

Good Practice on GRI Reporting II

When reviewing the first two rounds of accountability reports from the members of the INGO Accountability Charter, the Independent Review Panel selected answers that they felt were comprehensive and could be seen as *Good Practice* for how to report against parts of the GRI NGO Sector Supplement. Please find these answers below.

Last update: November 2011.

Table of content:

“1.1 Statement from the most senior decision-maker of the organization.”	3
“Section 2: Organizational Profile”	9
“3.5: Report Scope and Boundary/ Process for defining report content. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]”	12
“4.1. Governance structure of the organisation, including committees under the highest governance body responsible for specific tasks, such as setting strategy or organisational oversight. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]”	144
“4.2. Indicate whether the Chair of the highest governance body is also an executive officer (and, if so, their function within the organisation's management and the reasons for this arrangement). Describe the division of responsibility between the highest governance body and the management and/or executives. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]”	146
“4.4: Mechanisms for internal stakeholders (e.g., members), shareholders and employees to provide recommendations or direction to the highest governance body. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]”	17
“4.15: Basis for identification and selection of stakeholders with whom to engage.”	18
“NGO1: Involvement of affected stakeholder groups in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs.”	21
“NGO2: Mechanisms for feedback and complaints in relation to programmes and policies and for determining actions to take in response to breaches of policies.”	26
“NGO3: Systems for program monitoring, evaluation and learning (including measuring program effectiveness and impact), resulting changes to programs, and how they are communicated.”	29
“NGO5: Processes to formulate, communicate, implement and change advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns. Identify how the organization ensures consistency, fairness and accuracy.”	30
“NGO6: Processes to take into account and coordinate with the activities of other actors. How do you ensure that your organization is not duplicating efforts?”	34
“NGO7: Resource allocation.”	37
“NGO8 Sources of funding by category and five largest donors and monetary value of their contribution.”	40
“EC7: Procedures for local hiring and proportion of senior management hired form the local community at locations of significant operation.”	42
“EN16: Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight.”	447

“EN18: Initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reductions achieved.” 48

“LA13: Composition of governance bodies and breakdown of employees per category according to gender, age group, minority group membership, and other indicators of diversity.” 49

“SO1: Nature, scope, and effectiveness of any program and practices that assess and manage the impacts of operations on communities, including entering, operating and exiting.” 54

Other Good Practices 56

“1.1 Statement from the most senior decision-maker of the organization.”

ACTIONAID (Reporting period January – December 2010)

“Letter from Chief Executive

We are proud to submit our report of the highlights of ActionAid International’s work during 2010, across 43 member countries and through the International Secretariat, in the penultimate year of our 2005-2011 strategy Rights to End Poverty. This report is our fourth since becoming a founding member of the Accountability Charter, and our second using the GRI NGO Supplement. We have chosen to report against the 23 indicators that are most directly relevant to our work and in line with current monitoring metrics (up from 18 last year). We are pleased to contribute in this way to strengthening accountability – our own, and we hope that of the sector.

It is not possible or necessary to describe all the key events, achievements and failures across the 43 country programmes, associates and affiliates that make up our federation. Our 2010 Annual Report to our General Assembly, available at www.actionaid.org, provides an overview by selecting one story from each context that illustrates achievement, and gives an overall review and reflection that highlights challenges and failures. We focussed this year more on stories of change demonstrating impact, as we had several comprehensive external evaluations and internal reviews that had already been a rich learning process. There are also comprehensive reports available from each of our members, branches, and international secretariat units. A summary of the events, achievements and failures, as requested, follows.

Events

Externally, disasters were the defining characteristic of 2010. Climate change continued to exacerbate the food crisis – which pushed another 44 million people newly into poverty – and devastated the lives of people with whom we work. The worst of these disasters were the January earthquake in Haiti that killed 250,000 people, and the devastating floods in Pakistan in July, which destroyed lives and livelihoods across the country. The BP oil spill was a salutary reminder that disasters often have human as well as natural causes – whether it is big corporations taking safety shortcuts; illegal loggers systematically destroying forests and turning floods into catastrophes; or landlords building shoddy housing, making earthquakes lethal for so many people. This highlights the importance of our rights-based approach, of the need to empower people to build movements to campaign on rights – to hold governments and corporations to account – even as we meet immediate needs.

We are thus proud that in 2010 we not only helped hundreds of thousands of people recover from these and other disasters, but also campaigned to get decision-makers to take action on climate change and on the food crisis. We strengthened our local and policy work on sustainable agriculture. We brought the issue of women’s rights to land to the fore in international negotiations and within national policy debates, while standing alongside women to claim land and other rights locally. As the stories in our annual report show, we also made considerable gains in securing safe and accessible education for millions of children, in advancing just and democratic governance, and in supporting people living with HIV and AIDS.

Achievements

A major achievement was a more consistent application of the minimum standards of our human rights-based approach, across very different contexts. In Ethiopia and China, where there are severe restrictions on our ability to do human rights work, we have nonetheless been able to stand by women and girls to defend and achieve their rights. In Pakistan

and Haiti, in the face of having to respond immediately to incredible suffering, we have analysed and taken action on longer term rights abuses with survivors. In Kenya, Brazil and Nigeria, we have taken advantage of more open contexts to push the boundaries and advance legal rights, securing new clauses in constitutions that protect and advance rights for poor and excluded people. In the US, UK and Italy we have influenced the policies of governments that impact on the lives of millions in the countries in which we work.

Our greatest achievement this year, particularly given that it was a weakness identified in 2009, is the step-change we have seen in our campaigning, and more broadly bringing more consistency to programme quality and our human rights-based approach, as illustrated in the stories in this review. This has been achieved through focused leadership across all regions. We have also put in place tools for future improvement, with initiatives such as the launch of our new Human Rights-Based Approach handbook and campaign vision; the development of new monitoring and evaluation standards; more integration between our funding and programme approaches; and work to improve programme strategies within each of our themes and in cross-thematic areas such as National Development strategies, social protection, and work with children and youth. We are also very proud of the continued development of our governance structures. There is a marked change in the levels of involvement of our boards and assemblies, with members now taking an active role in strategy development, for example.

Throughout this work, we have managed to involve children and youth more consistently – for example children drawing about food rights in Brazil, pastoral children in Kenya using dance, poems and drama to demand girls' education, Activista mobilisations in Greece and the further development of our child-centred empowerment methodology, and Children's Reflection and Empowerment for Social Transformation (CREST), in West Africa. There is a strong theme of women's rights across almost all the stories, showing the great gains we have made in both our standalone and cross-cutting women's rights work. We are also getting better at quantifying our impact, being able to show in more cases the numbers of people we reach through change, and providing qualitative stories which illustrate shifts in power that go beyond individuals.

Failures

But the review of the stories also shows some weaknesses. We don't have strong enough stories of how our supporters have helped to bring about change. It is still not always clear enough how our local, national, and international work is linked. We are better at describing what our partners have done, than what changes were achieved, or what our contribution was. We don't have a consistent enough approach to aggregating numbers and impact, or providing evidence for that impact. The three external reviews carried out during 2010 – including the comprehensive strategy review, and our reviews of our governance and HIV and AIDS work – pointed out some other areas for attention. Key amongst them was the need for having an identity narrative with more coherence between our strategy, fundraising, and activities as well as the need for more investment in organisational development and learning.

An area for focused attention and improvement in our work, which we have identified above and beyond findings of the evaluations, is our approach in new middle-income countries such as Thailand, South Africa, and China, where we are not yet having the impact we believe is possible. We also want to further diversify our funding and increase unrestricted funds, while better aligning our fundraising, programming, and planning processes. While we did achieve the explicit programming methodology and campaigning model we identified as necessary in 2009, we did not manage the more specific

actions of developing better systems and skills for integrating diverse models of mobilisation and campaigning, or consistently developing micro-level organisations into something more powerful at national level. These gaps are consistent with findings in the review of our international strategy, Taking Stock 3, and are being taken forward with our new strategy.

Our internal environment

Internally, it was a year of major transition at ActionAid with the recruitment of the new Chief Executive, Joanna Kerr, in June 2010. The General Assembly met for the second time and the ongoing progression of country programmes to Affiliate status enhanced our accountability by giving more power to those working closest to poor and excluded people, and by diversifying our presence in developed countries. India, Denmark, and Guatemala became full affiliates. Additionally, Thailand, The Gambia, Zambia, Bangladesh and Nepal attained Associate status. The exploratory programmes in DRC and Myanmar were appraised and approved as full country programmes, while those in Cameroon and Guinea Bissau were closed.

Overall accountability within ActionAid is making great strides towards the desired improvements. In 2010, the General Assembly was held for the second time and it saw members tabling motions and key decisions being made for the organisation. Significant work was also carried out on a federation-wide governance manual. The new Resource Allocation Framework, Fundraising Policy and the Assurance Policy were all approved at the General Assembly. The nine-member board met five times as a full board, in addition to working in four sub-committees. Besides recruiting and supporting the transition of a new Chief Executive, the board also took an active part in the Taking Stock 3 review of the international strategy and the development of the new international strategy.

Finally, we launched our end of strategy evaluation, Taking Stock 3, to be accountable to the promises we made in Rights to End Poverty. This was an intensive process and was a building block for developing our new international strategy, which has been approved at the Annual General Meeting in July 2011, for start in 2012.

Outlook on the organisation's main challenges, targets for the next year and goals for 3-5 years

2011 is the final year of our international strategy Rights to End Poverty, so our work will focus on consolidating goals, finalising the new international strategy (approved by the Assembly in July 2011) and in developing a new organisational structure to fit the new strategy. We will also be developing supporting policies and documents such as a long-term financial plan, a communications strategy, and a programme design and monitoring framework.

Goals and targets for the next three years will be agreed through the strategy development process and reported on in our next INGO report. In 2010 we identified major issues to address, including internally having a more coherent identity, and externally a more coherent brand, resolving ongoing tensions between the pressure for tangible, concrete impact, particularly in the lives of children (linked to our funding sources) and longer term change (linked to our HRBA). We know we want to improve our reporting of impact, and our mutual accountability, and continue broadly within a similar rights based approach.

2011 is also a year for increasing the capacity of ActionAid staff in relation to understanding and implementing our Human Rights Based Approach. Part of this will

be piloting our new Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) requirements, adopted in 2010, with guidelines and tools being developed as appropriate, following the piloting and testing.

