making.
3. Quality of P&R moments.

**Adapting Pause & Reflect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT YET PRESENT</th>
<th>EMERGENT</th>
<th>EXPANDING</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-We have not yet participated in P&amp;R opportunities.</td>
<td>- We participate in required annual portfolio review and CDCs mid-course stocktaking for accountability and reporting purposes.</td>
<td>- We participate in portfolio reviews and ad hoc partner meetings focused primarily on activity-level learning as well as CDCs mid-course stocktaking.</td>
<td>We usually:</td>
<td>-We consistently and systematically:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Partner meetings are rare and provide information to implementing partners.</td>
<td>-P&amp;R activities are not aligned to design and implementation schedules.</td>
<td>-Host and attend a variety of relevant P&amp;R activities to reflect on progress and learning to date.</td>
<td>-Host and attend a variety of relevant P&amp;R activities to reflect on progress and learning to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Additional P&amp;R opportunities might be identified but are not acted upon.</td>
<td>-P&amp;R activities are characterized by information dissemination and basic knowledge exchange.</td>
<td>-Hold P&amp;R activities to feed into design and implementation schedules so learning is generated when it is most usable.</td>
<td>-Hold P&amp;R activities to feed into design and implementation schedules so learning is generated when it is most usable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Facilitate P&amp;R activities for staff and relevant stakeholders, using a variety of participatory approaches to encourage candid conversation.</td>
<td>-Facilitate P&amp;R activities for staff and relevant stakeholders, using a variety of participatory approaches to encourage candid conversation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATURITY STAGES**

- Not Yet Present
- Emergent
- Expanding
- Advanced
- Institutionalized
We work with partners to identify successes, challenges, and subjects that warrant further exploration at the activity level.

We usually:
- Work with **key internal and external stakeholders** to **analyze** successes, challenges, and **failures** to identify lessons learned and subjects that warrant further exploration.
- Use learning to inform decisions on maintaining, adapting, or **discontinuing** current approaches.
- Work with **key colleagues** in the mission and Washington bureaus (as appropriate) to **take action** to adopt strategy, projects, and/or activities accordingly.

Adapting Adaptive Management

**KEY CONCEPTS**
1. Variety and purpose of pause and reflect (P&R) opportunities.
2. Inform decision-making.
3. Follow through on decisions reached to manage adaptively.

**NOT YET PRESENT**
- We have not yet identified opportunities to apply learning or course corrections.

**EMERGENT**
- We work with partners to identify successes, challenges, and subjects that warrant further exploration at the **activity level**.
- Using learning to **inform activity-level decisions** on maintaining or adapting current approaches.
- Sometimes take action based on decisions reached, consulting with key colleagues in the mission as needed.

**EXPANDING**
- We work with partners to:
  - Identify successes, challenges, and subjects that warrant further exploration at the activity level.
  - Using learning to **inform activity-level decisions** on maintaining or adapting current approaches.

**ADVANCED**
- We **usually**:
  - Work with **key internal and external stakeholders** to **analyze** successes, challenges, and **failures** to identify lessons learned and subjects that warrant further exploration.
  - Use learning to inform decisions on maintaining, adapting, or **discontinuing** current approaches.
  - Work with **key colleagues** in the mission and Washington bureaus (as appropriate) to take action to adopt strategy, projects, and/or activities accordingly.

**INSTITUTIONALIZED**
- We **consistently and systematically**:
  - Work with key internal and external stakeholders to analyze successes, challenges, and failures to identify lessons learned and subjects that warrant further exploration.
  - Use learning to inform decisions on maintaining, adapting, or discontinuing current approaches.
  - Work with key colleagues in the mission and Washington bureaus (as appropriate) to take action to adopt strategy, projects, and/or activities accordingly.

**MATURITY STAGES**
- **NOT YET PRESENT**
- **EMERGENT**
- **EXPANDING**
- **ADVANCED**
- **INSTITUTIONALIZED**
Only certain mission staff and implementing partners understand programmatic decision making processes or the scope of their own autonomy.

Rationale for decisions taken is rarely documented and only shared with stakeholders after the fact.

