

CARE Inclusive Governance Marker Vetting Form

Date:
Country:

Project title:
Stage graded:

Reviewer:

Project ID:

1. Select which of the following statements best describes this intervention:

i. Is NOT considering governance or power relations

GRADE 0

ii. WORKS WITHIN existing institutions, structures and power relations

GO TO COLUMN A

iii. CHALLENGES institutions, structures and power relations

GO TO COLUMN B

2.

COLUMN A

WORKS WITHIN existing power relations

Answer the questions below:

Tick YES for all of the statements that apply.

Analysis: Is this intervention informed by basic stakeholder and situational analysis that considers the needs and interests of different population groups and the responsibilities of power holders?

☐

Activities: Does the intervention include strategies and activities in **at least one** of the GPF domains (1. organized & empowered citizens; 2. responsive power-holders; & 3. inclusive & effective spaces for negotiation)?

☒

Integration: Are we working with different **stakeholders** (civil society, state, and private sector), at different **levels** (at the least, connecting community to subnational/district changes)?

☒

CARE's own accountability: Does the intervention include **at least two** components of CARE's approach to organizational accountability (transparency, citizen participation, feedback mechanisms, & organizational systems)?

☒

OR

COLUMN B

CHALLENGES structures and power relations

Answer the questions below:

Tick YES for all of the statements that apply.

Analysis: Is this intervention based on an **in-depth** power, political economy or context analysis, considering all the domains of the GPF (1. organized & empowered citizens; 2. responsive power-holders; & 3. inclusive spaces for negotiation)?

☒

Activities: Does the intervention include strategies, or coordinate with actions of other actors across **all three** GPF domains (1. organized & empowered citizens; 2. responsive power-holders; & 3. inclusive & effective spaces for negotiation)?

☒

Integration: Are we working with multiple **stakeholders** (civil society, state, and private sector), at multiple **levels** (connecting local to national changes)?

☒

CARE's own accountability: Does the intervention include **all four** components of CARE's approach organizational accountability (transparency, citizen participation, feedback mechanisms, & organizational systems)?

☒

3. Add up the total number of YES: _____

Add up the total number of YES: _____

4. Using the Grading Guidance below, tick the grade received:

0 YES= Grade 0, 1-2 YES= Grade 1, 3-4 YES= Grade 2

Using the Grading Guidance below, tick the Grade received:

0-1 YES= Complete column A, 2-3 YES= Grade 3, 4 YES= Grade 4

GRADE 0
Unaware

GRADE 1
Tokenistic

GRADE 2
Accommodating

GRADE 3
Responsive

GRADE 4
Transformational

NOTE: All elements ticked as YES require justification below, and supporting documentation to be attached.

Please describe the reasons that support your YES answers above, and provide with supporting documents or links:

QUESTION	REASONS (WITH SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS OR LINKS ATTACHED)
Analysis	
Activities	
Integration	
CARE's own accountability	

LESSONS	FEEDBACK
What were the three main lessons (can be both positive and negative) from integrating inclusive governance into your project design / implementation?	Based on these lessons, what will be changed within the intervention to improve integration of inclusive governance?

If you scored **Grade 0**, please explain why governance was not relevant to this intervention: _____