The environment we work in (This section is extracted from the new international strategy)

We are at a remarkable moment in the global struggle for a more just and sustainable world. The planet is changing rapidly – but not rapidly and positively enough for the billions of people who live daily with the profound injustice of poverty. Inequality, both within and across countries has increased in the past 20 years. As we set out our strategy for the coming years, we can see, from research and trend analyses, a volatile decade ahead full of challenges – and opportunities:

- *Dramatic shocks and crises will inevitably occur – whether related to food, fuel, finances, climate or conflict – increasing human vulnerability and inequality.*
- *Over half the world’s population will be children or youth. Half will also be living in urban areas, shifting the location of poverty. Gender-based discrimination will persist as a cause of poverty and injustice, although women will be striving for increased leadership in all sectors.*
- *The rise of consumption and growing middle classes around the world will increase demands for energy and food, and put significant pressures on natural resources, especially in low- and middle-income countries.*
- *As the world faces up to its natural resource limits (notably of oil reserves, water, forests and land), there will be a more compelling agenda for advancing ecological justice, sustainable agriculture and development models based on fair shares for all. A generation of young people with more community-based values may challenge the individualism of recent decades.*
- *Political and economic power will continue to shift away from the United States and Europe, towards a more multi-polar world. Economic powers including China, India, Brazil and South Africa will rise and re-emerge, expanding and transforming approaches to global governance and economic and social development.*
- *The capacity of states to take effective large-scale action against poverty will increase in many developing countries as they head towards middle income status; yet the temptation may also grow to use enhanced state power to enforce repressive policies that favour political elites or private sector interests. At the other end of the spectrum, a growing share of those living in extreme poverty are likely to be concentrated in fragile or predatory states where enforcing human rights obligations is extremely difficult.*
- *The globalisation agenda of the international financial institutions will likely continue to perpetuate unfair trade agreements and the privatisation of public services. However we are likely to see many “developmental states” challenging this doctrine to pursue more equitable and redistributive policies.*
- *Many multinational corporations will try to accumulate unprecedented market power and political influence, which often results in worker exploitation, land grabs, or tax dodging. The case for government regulation, international action and legally-binding frameworks to stop corporate abuse will likely become stronger because of increasing global awareness. More progressive corporations will contribute to finding sustainable solutions to ending poverty.*
- *The rapid pace of technological development will accelerate further, in many cases deepening divides between the “haves and have nots”. At the same time it will create huge opportunities for democratising access to information and for people to be more involved in government and corporate processes. Online communities and social networking will continue to change the nature of activism, organising and campaigning.*

- *Civil society and people's movements will find new ways to connect and strengthen their movements across the planet, making their voices heard and contributing to building more democratic and sustainable approaches to development. However, reactionary and intolerant movements will also strengthen, threatening to undermine the rights of women and minorities.*
- *Finally, the "aid business" will become less relevant if it fails to move beyond the post-colonial model, reducing aid dependency and more effectively and transparently promoting local ownership and human rights approaches for those living in poverty.*

These few examples above show that to succeed in the coming years, the struggle for justice and equality needs new thinking, new approaches and new ways of organising. There is much cause for optimism. As the 2015 deadline for the Millennium Development Goals passes and the policies of International Financial Institutions are discredited in the wake of the financial and food crises, new frameworks will be needed. Rights-based alternatives are being developed every day, on every issue, in different spaces, in different countries. With people around the world, ActionAid is committed to harnessing and advancing these into strategic solutions for a poverty-free planet."

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 May 2009 - 31 March 2010)

*"The combined issues of the global economic crisis, food prices and, above all, climate change, are making the lives of people living in poverty even harder. Our role is to help them build their resilience, whether in preparedness for humanitarian crises of adapting agricultural production to a world affected by climate change. This is the focus for 2010/11. In terms of our income, we expect a slow recovery from the global recession. However, in this context we plan to have an incremental growth in our income. This will allow us to invest in attracting new supporters in the UK, and to strengthen the **Oxfam** International confederation through a movement to a Single Management Structure (see Indicator 6 on page 10 below). In the long run, this investment will improve our delivery and effectiveness as an international NGO, but we recognise that managing the process of change will be challenging.*

The following principles will continue to underpin the way we work:

- *putting poor women's rights at the heart of all we do*
- *improving accountability to all stakeholders*
- *developing, and, where possible, internally promoting our staff*
- *continuing to work to reduce our carbon footprint.*

2009/10 involved a huge, continuing effort on the part of Oxfam and our allies to raise public awareness of the reality of climate change, and to persuade our global leaders that the Copenhagen summit in December was the time and place to commit to a fair, ambitious and binding global treaty to reduce carbon emissions. There is no denying that Copenhagen was a disappointment. Now the challenge for us is to maintain and build on the global momentum which Oxfam campaigners and supporters helped to create, until a binding global treaty is reached.

Oxfam's Haiti response (coordinated from a makeshift office in a battered hut after our Port-au-Prince office was destroyed) has been a story of obstacles overcome. In the toughest of conditions, and in spite of devastating personal bereavement and loss, our Haiti team worked tirelessly to help survivors in the first days, before the huge-scale relief effort got underway.

In 2009/10:

- *Our work reached 17 million people living in poverty in 64 countries*
- *An estimated 12 million campaigners globally took action with Oxfam GB and our affiliates*
- *We gave financial support to 1021 partner organizations*

Further details of key events, achievements and failures, and our future plans are in our Annual Report and Accounts (http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/downloads/reports/report_accounts09_10.pdf) and our Accountability Report

(<http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/accounts/downloads/accountability-report-0910.pdf>).

This GRI report should be read together with those two documents. Together, the three Reports also demonstrate our commitment to the International NGO Charter (<http://www.ingoaccountabilitycharter.org/>) and, in the UK, to the Code of Governance for the Voluntary and Community Sector (<http://www.acevo.org.uk/Document.Doc?id=39>).

Barbara Stocking, Chief Executive”

“Section 2: Organizational Profile”

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: Calendar Year 2010)

“2.2 Primary activities (e.g., advocacy, social marketing, research, service provision, capacity building, humanitarian assistance, etc.). Indicate how these activities relate to the organization’s mission and primary strategic goals (e.g., on poverty reduction, environment, human rights, etc.). [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL’s vision is of a world in which every person enjoys all of the human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments. In pursuit of this vision, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL’s mission is to undertake research and action focused on preventing and ending grave abuses of these rights. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL addresses governments, intergovernmental organizations, armed political groups, companies and other non-state actors. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL seeks to disclose human rights abuses accurately, quickly and persistently. It systematically and impartially researches the facts of individual cases and patterns of human rights abuses. These findings are publicized, and members, supporters and staff mobilize public pressure on governments and others to stop the abuses.

In addition to its work on specific abuses of human rights, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL urges all governments to observe the rule of law, and to ratify and implement human rights standards; it carries out a wide range of human rights educational activities; and it encourages intergovernmental organizations, individuals, and all organs of society to support and respect human rights. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL’s strategic human rights priorities in 2010-2016 are: (1) Empowering people living in poverty; (2) Defending unprotected people on the move; (3) Defending people from violence committed by state and non-state actors; and (4) Protecting people’s freedom of expression and freedom from discrimination. Details on these and other organizational priorities are described in our “AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL INTEGRATED STRATEGIC PLAN 2010 TO 2016” (<http://www.amnesty.org/en/integrated-strategicplan>), which aims to empower rights-holders whose rights are challenged and strengthen the human rights movement.

2.3 Operational structure of the organization, including national offices, sections, branches, field offices, main divisions, operating companies, subsidiaries, and joint ventures. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

The AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL movement comprises of national sections and structures and the International Secretariat. Sections and structures carry out work to promote human rights in their own countries/territories in accordance with AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL’s Statute (<http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/accountability/statute-of-amnesty-international>). The International Secretariat provides key research and action functions and coordinates AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL’s day-to-day work at the global level.

2.4 Location of organization’s headquarters. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL’s International Secretariat (IS) is located at 1 Easton Street, London, WC1X 0DW, UK (main office of the IS).

There are eight other IS offices worldwide (Dakar, Kampala, Beirut, Hong Kong, Moscow, Geneva, Paris, New York) in addition to country project offices.

2.5 Number of countries where the organization operates. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL currently has 69 legal entities present in 66 countries/territories:

Global South (43 entities in 43 countries/territories): Algeria, Argentina, Benin, Bermuda, Burkina Faso, Chile, Cote D'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Faroe Islands, Ghana, Hong Kong, Hungary, Israel, Kenya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Global North (26 entities in 23 countries/territories): Australia, Austria, Belgium (2 entities with one Flemish speaking and one French speaking), Canada (2 entities with one English speaking and one French speaking), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK (2 entities with one section and the International Secretariat), USA

2.6 Nature of ownership and legal form. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a worldwide movement based on voluntary membership and composed of independent legal entities being national sections and structures and the International Secretariat. The work carried out through the International Secretariat is organised into two legal entities, in compliance with United Kingdom law. These are Amnesty International Limited ("Amnesty International L") and Amnesty International Charity Limited ("Amnesty International CL"). Amnesty International Limited undertakes charitable activities on behalf of Amnesty International Charity Limited, a registered charity (UK Charity Registration Number: 294230). For charity statuses of sections and structures, contact information can be found at <http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-weare/amnesty-international-in-your-country>.

2.7 Target audience and affected stakeholders. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a worldwide movement of people who campaign for internationally recognized human rights to be respected and protected for everyone. We believe human rights abuses anywhere are the concern of people everywhere. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL works to improve people's lives through campaigning and international solidarity. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL conducts research and generate action to prevent and end grave abuses of human rights and to demand justice for those whose rights have been violated. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's members and supporters exert influence on governments, political bodies, companies and intergovernmental groups. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's activists take up human rights issues by mobilizing public pressure through mass demonstrations, vigils and direct lobbying as well as online and offline campaigning.

2.8 Scale of the reporting organization. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

As of Dec 2009, AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL had about 3 million members and supporters (about 88% from the Global North and about half were women). And we estimate at least 1 million individual activists around the world took part in actions (traditional methods such as letter writing, signing petitions, demonstrations, lobbying, and other innovative methods such as blogging, social networking, street theatre and road shows) sponsored by AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL in 2009. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's 2009 global income was €200 million and expenditure was €193 million. AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL's net assets at the end of 2009 was €108 million (€156 million of assets, €48 million liabilities) with €55 million in cash.

In 2009 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL sent 163 research missions into the field covering 87 countries/territories and logging 4333 person-days.

Please note some countries (e.g., China, Cuba, Iran, Laos, Saudi Arabia, Turkmenistan, Vietnam) prohibit our entry to investigate human rights violations; others make entry for

research purpose either rare or extremely difficult (e.g., India, Libya, Syria); and, in respect to some countries our research methodologies mean it is simply too unsafe to enter, both for our contacts in those countries and for our staff.

2009	Missions	Person-Days	Countries/Territories
<i>Africa (Sub-Saharan and Southern)</i>	44	1508	23
<i>Americas</i>	23	589	13
<i>Asia-Pacific and South Asia</i>	51	1310	20
<i>Europe and Central Asia</i>	30	467	23
<i>Middle East and North Africa</i>	15	459	8
Total	167	4333	87

To publicize human rights abuses around the world AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL published 130 reports (10 pages or longer) and 399 shorter documents (country updates, campaign digests, case sheets and leaflets) documenting human rights violations in 112 countries/territories in 2009.

2009	Reports	Other shorter Documents	Countries/Territories
<i>Africa (Sub-Saharan and Southern)</i>	21	85	24
<i>Americas</i>	24	93	17
<i>Asia-Pacific and South Asia</i>	26	97	24
<i>Europe and Central Asia</i>	37	56	33
<i>Middle East and North Africa</i>	22	68	14
Total	130	399	112

Issued when a person is in imminent danger of human rights abuse and the bringing of public attention through letter writing is likely to make a difference, urgent actions are a longstanding means of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL calling for activist action. In 2009 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL issued 600 urgent actions and related updates covering 77 countries/territories.

2009	New Urgent Actions	Urgent Action Updates	Countries/Territories
<i>Africa (Sub-Saharan and Southern)</i>	30	15	13
<i>Americas</i>	119	63	21
<i>Asia-Pacific and South Asia</i>	55	43	14
<i>Europe and Central Asia</i>	31	32	15
<i>Middle East and North Africa</i>	108	104	14
Total	343	257	77

2.9 Significant changes during the reporting period regarding size, structure, or ownership. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

None.

2.10 Awards received in the reporting period. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]

None."

“3.5: Report Scope and Boundary/ Process for defining report content. [GRI NGOSS: p. 26]”

ACTIONAID (Reporting period January – December 2010)

“This report is ancillary to and should be read alongside the Annual Report of ActionAid International 2010, available on our website. The boundaries of the report are the same as for the Annual Report. As ActionAid International operates in 43 countries with a number of partners in each country, it is important to stress that it is not the partner’s activities as such which are reported on. This report seeks to consolidate the work that ActionAid International does overall in relation to its own strategy and objectives, as stated in the International Strategy: Rights to End Poverty 2005-2011.