- We do not yet have clarity around decision making processes or authority.

- A minority of mission staff and implementing partners understand decision-making processes at the mission.
- The level of autonomy staff have to make decisions about their own work differs according to the teams and individuals involved.
- FSNs sometimes play a role in maintaining knowledge and continuity.

We usually develop scenario narratives to reflect on potential risks and opportunities.

- The majority of mission staff and implementing partners understand decision-making processes.
- Staff are usually granted an appropriate level of autonomy to make decisions about their work.
- Decisions are usually made after soliciting input from appropriate internal and external stakeholders, and the rationale is documented and shared with them.

- The process for making decisions is fully transparent.
- Staff are consistently granted an appropriate level of autonomy to make decisions about their work.
- Decisions are consistently made after soliciting input from appropriate internal and external stakeholders, and the rationale is documented and shared with them.

Process Decision-Making

KEY CONCEPTS
1. Awareness of decision-making processes.
2. Autonomy to make decisions.
3. Appropriate stakeholder involvement in decision-making.
### Mission Resources

**KEY CONCEPTS**

1. Roles and responsibilities vis a vis CLA.
2. Professional development of CLA.
3. Procurement of CLA support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT YET PRESENT</th>
<th>EMERGENT</th>
<th>EXPANDING</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - We are not yet leveraging financial and human resources to support CLA integration throughout the program cycle. | - The missions **M&E specialists** are responsible for CLA.  
- **Only a few individuals** are trained and recognized for CLA-related knowledge and skills. | - The mission **M&E specialist(s) and points of contact from technical offices** are responsible for CLA.  
- A **minority** of staff are trained in and recognized for CLA-related knowledge and skills.  
- The mission has **support mechanism(s) with some elements related to CLA**. | - The mission has **CLA points of contact** in the program office and across the technical offices.  
- A **majority** of staff are trained in and recognized for CLA-related knowledge and skills.  
- The mission **procures mechanisms** to support CLA. | - Staff **mission-wide** incorporate CLA into their **scope and workload** and there are identified CLA champions throughout the mission who coordinate efforts with the program office.  
- Staff **mission-wide** are trained in and recognized for CLA-related knowledge and skills.  
- The mission procures and **uses tailored support** to promote effective CLA. |

**Maturity Stages**

- **NOT YET PRESENT**
- **EMERGENT**
- **EXPANDING**
- **ADVANCED**
- **INSTITUTIONALIZED**
**KEY CONCEPTS**

1. Mechanism type and scope enables CLA.
2. Budgeting.
3. Staff compensation and skills.

**Resources**

**CLA in Implementing Mechanisms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT YET PRESENT</th>
<th>EMERGENT</th>
<th>EXPANDING</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff <em>rarely</em>:</td>
<td>Staff <em>sometimes</em>:</td>
<td>Staff <em>usually</em>:</td>
<td>Staff <em>consistently and systematically</em>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allocating mechanisms are not yet supporting CLA integration.</td>
<td>- Use mechanism types and scopes that enable CLA integration during implementation.</td>
<td>- Use mechanism types and scopes that enable CLA integration during implementation.</td>
<td>- Allocate and/or approve mechanism resources to support CLA integration</td>
<td>- Use mechanism types and scopes that enable CLA integration during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Allocate and/or approve mechanism resources to support CLA integration</td>
<td>- Allocate and/or approve mechanism resources to support CLA integration</td>
<td>- Request and/or approve key personnel with the capacity in adaptive management and other CLA-related skills.</td>
<td>- Allocate and/or approve mechanism resources to support CLA integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Request and/or approve key personnel with the capacity in adaptive management and other CLA-related skills.</td>
<td>- Request and/or approve key personnel with the capacity in adaptive management and other CLA-related skills.</td>
<td>- Request and/or approve key personnel with the capacity in adaptive management and other CLA-related skills.</td>
<td>- Allocate and/or approve key personnel with the capacity in adaptive management and other CLA-related skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maturity Stages:

- **Not Yet Present**
- **Emergent**
- **Expanding**
- **Advanced**
- **Institutionalized**