We believe we have included information and topics of relevance to our stakeholders and staff, which also pertain to our organisational objectives and indicators of change, as well as our values, policies and strategies and management systems that we report against in our annual reporting. ActionAid International has strong values and policies in relation to accountability as well as in relation to transparency and sustainability. One way to adhere to these values and principles is by being a member of the International NGO Accountability Charter and in developing this report. In this report we emphasise those issues of highest importance to our organisation and to our stakeholders, which also exemplify our work, and our strengths and weaknesses.

Report content is defined during the annual reporting process with inputs and feedback from the Board, senior management teams in all countries, partners and ActionAid International staff globally. The partners are responsible for bringing the voice of the people that ActionAid International reaches and works with to the report. Our analysis is based on the annual review and reflection process, which includes input from stakeholders outside and within each theme and country. Each annual review and reflection process is documented – and reported to the International Secretariat. It is from these annual reports that most information has been gathered for the annual report, in addition to the country-level annual reports.

The process of writing the ActionAid International Annual Report in 2010 took a lighter approach than in the past. The reason for this was a management decision to focus resources and energy on the end of strategy review, Taking Stock 3, and the development of the new international strategy. The Directors decided to incorporate the ‘most significant change’ method for reporting – requesting each country and each unit of the organisation (themes and functions) to report on the most significant story of change from their work in 2010. This led to an annual report of a lighter nature, in which each country is represented in the report by a story of significant change. Each theme and function unit of ActionAid International was requested to use a specific format for their Participatory Review and Reflection Process (PRRP), which synthesised their most significant achievements and failures for 2010. We have used the PRRP reports and country reports to consolidate this accountability report.

In choosing which indicators to report on in this format, ActionAid International has looked at what information is already being gathered by which organisational units, and which ones can feed in to this GRI report. For gathering content for the report, the units responsible/of relevance to each indicator were involved in gathering relevant and necessary information. Additionally, some indicators in this report, for example the environmental indicators, have helped us analyse which environmental indicators are relevant and pertinent to ActionAid International’s work and which we really should be reporting against as a sustainable organisation promoting and advocating climate

protection. Therefore, we acknowledge that some indicators may not have full answers in this report for 2010, but we have made our best attempt to include information on what we are able to at this time. We do not choose to exclude indicators in order to not disclose/hide information."

CIVICUS (Reporting period: April 2009 – March 2010)

"In determining the materiality of the information and topics prioritised in this report, CIVICUS adopted the standard recommended indicators adopted for the NGO sector by the NGO Working Group. The indicators selected should speak closely to the information which CIVICUS believes is of interest and relevance to its stakeholders, both "upstream" and "downstream". This content results in a Level C Report, including NGO specific indicators, which it is hoped will be qualitatively richer than other GRI templates.

CIVICUS hopes and expects that this 2009-2010 Accountability Charter report will be read first and foremost by its members and wider constituency of partners. Donor organisations and the wider public are secondary intended audiences for the report. The report is written and completed in the spirit of maximum disclosure, intended to inspire discussion and feedback from alliance members and partners about what CIVICUS (the organisation) can and should do differently. Although the report highlights some gaps in CIVICUS' internal practice, it is hoped that honest assessment of these can lead to substantive improvements and a roadmap for improved accountability in 2011 and beyond.

This report should be read in conjunction with the 2009 CIVICUS Annual Report, available at <http://www.civicus.org/content/reports/Annual-Report-2009.pdf>. The Annual Report contains additional comprehensive financial and performance information on the organisation during 2009."

“4.1 Governance structure of the organisation, including committees under the highest governance body responsible for specific tasks, such as setting strategy or organisational oversight. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]”

TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: Calendar year 2010)

“The governance structures at Transparency International aim to reflect the spirit of our mission and the ownership by our Members operating on the front lines of the fight against corruption and to embody our commitment to transparency, accountability and integrity. We will continue to evaluate and assess our governance procedures and to pursue best practice in this arena.

The functioning and governance of TI-S can be illustrated as follows:



The pillars of our governance principles are deeply rooted into our Charter www.transparency.org/about_us/organisation/charter which is itself approved by our Annual Membership Meeting.

The Annual Membership Meeting is the highest decision-taking body. Main policies and the financial statements are subject to its approval, it elects the Board of Directors from among the Chapter Representatives and the Individual Members.

The TI Board of Directors reports to the Membership Meeting, is in charge of supervising the organisation through the year, appoints the TI-S Managing Director, approves the budget, and is, by virtue of our Charter, in charge of Strategy. However, while it watched over the 2015 Strategy Process Development, it submitted the approval of the final draft to the critical feedback and final approval of the Annual Membership Meeting.

The Board of Directors comprises members of the Executive (Chair and Vice Chair) and ten additional members. Members of the Board of Directors are elected for a three-year term. Retiring Members are eligible for re-election for a second term, but must retire for at least one year before being eligible for re-election for a final third term as a Director.

The Board of Directors forms a number of specialised sub-Board Committees including:

- Audit Committee
- Financial Committee

- *Ethics Committee*
- *Membership Accreditation Committee*
- *Communications Committee*
- *Awards Committee*

Composition and Terms of Reference of these Committees can be found at:
www.transparency.org/about_us/organisation/board/board_coms

TI Board members are subject to a Board code of conduct and a Conflict of Interest policy and are required to compile a register of interests. (download document posted as Annex 3 at www.transparency.org/about_us/organisation/board/conduct_board)”

“4.2. Indicate whether the Chair of the highest governance body is also an executive officer (and, if so, their function within the organisation's management and the reasons for this arrangement). Describe the division of responsibility between the highest governance body and the management and/or executives. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]”

ACTIONAID (Reporting period January – December 2010)

“Neither the chair of the board nor the convenor of the assembly is an executive officer.

The ActionAid International governance manual states that: “Governance is the process by which an Assembly or Board functions as a unit to direct the organisation while management is the process of implementation, translating governance policy into programmes and services.” The following table illustrates this distinction.”

Governance	Management
<i>Determine fundamentals of organisation: values, vision, mission, overall strategy</i>	<i>Implement activities based on the fundamentals</i>
<i>Focus on strategy and policy: high level guidance</i>	<i>Interpret the high-level guidance in practice</i>
<i>Choose, manage, support, guide and challenge the Chief Executive</i>	<i>Headed by the Chief Executive who chooses, manages, supports, guides and challenges all other staff, directly or indirectly</i>

“4.4: Mechanisms for internal stakeholders (e.g., members), shareholders and employees to provide recommendations or direction to the highest governance body. [GRI NGOSS: p. 27]”

CIVICUS (Reporting period: April 2009 – March 2010)

“The primary mechanism is through the members' Annual General Meeting, where members give feedback and guidance on the organisation's direction. The members' AGM takes place usually at the annual CIVICUS World Assembly, a global gathering of civil society representatives. The CIVICUS Board also proactively uses this as an opportunity for an informal sounding board with members, as well as the wider stakeholder constituency. A membership team based at the CIVICUS secretariat also works throughout the year to seek feedback and input from members into the work of both the organisation and Board. However, the latter has not always worked well or resulted in significant input, signalling that this mechanism is probably weaker than it should be. During the reporting period, CIVICUS was not able to hold its annual World Assembly due to a restrictive funding environment, though it did hold an annual members' meeting in Johannesburg, South Africa. Plans for a revised membership approach, subsequent to this reporting period and guided by CIVICUS' new Convening Unit, should begin to improve this mechanism in 2011.”

One mechanism utilized during 2009 – 2010 for member input, recommendations and direction was CIVICUS' involvement in the Comparative Constituency Feedback Survey, together with another 8 transnational networks, with coordination by Keystone and iScale. About 30% of CIVICUS constituents of all types were involved and provided feedback on a range of issues concerning CIVICUS; programmes design, effectiveness, efficiency, communication, among others. CIVICUS has formally committed itself to engaging in such surveys of its constituents in the future as an useful means for obtaining feedback and complaints from its stakeholders.

Some mechanisms exist for employees to provide recommendations to the highest governance body, the CIVICUS Board. When the Board meets, there are usually attempts to schedule staff-Board interactions. While these have not always generated discussion of the quality desired, in 2010-2011 there has been a move to shift these towards more substantive discussions touching on salient topics. Staff, members, partners and donors are also involved in the regular appraisal of the Secretary General / CEO carried out by the Board. However, the main mechanisms for staff-Board interaction continue to be through informal contact, primarily on programmatic issues.”

“4.15: Basis for identification and selection of stakeholders with whom to engage.”

ACTIONAID (Reporting period January – December 2010)

“The processes for this are described in our Accountability, Learning and Planning System (ALPS), which includes our processes for appraisal, our partnership policy, and other policies relevant to this question. ALPS informs the whole organisation, at all levels, of the organisational process to undergo in order to start up a programme/activities and throughout the programme period.

ActionAid undergoes periods of appraisal in which a contextual mapping exercise and situational analysis take place. This process informs ActionAid of areas of concern and issues to work with as well as of stakeholders, possible partners, target audience, etc.

When choosing local partners, the local ActionAid country programme conducts a partnership appraisal in order to identify the most appropriate partner. The local partner will also identify and select stakeholders to engage at local and national level. These stakeholders are also involved in the strategic planning process.

The local communities take part in the selection process of relevant rights holders to be part of the ActionAid programmes. This takes place through the appraisal process mentioned above, and by including the communities in the planning process. They assist the local partner organisations and ActionAid Country Programme to identify who to involve in the programme.

In 2010, ActionAid International published the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) handbook. The handbook sets out criteria for how to select stakeholders and other actors with whom to engage. The handbook describes programming principles, and two of the principles adhere directly to engagement with others, namely that we put rights holders first and ensure participation of rights holders, and we work in partnership. The handbook prescribes that ActionAid International must work together with rights holders to analyse and strategise about how their rights can be addressed and we work to build the organisation and power of rights holders. We also work with alliances and building networks. We work in partnership by building partnerships with rights-holder organisations and movements, and NGO or community-based organisations supportive of rights holders’ struggles. About 75% of all ActionAid International programmes worldwide are managed by partners, which is why partnerships are critical to the Human Rights Based Approach. There is a period of mutual assessment in each programme and partnership starting up, after which a Memorandum of Understanding is developed – if partnership is mutually accepted. Partners and partnerships need to be reviewed on an ongoing basis, at least once a year. The partners should give feedback to ActionAid International on its work and the relationship, and vice versa.

In relation to other stakeholders, such as potential donors or sponsors, the ActionAid International Company Fundraising Policy stipulates whom we can or should not engage with:

ActionAid recognises that the private sector is a key part of the economic environment within which we operate, but we must take care that we do not enter into relationships with companies that fail to demonstrate adequate respect for human rights (including labour rights) or adequate compliance with core environmental standards, as set out in specific UN conventions and treaties. Partnerships with such companies that are knowingly sustaining poverty compromise our ability to deliver our mission and live by our values.

It needs to be emphasized that this policy contains the global minimum standards for the screening and acceptance of donations, gifts in kind and brand associations with companies for all ActionAid Associates, Affiliates and Country Programmes. These global standards are primarily applicable to multinational enterprises, with the following exceptions:

- The global minimum standards define a small number of 'excluded' industries, from which no donations may be accepted by any ActionAid member, Country Programme or department – regardless of the size of the gift or whether the company in question is a national or a multinational enterprise.*
- The global minimum standards require screening of national or multinational companies that have been identified as international campaign targets.*

Most nationally owned and operated companies fall outside the remit of this policy. Therefore, each ActionAid International member country is strongly encouraged to develop its own standards for screening, guided by the principles and direction of this policy. A member country may wish to define additional ethical criteria or exclusions for donations from multinational companies, which are appropriate to its programme of work, cultural and legal contexts. Where one member of the ActionAid International network is raising funds to be spent in one or more other countries, both the funding member and the spending member(s) must comply with the national company fundraising policies of both, as well as with the global minimum standards.

We never accept funding from multinational or national companies operating in any of the following industries whose practices are consistently at odds with our mission and values:

- Industries involved in the extraction of developing countries' natural resources;*
- Armaments industry and industries whose core business is producing and/or selling products or services for military use (i.e. any company that generates more than 10% of its revenue from the industry);*
- Tobacco manufacturing industry;*
- Commercial agricultural input industries; and*
- Pharmaceutical research and development industry.*

Secondly, we will not accept or seek funds from national or multinational companies that are the named and active targets of international campaigns involving at least four ActionAid member countries. Such companies and their subsidiaries are defined as active primary campaign targets. This exclusion is not permanent but applies only for the lifetime of the campaign. The exclusion applies only to named companies and their subsidiaries, not to entire industries or sectors. Any multinational corporation or company belonging to an industry against which we are currently running a multi-country campaign, but which is not itself a named campaign target, is considered a secondary active campaign target. Such a company is not automatically excluded but must be screened.

Companies where we feel uncertainty must be screened for practices violating human rights and environmental standards, and for the reputational risk associated with such violations. A risk-assessment-based screening system has been developed for us by SOMO, a well-respected research institute on corporate ethics. Each instance of poor ethical practice or reputational risk will earn the company a 'high risk' point. Based on the total number of points accumulated, it will be possible to classify the company as low, medium, or high risk.

There are some companies which exemplify excellent human rights and environmental practice in their industries and we would actively encourage fundraisers to pursue

partnerships with these companies. The Policy and Campaign division with the Fundraising division will work to screen industries in order to identify multinational companies who are leading the way in terms of being socially and environmentally responsible. We will then encourage staff across ActionAid to pursue relationships with these companies.”

OXFAM CANADA (Reporting period: 1 April 2009 – 31 March 2010)

“The basis for engagement, as with the nature of engagement, varies significantly among stakeholders. Partner organizations are selected with the greatest rigour, based on a series of criteria that consider their role, relevance, fit and impact. These criteria include:

Impact: Do they have impact beyond their own organization? Are they a key actor at the national, regional, global level? (social, political, economic) Is there a value-added to engagement with Oxfam Canada?

Coherence: Do they have the capacity to contribute to our program? Do they bring a rights-based perspective to their work? Are they organized on democratic principles, with autonomy from political parties or the state? Do they contribute to alignment/coherence within Oxfam International? Is their program content and methodology consistent with Oxfam Canada and Oxfam International? Is there a link with other counterparts and current/historic program?

Match: Do they reflect our political analysis and attitude? Do they have a strong gender analysis or are they receptive to deepening their gender analysis? Do they take HIV/AIDS into consideration or are they open to doing so? Do they have good environmental practice or are they receptive to improving their stewardship? Is there a good match with our program and the role(s) we play? Can they engage in analysis and policy work? Is there a link to Oxfam’s policy, research and learning agenda? Is there a link to policy work with Canadian government?

Resonance: Is there resonance with members, donors and allies? Is there potential media interest? Do we have historic ties? Do they help to strengthen or diversify our supporter base?

Suitability: Do they have a proven track record? (emerging organizations should be linked to networks) Are they rooted in the reality of a constituency to which they are accountable?

Do they have absorptive capacity? Do they have the capacity and systems required to be accountable for reporting on programs and funding? Do they have other funders? (priority given to groups with diversified funding base or have clear plan to diversify funding)

Oxfam Canada, GRI Report April 1 2009 to March 31 2010 9/20 Are they likely to have enduring relevance? Proactive engagement with stakeholders flows from decisions made within the strategic plan (target sectors and actors).

Members are self-selected, with membership open to people over the age of 13, normally resident in Canada, who share Oxfam’s Canada’s vision and support our mission.

Volunteers are selected based on commitment, skills and agreement to respect Oxfam Canada’s ways of working.

Donors are actively solicited from the Canadian public. Oxfam Canada’s Gift Acceptance Policy sets out the issues to be considered in accepting a donation from an individual, corporation or foundation.

Oxfam Canada also solicits and accepts from governmental and institutional fundors. Special consideration is given to accepting program funding from governments that might be seen as belligerent actors in conflict situations.

Engagement with staff is both an institutional commitment and a contractual obligation.

Decisions to engage with governments, at the local, regional, national or international level, are made based on an analysis of the opportunity to exert influence on priority issues and the risks that arise from doing so.

Oxfam also engages with women and men, girls and boys living in poverty. This engagement arises from the circumstances of the programs we support and our role and that of our partners, and flows largely from the decisions made with respect to the partners with which we collaborate.”

“NGO1: Involvement of affected stakeholder groups in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs.”

ACTIONAID (Reporting period January – December 2010)

“ActionAid International has policies and practices ensuring stakeholder involvement at various levels of policy-making and programming as this is critical to its understanding and perception of how to reach its development goals and objectives. ActionAid International has multiple accountabilities – to the poor and excluded people and groups we work with, supporters, volunteers, partners, donors, governments, staff and trustees. ALPS sets out the key accountability requirements, guidelines and processes of the organisation not only in terms of organisational processes for planning, monitoring, strategy formulation, learning, reviews and audit, but also for personal attitudes and behaviours. (See more information on ALPS: <http://www.actionaid.org/who-we-are/how-we-work/transparency>)

ActionAid's organisational processes and planning cycles are designed to increase the influence of poor and excluded people on ActionAid's work. Plans, budgets and strategies at the grassroots level are developed with poor and excluded people. These help determine country strategies, which in turn influence the overall ActionAid International strategy.

ActionAid works primarily with and through partners. At the grassroots level, programmes are designed with community involvement at all stages – from the initial appraisal through the five-yearly strategic planning cycle and the annual planning and review cycle. The participatory review and reflection process is a key mechanism promoting the direct involvement of poor and excluded people and other local stakeholders.

Each of the 43 Country Programmes, Affiliates and Associates has its own country strategy, aligned to the global strategy, but developed with its stakeholders every 5-6 years. Annual plans and reviews guide the detail of work. Participatory review and reflections are held annually at the national level to ensure effective involvement and feedback from all stakeholders. External reviews are required at the end of each strategy period. In addition, a peer review of each country by a team composed of trustees and staff from across the larger ActionAid International federation is organised to learn and comment on consistency with ActionAid International's shared core strategies and policies.

ActionAid International's work is guided by an international strategy which is agreed collectively every 5-6 years. It is supported by an International Secretariat made up of regions, functions and themes. Each of these has strategic plans that explain how each unit works to support the strategy. International campaigns also have strategic plans and external reviews. Each of these units has an annual review and planning cycle within which participatory review and reflections play a central role. An external review of the whole of ActionAid International is required every five years. (This system was reviewed and simplified in 2010, but changes are only effective from 2011).

Audits and climate surveys are carried out periodically to provide additional insights into the health of the organisation and its various parts. Governance reviews on the performance of Boards are also carried out by Affiliates and ActionAid International.

How are decisions and decision-making processes communicated to stakeholders?

Stakeholders are informed at various levels through a variety of channels: reports, workshops, meetings, social audits (at local, district/regional and national level), community newsletters, child sponsorship letters, annual general meetings, community

billboards and notices, amongst others. In most countries, communities and partners also take part in decision making through participatory planning and budgeting and/or participatory reviews and reflections. What information has to be shared is set out in our Open Information Policy, which forms part of ALPS.

How did feedback from stakeholders affect the decision-making process or reshape policies and procedures?

Feedback received from stakeholders, particularly during participatory review and reflection sessions, is used for monitoring and adjusting programme plans. This process ensures accountability to the rights holders and to other stakeholders and donors. Further, throughout planning and implementation, there is regular engagement with stakeholders, for example coalition partners. These processes take place in each member country as well as in each unit of the International Secretariat and form the basis of our annual planning and programming. It is impossible to list here these processes from each country and unit. However, annual reports are available for each of these from our website, which will provide an insight to how some policies or procedures have been influenced.

Some examples from 2010:

- The external review of the whole organisation and international strategy, *Taking Stock 3*, which involved external reviewers evaluating ActionAid International's work over the past five years, included many discussions with stakeholders across the globe. The results of this review are reported in a number of review reports, available on the website. Additionally, the results of the consultations with stakeholders have been considered and taken into account in the formation of the new international strategy. ActionAid country teams organised two strategy days during October and December 2010, in which partners and communities came together and were asked to engage with the results of the evaluation, and give input to the future strategy. They provided input in relation to the strengths and weaknesses of ActionAid International work. They also discussed what they felt ActionAid should be working on in the future, from the local to the international level, and "how we work". A summary of the insights from these consultations were compiled, drawing on feedback from countries including Somaliland, Pakistan, Ghana, Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania, Myanmar, Cambodia and China. This information was shared with the Strategy Drafting team and other ActionAid colleagues to help inform decision making around ActionAid International's strategy for 2012-2017. This was an unprecedented attempt to involve the communities we work with around the world to be able to influence and shape the organisation as a whole.
- Our review on our work on HIV and AIDS in 2010 constituted a major form of feedback from stakeholders and resulted in our continued strong emphasis on the use of the STAR (Societies Tackling AIDS through Rights) approach in HIV and AIDS programmes.
- The review of Just and Democratic Governance theme work – the external Review of the Implementation of the Strategic plan Just and Democratic Governance 2006-2010 – was conducted by one Asia expert, Mr Tran Dac Loi, and an Africa expert, Ms Ashanut Okille. The review mission employed both horizontal and vertical approaches. Key stakeholders were involved in both.

The horizontal approach looked at the context of governance and role relevance of ActionAid International in promoting a rights-based approach, people-centred approach and working through the lens of governance. Its primary methodology for this was a review of documents and discussions with relevant stakeholders. The interviews with stakeholders

obtained their assessments and visions about the specific contribution of the Just and Democratic Governance theme to a rights-based approach and had the purpose of promoting accountability about the Governance Review and the ActionAid International governance work. Specifically, the reviewers participated in meetings in Nepal and Tanzania with external stakeholders such as community representatives, CSOs, NGO network partners, research institutions and members of local governments. They also met with key internal stakeholders such as Asia and Africa Country Directors, Governance Leads, representatives of other thematic groups and Country Programme field staff.

The vertical approach was to review the programmes, partnership lessons and methodologies in specific countries with significant governance work and 'exposure'. The vertical approach entailed both a survey and participatory review and reflections. For this purpose, four Country Programmes with significant governance exposure were selected through a purposive sample: Nepal and Cambodia in Asia, and Nigeria and Uganda in Africa. Field trips took place in the four countries to meet the countries' programme staff, and with external stakeholders such as partner organisations, women's organisations and people of local communities, in order to understand and assess the work on the ground and to promote accountability about the review and the governance work.

- One major focus for 2010 was our work on accountability. Six country programmes are collaborating with the Institute of Development Studies on 're-imaging accountability', which seeks to document our best accountability practices and advance a new-generation concept of accountability. Several other countries are part of an initiative within the human security theme to integrate accountability requirements. Research took place in six countries, which led to a workshop to which partners and staff were invited from each country to discuss how we should conceptualise and follow through on our accountability requirements. This led to recommendations for a revision of ALPS and it provided recommendations for the new international strategy, which have been included in the new draft strategy 2012-2017. The newly established internal Child and Youth Support Group is examining ways of improving our accountability to children. A monitoring and evaluation task force established at the end of 2009 managed to develop recommendations to strengthen our monitoring and evaluation system to improve our accountability to all stakeholders. The recommendations to the International Directors were approved and decided to be implemented over a period of two years, aligning with the process of the development of the international strategy. The new M&E requirements will see improved accountability in the form of participatory baselines and indicators, monitoring frameworks aligned to the international strategy, better methods for counting the numbers of people we reach and a better information gathering system to help us do so and to provide better overview of programmes. This will also enable us to make better linkages across programmes and enable local rights programmes to link up with national and international campaign and policy work.*

- At Local Rights Programme level (locally in countries) up to national level, this example can be drawn from Pakistan: a review took place a Local Rights Programme level, where rights holders and communities as well as partners were involved. The review pointed to a lack of focus in the work. Overall, ActionAid Pakistan had a national country strategy focussing on six thematic areas. Each Local Rights Programme had to focus on each of these six thematic areas. This led to lack of focus. The feedback from the communities and partners was rather to focus attention on two or three thematic areas of importance in the local context. As a result, there is now more focus in each Local Rights Programme for issues of major concern and priority as identified by the communities and partners together with ActionAid Pakistan. Accordingly, the plans and*

budgets for 2011 were adjusted. In addition to this, there has been an improved framework for how to work with policy and advocacy, by ensuring better coordination and integration of local and national policy and campaigning initiatives. This means more focussed work is being done locally, on issues of local relevance, and nationally, bringing relevant information and policy issues to the fore.

Additional documents for more information:

Open Information Policy: see page 34 of ALPS:

<http://www.actionaid.org/who-we-are/how-we-work/transparency>

ALPS: <http://www.actionaid.org/who-we-are/how-we-work/transparency>

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: Calendar Year 2010)

“As a founding member of the INGO Accountability Charter and a contributor to the development of the GRI NGO Sector supplement, we recognize the continuous need to improve and promote our accountability mechanisms to all of our stakeholders. But more specifically, we would identify primary stakeholders as those individuals at risk of grave human rights violations anywhere in the world and strive to include them at every stage of our work and across every part of the organization.

Several steps have been taken towards this. For example, our six-year Integrated Strategic Plan (“ISP”, see 2.2 above) is the result of extensive consultations with our members, partners and independent experts. A general public online survey was also developed as a way to encourage views from the general public. At the heart of the ISP is our aim to empowerment of right holders whose rights are challenged and strengthen the human rights movement. Moreover, one the ISP’s main priority is to develop ‘active participation’ and participatory methods for research and action to ensure wider inclusion of stakeholders as well as improved effectiveness and impact.

From our global strategy down to an individual project level, we try to involve stakeholders at every stage of the project cycle, from situation analysis to setting indicators to reporting on results. The International Secretariat project management methodology encourages all staff to conduct participatory exercises with affected stakeholder groups, at the planning stage of a project, during periodic organisational review times and during evaluation exercises. Partners, and communities we work with are consulted on plans, and involved in reviews and evaluations we carry out. This can vary from consultation to participative processes. During the “StopViolence Against Women” Campaign, which was completed in 2010 we found it difficult to bring partners and stakeholders together to give time to reflect on our work with us despite concerted efforts. This and other organisational directions have given rise to a project on active participation, which is developing more inclusive and effective approaches and tools for engagement with stakeholders.

We have also developed qualitative methods for assessing impact placing constituency voices at the centre of such assessment. There are many different research methods by which to assess impact. Given our core values and our vision and mission, which value people’s experience and the change we deliver for individuals, our key method is ‘stakeholder engagement’. This research method involves the gathering of stakeholders’ perspectives. For this method to produce reliable results, we always try to include the widest possible range of affected stakeholders. As a matter of principle, evaluation and impact assessment findings are shared with those who took part, and are affected by the issue concerned. Additionally, where possible, feedback is sought from stakeholders to strengthen the learning exercise. This process also helps us articulate concrete and grounded lessons from multiple dimensions of a project. Action plans based on the findings and recommendations are developed so that the learning derived can influence future projects. All the information enables us to make improvements to its projects and programmes of work on a regular basis and in the longer-term helps guide the organization’s priorities and use of

resources. We strive to share the findings and extensively disseminate evaluations of major global campaigns to key stakeholders, partners, and those we individuals and communities involved in the projects, we also post evaluation reports on the international website. The results of the evaluation of the "Stop Violence Against Women" Campaign can be found at <http://www.amnesty.org/en/review-stop-violence-against-women-campaign>.

“NGO2: Mechanisms for feedback and complaints in relation to programmes and policies and for determining actions to take in response to breaches of policies.”

ACTIONAID (Reporting period: January – December 2009)

“A new way that we ensure accountability is through our complaints mechanism, which we introduced in 2008 following a recommendation made in a review by One World Trust. For detailed information on feedback and complaints principles and procedures, please go to the “Complaints and Response Mechanism Framework”:

<http://www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf/Complaints%20mechanism%20and%20Policy.pdf>.

Having a well-designed and well-managed mechanism for handling external complaints can improve the quality of our work, enhance the trust and confidence of our stakeholders, identify areas of our work which need to be improved and ensure that ActionAid learns from the feedback provided through this process. ActionAid therefore welcomes feedback and will react constructively to complaints from the people it works with, its supporters/ donors, the general public, official bodies and its partners.

The complaints and response mechanism links to the principles of ALPS and will ensure feedback, transparency and learning which will strengthen our accountability as an organisation.

ActionAid's complaints and response mechanism needs to be transparent and independent. In very serious cases a complaint may require a national board of trustees or the international board to investigate and respond. The national board of a country also has a role in overseeing the number of complaints received by ActionAid and ensuring that they have been handled satisfactorily and that corrective action has been taken.

In terms of monitoring compliance with policies, we have an assurance policy, supported by a reporting tool, which requires each affiliate chair and director to officially sign off each year on the degree of compliance with all AAI policies. In addition we have an internal audit function, an affiliate review process, and a peer review mechanism, all of which provide for reviewing of compliance of members with policies.

The following example of the use of the complaints mechanism in the UK illustrates our experience of using this mechanism to strengthen accountability to supporters.

Some 161,200 people in the UK support our work through donations, fundraising, campaigning or volunteering each year. In 2009, the first full year of our complaints mechanism, we received 697 complaints, 87% from these supporters. More than half (58%) of these were in relation to our fundraising activities. Other complaints related to our campaigning work (3%), our policies (26%) and programme administration (13%). We responded to all these complaints, trying our best to resolve each complaint within six weeks.

There were 93 complaints about our international work, the majority of which related to the timeliness and quality of the feedback we provide to sponsors on a child's progress. Such complaints require response from countries, which in some cases proved difficult to secure in a timely fashion, risking funding as well as our good reputation. Two things that have changed following these complaints are as follows:

- We received complaints from supporters who thought the use of a folder to hold all the material together in a donor appeal was wasteful. We have since stopped this practice.*

- *Following complaints about the use of a plastic card within the 'Who Pays' supermarket campaign pack, we have used only recycled materials in subsequent mailings.*

AAI also has a whistle blowing policy, developed in 2008. This policy applies to all staff of ActionAid and those of partner organisations who are in a long-term (over one year) relationship with ActionAid. The policy covers the responsibility to report wrongful acts committed by staff of ActionAid and those of partner organisations. Wrongful acts in this sense are described as financial and procedural malpractice including those relating to mismanagement, misappropriation of funds, actual or suspected fraud or abuse of authority. Under this policy, it will be a disciplinary matter if a genuine whistleblower were to be victimised. While the policy does not specifically cover ex-employees of the organisation, reports received from ex-employees will be considered for investigation.

For more information on the whistle blowing policy of AAI, please go to: [http://www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf/Whistle%20Blowing%20Policy%20FINAL%20\(June%202008\).pdf](http://www.actionaid.org/assets/pdf/Whistle%20Blowing%20Policy%20FINAL%20(June%202008).pdf)

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 May 2009 - 31 March 2010)

"Our complaints policy sets out our overall approach to feedback and complaints (http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/accounts/downloads/oxfamgb_complaints_policy.pdf). In Great Britain we report on the number of complaints by calendar year. The breakdown in numbers of complaints is found in our Accountability Report, at pages 11-12. See also Indicator 18 below. In our international program we do not have aggregated data, but the Complaints Policy has been widely communicated. Although implementation remains patchy, we can report an increasing number of cases where feedback and complaints mechanisms are working well in our humanitarian response programs. In the Philippines and Haiti, for example, we are encouraging people in the communities we are working with to give us feedback by ringing freephone numbers. Calls are then logged, analysed and followed up. This information enables us to make improvements to our programme on an ongoing basis, and the learning gathered in Haiti is being shared widely across the sector. In the Philippines the response to Hurricane Ketsana made good use of complaints reporting by mobile phone.

We operate a global whistle-blowing policy, and have safeguards for complainants. Serious complaints may be escalated to the Chief Executive or Trustees. Otherwise each complaint is dealt with by the relevant department, unless the complaint is addressed to the Trustees or The Chief Executive or the Company Secretary, in which case they decide how the complaint is dealt with, consistent with the Policy. This still usually is dealt with by the relevant department. The complaints in Great Britain are monitored by the Head of Supporter Relations, who reports on them to the Corporate Management Team, and for Trading the complaints are monitored by the Shop Support Team. Although The Complaints Policy recognises the potential for vexatious complaints, none were reported to the Company Secretary in the year and no finding of vexatiousness was made.

As noted above, we do not yet have the processes in place to obtain accurate information at a central level about complaints and feedback in our international programmes, and we recognise that we have a long way to go to embed effective procedures. Complaints and feedback have been an important dimension of good development practice for Oxfam for many years.

As noted above, in our humanitarian work there was a marked improvement in our ability to deal with complaints, as evidenced by our Haiti and Philippines responses. However, complaints systems across the full breadth of our programming remain inconsistent, and this

is an important area for the future. Many countries have feedback and response mechanisms in place. However, we need to ensure that these mechanisms are effective for the people we work with, and that there is a system in place to centrally monitor the serious complaints that are made against and/or by our staff. We recognise that by not having a central monitoring system it is difficult, as an organisation, to measure trends, or change policy and practice on a global basis where necessary. Therefore, setting this up will be an important part of our accountability work next year.

All programme monitoring and evaluations aim to take partners' views into account; this includes the Real Time Evaluations, which are carried out in all major humanitarian responses. This feedback informs the ongoing delivery of humanitarian programs and also contributes to wider organisational thinking about future strategies and priorities. Based on a pilot in 2008 in a number of countries, we are now building partner feedback into the annual performance appraisals of programme staff. All regions will now ask partners for feedback on the performance of Oxfam staff, and partner views will regularly be solicited as part of '360 degree feedback' for programme staff. For example, in Middle East, Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States (MEEECIS) region, all staff were asked to include a partner in their requests for feedback. In East Asia region, most Country Directors championed the process (of obtaining feedback from partners) and found it valuable. While most partners did offer useful feedback, a significant number appeared to find it difficult to give critical feedback about Oxfam staff, preferring to make only positive comments."

“NGO3: Systems for program monitoring, evaluation and learning (including measuring program effectiveness and impact), resulting changes to programs, and how they are communicated.”

OXFAM INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: 1 April 2009 – 31 March 2010)

“We have in place a number of systems for monitoring and evaluating our development programs, including a Program Evaluation Policy; Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Principles and the Program Standards, mentioned above, which signals participatory, evidence-based learning as essential to improve our work and to demonstrate results (Program Standard #10).

For the first time in our history, we have agreed to use three common measures of success in measuring the quality of our program work: 1. Adherence to program standards (in a reference to program quality); 2. Sustainable changes in people’s lives and enjoyment of basic human rights; and 3. Effective relationships based on accountability, transparency and openness. The methodologies to be able to report on these measures will be phased in over time starting in 2011. The first measure will be used in all of Oxfam’s program countries and will be determined through a self-assessment tool, with a built-in improvement mechanism for follow up. We are encouraging program staff to invite partners and other stakeholders to be involved in the process. The second measure will be assessed through case study methodology, in 12 sites across the globe, with agreed common steps to facilitate learning between Affiliates and information for decision-makers. The third measure will be included in the self-assessment tool, with the purpose of promoting an attitude and practice among staff toward greater accountability, transparency and openness, while also including key questions in the case studies, to ensure an external perspective on this key measure. Further, we are currently developing plans for an accountability community of practice to gather the information about current field practices around accountability and prepare a resource to enable country field staff to take additional steps. The Executive Directors Group will now have brief updates on the above measures as a permanent item in the agenda for their bi-annual meetings.

The Single Management Structure also outlines monitoring, evaluation and learning responsibilities. Currently, we are working to establish support systems and put resources in place to begin this work in 2011. The findings generated from these systems will be submitted to the PDG (Program Development Group), a senior leadership group within Oxfam. Within our advocacy and campaigns work, we have developed a draft “Oxfam Approach to Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Campaigns/Advocacy”, built on practice and review from the last 20 months. This draft will be trialed this year. It has already been shared with external colleagues (including through presentations at the European Evaluation Society and the American Evaluation Association annual respective conferences) for feedback. Plans to share the approach with other International NGOs who struggle with this complex evaluation challenge are currently in formation.

Within our humanitarian work, we use a Real Time Evaluation tool (developed from internationally accepted benchmarks for good practice) in the context of rapid on-set evaluations to assess our effectiveness. In 2010, a major meta-evaluation of Real Time Evaluations from 2007-2009 was carried out, identifying key challenges and action points moving forward. We are also planning an impact evaluation of our response to the Tsunami 6 years on.”

“NGO5: Processes to formulate, communicate, implement and change advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns. Identify how the organization ensures consistency, fairness and accuracy.”

OXFAM INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: 1 April 2009 – 31 March 2010)

“Process for arriving at public policy awareness and advocacy positions

- *Each priority campaign has a policy lead that coordinates a multi-Affiliate policy team. The policy lead or a team member leads the policy team in consulting, discussing and proposing positions that come up in the course of campaign development, planning or implementation. Depending on the issue, policy development or assessments may draw on research, input from field staff, analysis by internal policy leads or issues experts, policy positions of colleague organizations and consultations with other external stakeholders. Extensive discussion takes place by email and/or teleconference and a proposed policy is drawn up that reflects the discussions and inputs.*
- *The policy proposition goes to the Oxfam International Advocacy and Campaigns Director for approval, who considers elements of quality, coherence with existing policies and tone, sensitivities with stakeholders and targets, consistency with values, and brand risk. If the policy is completely new, or pertaining to a particularly sensitive topic, a policy sign off group consisting of all Affiliate advocacy directors will be required to give approval. If the policy raises sensitivities for a particular location, the relevant Affiliate or field office will give approval.*
- *Strategic top-line policy issues, and areas of conflict, such as engagement on the Middle East, are elevated to the Executive Directors and/or Board.*

Ensuring consistency during implementation

We have developed extensive “sign off” protocols that are applied across public policy materials and campaign activities to ensure coherence throughout planning and implementation. All key strategies and plans are signed off at senior staff levels and staff are held accountable to abiding by agreed policy, signed off plans and Oxfam’s principles. Criteria and processes for the various kinds of materials are contained in the Policy Sign Off Handbook.

Fair and accurate public criticisms

Oxfam is committed to fair and accurate criticism. The quality control and brand risk management exercised in the public policy, campaigns and media sign off protocols provide checks on accuracy and fairness. Campaigns that criticize companies or governments may be required to be vetted by our lawyers and campaign targets given advance notice and right of reply. In 2010, Oxfam apologized to the Government of Saudi Arabia for an incident at the UNFCCC Intercessional in Bonn. Subsequently the Board adopted a Code of Conduct for staff at Campaign Events which addresses public criticisms at the individual staff level.

Process for corrective adjustment of advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns

This process for policy is largely the same as the process for arriving at public policy awareness and advocacy positions. Policy teams raise concerns, consult as needed, and re-formulate policy that is then approved by the policy lead and advocacy director, going to the policy sign off group if necessary because the shift implied is fundamental.

Adjustments to campaigns are made more organically through periodic campaigns management team meetings where progress is assessed and corrections may be proposed or agreed. This often includes discussion of stakeholder relationships and may draw on partner or ally input. Where a significant or sensitive course of direction is implied, the campaign lead raises this with the Oxfam International Advocacy and Campaigns Director for

approval, who in turn may take it to the Oxfam Campaigns Group (a senior management multi-Affiliate team that oversees campaigns) if necessary because the shift implied is fundamental.

Corrective actions taken - examples

Climate change policy:

- We shifted our policy from calling for a 2 degrees emissions target to calling for a 1.5 degrees target. This was to reflect new findings and to support allies and the LDC position on this issue.
- We shifted our policy from opposing World Bank climate investment funds to, once they existed, stipulating how they could be managed more accountably.

Essential Services policy:

- We shifted our position from supporting the World Bank's role in managing the education Fast Track Initiative to calling for it to be removed from Bank auspices.

Essential Services campaign:

- We shifted emphasis from quantity of aid to quality of aid in light of aid environment.
- We increased focus on financial crisis issues, given its impact on poor countries and on aid.
- We shifted energy to more national level campaigning, and away from big global events in recognition of growing importance of national lobby.

Cross-campaigns:

- We increased investment in the BRIC countries and G20 due to changing external environment
- We increased investment in digital campaigning due to same

Publication of public awareness and advocacy positions

Positions are sometimes published on the Secretariat and Affiliate websites. However, generally they remain internal, appearing in abbreviated form in public policy materials (briefing notes, briefing papers, campaign reports, lobby letters, technical notes, and media notes) that contain broader content.

Process for exiting a campaign

We have asserted principles that exiting a campaign should be preceded by: clarity of timeline for achievement of objectives, an exit strategy built into original plan, clear communication of this, advance notice to partners and allies and a clear plan for campaign sustainability (i.e., ensuring Oxfam's absence does not permanently damage the campaign because Oxfam is supporting others to carry forward the next stage). However, the principles have not been mapped into a systematic process and practice.

Process to formulate, communicate and implement

Formulation: see above (Process for arriving at public policy awareness and advocacy positions). Communicate: internally via list serves; externally within public policy materials that are distributed to targets and allies and that are published on the Secretariat and Affiliate websites; use of media, events and popular mobilization; sharing through NGO networks via list serves and meetings."

PLAN (Reporting period: 1 July 2009 – 30 June 2010)

"As mentioned in section 2.2 above, Plan has been running two global campaigns; Learn Without Fear (LWF) the campaign to stop violence against children in schools, and Universal Birth Registration (UBR), the campaign to ensure every newborn is registered at birth. Each is underpinned by program work and policy positions to give authority and credibility to our messages and we use research to make sure we are also advocating best practice at global, regional, national and local levels.

We also publish what we aim to achieve, so that we can be held accountable. Our bespoke monitoring and evaluation exercise for LWF each year measures how far we have progressed against what we (publically) promised to deliver – see LWF launch report 2008 for the call to action, setting out our asks, but also our promises and responsibilities to our constituents at <http://plan-international.org/learnwithoutfear/resources/publications/campaign-report>

Plan's practice to date is to be relatively purist in order to create the best advocacy campaigns, which are a concerted effort to make positive changes for children. Child rights violations are raised from grassroots level via a very wide consultative process and distilling of issues that involve all stakeholders including children, parents, community leaders and local authorities as appropriate. We then also add program experience in order to derive a draft position and consult widely on this draft, to garner a range of opinions and include a variety of expertise. Policies and positions are then sent to a Leadership Team composed of senior Directors and the Deputy CEO who consider the content, risk and quality before approving or suggesting amendments. This is then communicated Plan-wide through internal communications systems to ensure consistency of approach and messaging.

In terms of the public awareness aspect, each national office has a devolved but similar system of consultation with all stakeholders in order to run public awareness campaigns enabling the empowerment and participation of children and the communities we work in, in order to address their issues. We have a focal point in each country for each campaign, so that the view of each country is reflected in our decisions, vision and goals at global level. We use a variety of research methods in order to substantiate our messages, or for accuracy or to ensure we are operating at a good level of best practice. These include global work e.g. commissions by the Overseas Development Institute, opinion polling at national level and questionnaires with individual children to give them a voice.

Our processes of Plan-wide consultation will lead to a strategy at global level, but with each regional office making a regional plan that contributes to the global strategy and each country office making a national plan.

If reactive opportunities arise, these are assessed according to criteria e.g. is there the opportunity to push forward the campaign agenda, make a positive policy change, according to capacity and resources. But also, for corrective measures, if new evidence arises, we will correct our policies/positions, and we do benchmark against others, e.g. using the Keeping Children Safe coalition work in mind when we work on child protection issues.

Short policy papers are also written collectively, capturing Plan's program level experience and practice, according to priority need, so that we advocate with credibility.

This means that program colleagues, who work on a daily basis with children and communities, are reflecting situations, needs and rights abuses when they are consulted about campaign issues and plans, parents, teachers, CBOs, CSO and a whole host of stakeholders can also be included in this way.

We also have an independent risk register for campaign work, so policies stemming from campaigns will have an additional check /control system in place.

The design of the above global campaigns allow for a great degree of adjustment as we have seen many gains through our advocacy work, and parameters within policy are adjusted accordingly. For example, as part of the universal birth registration campaign, Plan was

advocating for legislation to enable children to be registered as freely and as easily as possible. When legislative changes were achieved, we adjusted policy in the countries where this was appropriate, for example, shifting our asks to calling for the end to gender discrimination in many countries where women are not permitted to register children without the ‘father’. This is one area of policy work that is in development now.

Most shorter positions are for internal use, for example to guide program, advocacy and communications work. A few are published on line. For Learn Without Fear, however, we have had sufficient budget to publish and distribute substantial reports on violence against children in schools. Our groundbreaking piece of work – Prevention Pays – showed that it was cheaper economically and socially to prevent violence in schools than to pay for the consequences.

As Plan is relatively new at campaigning, we have not yet finalised this process. However, it will have the principles of sustaining the work through programs where it is still needed and does not put children in jeopardy when we withdraw. There will be responsible timelines and good planning with advance notice to partners. This is likely to commence next year.

In addition, once a position or campaign is arrived at, each country program team takes responsibility to communicate according to their contexts, cultures and needs.

Plan’s global campaigns complement other decentralised advocacy efforts addressing further areas that also respond to local situations analysed in the Country Strategic Planning process (see NGO1 above). This includes working with national alliances, civil society organisations, media agencies, community-based organisations and communities and children in changing the political agendas and public policies in favour of children’s rights. Plan also works in partnership at the regional level. For example, during FY2010 Plan held the regional secretariat for the Latin American and Caribbean Chapter of the Global Movement for Children which promoted policy changes and lobbied for the implementation of the recommendations of the UN Study on Violence against Children.”

“NGO6: Processes to take into account and coordinate with the activities of other actors. How do you ensure that your organization is not duplicating efforts?”

OXFAM INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: 1 April 2009 – 31 March 2010)

“Humanitarian

The Secretariat plays a key role in facilitating information sharing between the Affiliates. With the current transition to the Single Management Structure, the focus on coordination has never been more relevant. Indeed, more effective and efficient coordination is one of the main drivers behind the Single Management process underway.

All Oxfam humanitarian responses are coordinated under the management of the Humanitarian Consortium Management Group (HCMG). The HCMG consists of selected Affiliates working together to provide strategic steer and complementary support to Oxfam’s humanitarian work. The Humanitarian Consortium is responsible for ensuring the quality of Oxfam’s humanitarian responses. In every big emergency, four to six weeks into the response, an Oxfam Real Time Evaluation takes place, during which an evaluation team (with members from different Affiliates and the Secretariat) visits the affected area and makes recommendations on how to improve the response. Coordination between the different Affiliates is always part of such an evaluation exercise.

Information is shared through the Emergency Managers Network, a supportive virtual community of practitioners working under the Humanitarian Consortium Management Team to prepare Affiliates for an efficient humanitarian response. Each Affiliate is a member of this network. The role of this group includes coordinating and sharing information amongst Affiliates on thematic and cross-cutting issues (including on Oxfam’s core- competency areas of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene and Emergency Food Security and Vulnerable Livelihoods), and promoting minimum standards of programming in these areas.

During an emergency, we take a coordinated approach to external representation, such as coordination with other international agencies involved in the country, including through the UN cluster system and other coordination forums as appropriate. Affiliates have separate funding functions and usually make proposals unilaterally. In emergency situations, this has led to different Affiliates unknowingly approaching the same donor, which can have a negative impact on the donor’s perception of Oxfam. As a result, we are now looking at ways to better coordinate contacts with donors. In addition, we are adapting our ways of working to comply with an increased number of requests from institutional donors to deliver joint proposals.

The Oxfam Contract for Humanitarian Action recognizes the importance of other actors, not only in terms of coordination, but also in terms of advocating for these actors to uphold their obligations. Oxfam is a member of the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR) and a party to other strategic alliances with humanitarian actors. We strive to use this forum to improve and enrich international humanitarian response, and have committed ourselves to active contact with other key players working in emergencies, including the United Nations in order to facilitate coordination in humanitarian responses and to influence the policies and practices of others.

Oxfam recognizes that other organizations are better placed to deliver certain services, and aims to become world class in the competency areas in which it has built up specific areas of expertise and institutional capacity: particularly Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and Emergency Food Security and Vulnerable Livelihoods (EFSVL). Wherever possible, Oxfam works through local partner organizations and with affected communities. We seek to build

the capacity of partners and communities to respond to future disasters, and to involve affected communities in designing, monitoring and implementing emergency response work. We work with more than 3,000 partners in over 100 countries. We recognize that the different approaches of Affiliates towards partnership working can be challenging for partners, especially when they are dealing with more than one Affiliate at the same time. To address these challenges, we have developed a Partnership Policy which encourages Affiliates to harmonize their ways of working. Oxfam is also a signatory to the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief, as well as aspiring to deliver humanitarian aid in compliance with the Sphere Minimum Standards.

In spite of all the mechanisms, procedures and agreements between Affiliates that are in place, coordination during recent emergencies has been challenging. In Haiti, four different Affiliates are implementing emergency activities and two others have contributed substantial funds. A governing framework has been put in place to ensure accurate management of the response, including the funding, but this agreement has not fulfilled its role, especially in the first six months of the response, when there was a lack in mutual accountability and Affiliates were unable to produce a joint strategy. In Pakistan, procedures and agreements were respected, but the two responding Affiliates chose to go their own way (to different geographical areas) which resulted in very different response strategies and some confusion among donors, local government and beneficiaries. As a result of the some of these challenges, we are looking at ways of strengthening the role of the HCMG as the main body responsible for management of emergency responses within Oxfam.

Advocacy

Oxfam does not have a system in place to minimise duplication. However, it participates in a number of alliances (informal and formal) and listservs around which there is constant communication and coordination around advocacy, campaigns and research. As participants in these groups, we learn of others' efforts in certain advocacy and campaigning areas and that informs where we decide to focus our efforts to ensure complementarities.

Long-term Development Assistance

We do not currently have any formal requirements to coordinate with other agencies in our programming but do actively encourage sharing of proposals and plans with other like minded organisations. Consultants participating in programme evaluations often draw our attention to the work of other organisations who may be involved in similar activities or partners. In gender work coordination with organisation and alliances promoting rights of women is a high priority for this year, for example in work with the AWID (Association of Women in Development). Aid and development effectiveness is a high priority and we are actively engaged with other International NGOs (Care, World Vision, YMCA and the other agencies who have signed the Accountability Charter) to coordinate our efforts in connecting advocacy on these issues to our internal learning and accountability standards and practice. We are actively involved in Berlin Civil Society Centre activities that support such coordination efforts across our organisations.”

PLAN (Reporting period: 1 July 2009 – 30 June 2010)

“The development of a Country Strategic Plan (a key step in the PALS cycle) is key to Plan’s work in each of its 48 program countries. The PALS guidelines explain that these strategic choices, and the reasoning behind them, need to be explicit and should show how Plan will position itself in relation to the wider development context and to relevant frameworks such as national Poverty Reduction Strategies, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

This builds on a situation analysis that specifically requests countries to not only look at the child rights situation, to do an analysis of the responsibilities of duty bearers in fulfilling these rights and review trends over time, but also to specifically review:

Interventions

- *Where are the key gaps in the work being done to realise child rights?*
- *How are relevant organisations (government, civil society) working towards the realisation of child rights?*
- *How does Plan fit into this picture? Who are Plan's key partners (government, international and local NGOs, community based organisations) at different levels and how effective are these relationships?*
- *What are Plan's strengths/weaknesses?*
- *Which groups of children are Plan currently working with and why?*

In the area of Disaster Risk Management Plan's Disaster Risk Management Strategy 2009-2013 includes eleven outcomes that Plan will work towards.

Outcome #11 is 'Plan extends impact and builds profile by working collaboratively or in partnership with others'. The key indicators identified for this outcome are:

- *Number of disaster risk management initiatives carried out with other organisations.*
- *Extent of involvement in relevant networks, cluster working groups and associations.*
- *Number of countries in which Plan is involved in national disaster coordination groups.*

During the reporting period, examples in the area of disaster risk management following the earthquake in Haiti include:

- *Plan engaged with in-country coordination mechanisms initiated by the government and cluster systems initiated by UN.*
- *Plan considers information sharing as one of the key building blocks of cooperation and coordination. We provided updates and inputs to the International Council of Voluntary Agencies, an umbrella body of NGOs. ICVA put concerted efforts to improve coordination and cooperation in Haiti.*
- *The Post Disaster Needs Assessment initiative was conducted jointly done by Plan, Save the Children and UNICEF. The spirit of this process was cooperation and the guiding force was to amplify children's voices and opinions in recovery efforts.*
- *Plan also participated in the Inter Agency Standing Committee reference Group on mental health and psychosocial support in emergencies. Plan attended all conference calls and meetings of this reference group. This Reference Group produced Haiti earthquake / context specific guidelines on psychosocial issues (based on IASC TASK FORCE guidelines). This informed the guidelines that the government of Haiti passed later on. Plan's contribution has been acknowledged formally in the guidelines."*

“NGO7: Resource allocation.”

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: 1 January - 31 December 2010)

“Our resource allocation both globally and specifically for Greenpeace International, is contained in the Annual Report. The report for 2010 is due to be published in June 2011. Past Annual reports can be found here:

<http://www.greenpeace.org/international/en/about/reports/>. Draft (pre-audit) figures for Greenpeace International only are provided here.

Expenditure: (All figures EUR '000)	2010	2009
Grants to Greenpeace National Offices	8,524	8,437
Campaigns:		
Oceans	2,508	3,004
Forests	2,869	3,876
GE	1,453	1,773
Toxics	350	689
Climate & Energy	7,252	11,389
Peace & Disarmament	0	46
Media & Communications	6,353	4,571
Marine Operations and Action Support	12,431	8,638
Fundraising-Related Expenditure	2,533	2,831
Organisational Support	7,604	7,843
Interest	203	188
Foreign Exchange Loss	-755	-153
Unassigned	-0	
	-----	-----
Total expenditure	51,326	53,133”

TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: Calendar year 2010)

EXPENDITURE	2010	2009	2008
International Group			
Africa & Middle East	4,660	3,172	1,310
Americas	1,178	777	995
Asia & Pacific	1,599	1,188	735
Europe & Central Asia	2,726	1,916	1,024
	10,163	7,053	4,064
Advocacy Group			
Communications	1,263	977	811
Global Programmes	3,465	3,517	2,147
Policy & Research	1,396	1,085	1,625
Special Projects and other	669	306	377
	6,793	5,885	4,960
Governance & Other	835	1,007	1,613
Total Expenditure	17,790	13,945	10,637
Transfer to designated reserves	237	292	245
Total	18,027	14,237	10,882
Amounts in thousand (€)			

“See Annex 2 IFRS Statements:

www.transparency.ca/Reports/AGM/Files/2010-2011/201108-2010-FS.pdf

Note

The difference between the Statement of Comprehensive Income in the Financial Statements and the above budget report is caused by a deferred income and comprises the "Changes in accrued disbursements". It is explained in the financial statements on page 12, note 3 (b) paragraph 5-6.

In substance, payments to project partners are initially recorded as Receivables under Advances to National Chapters or Coalition Partners, or, if third parties are involved, as Advances to other parties as project outlays. At the same time, Related Donor contributions are not recognised as income until TI-S receives evidence of expenditure in the form of project audit reports, original receipts, or any other proof as required by the relevant contract. Instead, they are reported in the meantime as Liabilities to Donors in the Statement of Financial Position.

Advances to National Chapters, Coalition Partners or other parties, net of the recognisable income for which evidence of expenditure has been received, are recorded as Changes in accrued disbursements (see note 20 and 21).

We are aware that these figures are not as easy to understand as we would like it to be, thus we are seeking ways to present these numbers in a more easily understandable manner to the general public in the public.

Processes on the use of resources:

As an International Secretariat, TI-S conducts most of its activities through its staff while in Berlin or on travel. TI-S financial resources are administered following internal policies, in particular on Procurement, Travel, Personnel costs.

Our Clearance Procedures for the Submission of External Funding Proposals routinely verifies at top management level the consistency of the project with TI's strategic direction, costing practice, available resources as well as compliance with TI-S principles including our Donations Policy

(www.transparency.org/support_us/donate_now/donation_policy_procedure_and_guidelines)

Our salary ranges are published on our website at www.transparency.org/content/download/51164/818583/Salary+Structure+of+TI-S+01+05+07.pdf

The TI-S financial team is composed of 12,13 FTEs, (14 people full and part-time) and exercises controlling, while, since 2008, TI-S's financial accounts are audited following International Financial Reporting Standards, (IFRS) thereby providing explicit and detailed information on the use of our resources. These are available at www.transparency.org/about_us/annual/financial_reports. Individual projects are subject to project audits, as per the requirements of the relevant donors."

“NGO8 Sources of funding by category and five largest donors and monetary value of their contribution.”

CIVICUS (Reporting period: April 2009 – March 2010)

“CIVICUS’ financial year is from January to December every year, and so the financial information available to cover the reporting period covers Jan-Dec 2009 and Jan-Dec 2010.

In the year 2009, our gross income was 3.18 million, consisting of:

- *US\$ 1,677,919: from governments and other public authorities*
- *US\$ 344,300: from trusts and foundations*
- *US\$ 734,427: from non-governmental organisations*
- *US\$ 33,178: from bank interest*
- *US\$ 41,121: from membership fees*
- *US\$ 70,132: from other income (including rental)*
- *US\$ 277,807: from deferred income*

Top 5 donors of income from governments and other public authorities

- *CIDA US\$ 380,735*
- *SIDA US\$ 321,688*
- *Irish Aid US\$ 301,154*
- *EC US\$ 193,354*
- *PATC/Danida US\$ 166,996*

Top 5 donors of income from trusts and foundations

- *Nduna Foundation US\$ 100,000*
- *C.S. Mott Foundation US\$ 80,000*
- *Sasakawa Peace Foundation US\$ 55,000*
- *Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation US\$ 50,929*
- *African Women Development Fund US\$ 30,000*

Top 5 donors of income from non-governmental organisations

- *Oxfam Novib US\$ 343,525*
- *Overseas Development Institute US\$ 265,411*
- *Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations US\$ 56,615*
- *Oxfam GB US\$ 46,488*
- *Christian Aid US\$14,632*

In the year 2010, our gross income was 3.98 million, consisting of:

- *US\$ 2,254,650: from governments and other public authorities*
- *US\$ 511,540: from trusts and foundations*
- *US\$ 350,795: from non-governmental organisations*
- *US\$ 5,582: from bank interest*
- *US\$ 46,413: from membership fees*
- *US\$ 166,174: from other income (including rental)*
- *US\$ 649,003 from deferred income*

Top 5 donors of income from governments and other public authorities

- *SIDA US\$ 796,285*
- *CIDA US\$ 385,166*
- *PATC/DANIDA US\$ 256,691*
- *UNDEF US\$ 250,000*
- *NORAD US\$ 181,056*

Top 5 donors of income from trusts and foundations

- *Nduna Foundation US\$ 202,922*
- *C.S. Mott Foundation US\$ 140,000*
- *Ford Foundation US\$ 100,000*
- *OSI Foundation US\$ 68,618*
- *N/A N/A*

Top 5 donors of income from non-governmental organisations

- *Oxfam NOVIB US\$315,372*
 - *Christian Aid US\$16,151*
 - *Oxfam GB US\$9,500*
 - *IANGO US\$8,000*
 - *N/A N/A“*
-

“EC7: Procedures for local hiring and proportion of senior management hired from the local community at locations of significant operation.”

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 May 2009 - 31 March 2010)

“Local hiring:

We apply the following principles to local hiring. Country programme staff (including our Country Directors, Associate CDs and the Country Leadership Teams) should ideally be representative of the population of those we seek to work with in the country context. This will allow us to reach more effectively, and have greater impact, with the groups of people who we represent. Vacancies should, where context allows, be resourced using local candidates reflecting local culture and context. There may be some exceptions to this, e.g. for security or political reasons or where it is agreed that another cultural perspective would be valuable to the team and/or programme.

Where there exists a knowledge/skills shortage in country, or it proves difficult to source local staff, or if there is an agreed advantage to recruiting non-national staff, then candidates from outside the country should be considered. Ideally these candidates should be sought from within the Region first, both within Oxfam and across the Oxfam affiliates operating in country, and then opened up to a wider global pool.

Regional Centre vacancies should, wherever possible, be filled with staff from within the Region, and be representative of that Region. It is likely that Regional Management Team posts will require international experience.

Country Directors and Associate Country Directors are encouraged to move between countries (both in Region and across Region) to develop their own skills and bring fresh knowledge and experience to the role.

In our recruitment we operate a Positive Action Policy, to the extent that we are legally permitted to do so, and a Diversity Policy. (See: http://www.oxfam.org.uk/get_involved/campaign/climate_change/fag.html.) Members of recruitment panels are expected to attend a training course on 'Recruiting and Selecting a Diverse Workforce'. We do not have an explicit policy of groups or targets for local hiring, but we address under-representation as it exists in different countries where we work, and encourage applications from all communities and backgrounds.

Category	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10
Percentage of our international workforce from non-OECD countries	Over 90%	96.7%	87.5%	93%

The senior levels in our International Division are A-C, where A is the highest grade. We do not have readily accessible statistics on membership of the local community on a global basis, but do monitor whether staff are or are not from OECD countries. Note that Mexico is an OECD country, which explains why the OECD number for Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) is higher than for other Regions outside the UK. Also the administrative centre for the Middle East, Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States (MEEECIS) is in Oxford. The majority of our 64 programme countries are non-OECD. The following table shows the percentage of senior staff (i.e. Levels A-C, where A is the highest) in each region from non-OECD (and therefore programme countries). It includes the International Division Headquarters (IDHQ) based in Oxford, and our UK Poverty Programme. The other acronyms are explained in 2.7 above.

Levels A-C in International Division

Region	N	Y	Unknown	Grand Total	Non-OECD	OECD	Unknown	Estimate non-OECD*
East Asia	57	14	21	92	62.0%	15.2%	22.8%	80.3%
Horn, East and Central Africa	117	43	22	182	64.3%	23.6%	12.1%	73.1%
IDHQ	39	120	4	163	23.9%	73.6%	2.5%	24.5%
LAC	36	43	12	91	39.6%	47.3%	13.2%	45.6%
MEEECIS	36	23	4	63	57.1%	36.5%	6.3%	61.0%
South Asia	62	16	20	98	63.3%	16.3%	20.4%	79.5%
Southern Africa	51	11	12	74	68.9%	14.9%	16.2%	82.3%
UK Poverty Programme	0	17	8	25	0.0%	68.0%	32.0%	0.0%
West Africa	48	22	15	85	56.5%	25.9%	17.6%	68.6%
Grand Total	446	309	118	873	51.1%	35.4%	13.5	59.1

Mexico is an OECD country

“EN16: Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight.”

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: 1 January - 31 December 2010)

“GREENPEACE WORLDWIDE GHG EMISSIONS CO2 equiv. metric tonnes

SCOPE 1: Direct GHG Emissions

- *Direct emissions for marine transportation: 5,948*
- *Direct emissions for inflatables: 163*
- *Direct emissions for helicopter transportation: 67*
- *Direct emissions for natural gas: 329*
- *Direct emissions for vehicles: 806*

Total Scope 1 : 7,313

SCOPE 2: Indirect GHG Emissions – Electricity

- *Indirect emissions for office electricity: 887*

Total Scope: 2 887

SCOPE 3: Other Indirect GHG Emissions

- *Indirect emissions for business travel: 9,699*
- *Indirect emissions for paper consumption: 1,712*

Total Scope 3: 11,411

TOTAL GHG EMISSIONS: 19,611

Notes

1. The emissions methodology and 2009 emission factors are taken from the following resources: <http://www.ghgprotocol.org> .

The GHG Protocol operates under the umbrella of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) and the World Resources Institute (WRI).

<http://www.defra.gov.uk>

<http://www.iea.org>

<http://cfpub.epa.org>

<http://www.edf.org>

2. CO2 equiv. refers to all measurable greenhouse gases including CO2 and CO2 equivalents of CH4 and N2O.”

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 May 2009 - 31 March 2010)

“Table 1: Oxfam’s Carbon footprint in Great Britain in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent

	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10
Car fleet	354	254	290	260
Road freight	233	307	283	472
Work-related own car use	76	182	127	135
Work-related public transport	179	801	173	206
Commuter travel	1,597	1,641	1,439	1,670
Paper use	2,648	1,729	1,352	832
Electricity – shops and warehouses	6,738	5,683	3,506	2,922
Electricity – offices	1,107	517	0	0
Gas – shops and warehouses	523	487	418	326
Gas – offices	232	241	204	130
Waste to landfill – Oxfam House	36	36	47	41
Total	13,723	11,278	7,839	6,994
Percentage reduction on 2006/7		-18%	-43%	-49%

The methodology used is the UK government Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Greenhouse Gases guidelines and conversion factors for company reporting. We do not own or control any generation sources in the UK, and we do not report on small scale generators in programme offices, etc.

Table 2: International flights and freight transport in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent

	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10
<i>Air travel booked in Great Britain – short haul</i>	53	37	28	28
<i>Air travel booked in Great Britain – medium/long haul</i>	2,349	2,391	2,289	2,409
<i>Humanitarian air freight</i>	762	825	496	1,545
Total	3,164	3,253	2,813	3,962

Note: We do not compile data on CO₂ emissions for flights booked outside the UK, from our country offices in the six Regional Centres not based in the UK. This is due to the difficulty in obtaining the data from our 64 separate offices in different countries. However, we attempt to track reductions by using expenditure (for which our Finance systems provide data) as a proxy, see below. The increase in medium/long haul and in air freight in 2009/10 is probably attributable to the Haiti earthquake response.

To monitor flight travel in the international programme, we use expenditure as a proxy indicator. This shows that since 2007 we have reduced overall flight expenditure by 27 per cent. We have not seen significant reductions in prices, as costs (such as fuel surcharges) have increased over the last few years. The reductions have been driven primarily through promoting reduced travel, and by reducing the need for travel by investing in technology.

Table 3: Oxfam air travel in international programme, noting some overlap with Table 2

	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10
Air travel (£'000)	4,659	4,245	4,185	3,324
Percentage decrease vs. 2007		7%	8%	27%
Air travel as % of total expenditure	2.7%	2.2%	2.0%	1.6%

Oxfam GB (Reporting period 1 July 2009 – 30 June 2010)

TONNES CO2e	2006-2007	2009-2010	2010-2011
Scope 1 total	1,235	885	856
Car fleet	354	249	250
Van fleet	132	142	113
Gas	749	493	493
Scope 2 total	8,176	7,958	8,970
Electricity	8,176	7,958	8,970
Scope 3 total	9,391	7,019	7,403
Air travel booked via UK travel agent	2,860	1,753	1,840
Humanitarian air freight	907	1,862	1,586
Paper	3,215	874	1,053
Work related own car use	75	136	133
Work related public transport	198	197	180
Commuter travel	1,598	1,662	1,395
Trading logistics (extended scope in 2010-2011)	366	315	1,074
Waste HQ	171	220	142
TOTAL	18,802	15,862	17,229
Change from 2006 – 2007 baseline year	-	-16%	-8%
Change from 2009-2010	-	-	9%

TONNES CO2e	2006-2007	2009-2010	2010-2011
Comparative emissions (excl. newly reported area of trading logistics)	18,802	15,862	16,470
Change from 2006 - 2007 baseline year	-	-16%	-12%
Change from 2009-2010	-	-	4%

"In 2010/2011, Oxfam GB's operation generated just over 17,000 tonnes CO2e. This includes the emissions associated with new areas for reporting such as donated goods-related transport logistics. On a like for like basis, Oxfam's carbon footprint has decreased by 12% since 2006/2007 however, it has increased by 4% from 2009/2010. This is mainly

explained by higher electricity consumption during the cold winter, higher paper consumption and increased flights partly as a response to the Haiti Earthquake and floods in Pakistan.

In 2010/2011, emissions are reported in CO₂e following Defra and DECC recommendations. For comparability purposes, 2009/2010 data was updated using Defra/DECC's 2010 conversion factors and baseline year data was recalculated using a combination of 2010 and 2009 conversion factors following DECC guidance. The methodology applied this year uses standard conversion factors for electricity bought from the national grid, as recommended by Defra and DECC. This is different from previous years when the benefit of purchasing electricity from renewable sources could be accounted for in emissions calculations. This has affected Oxfam's overall progress, however, Oxfam's purchase of renewable energy helps prevent 4,400 tonnes CO₂e from being released into the atmosphere.

In addition, Oxfam reports on its International Division's passenger air travel as a percentage of expenditure. This expenditure includes all flights booked by the International Division, including flights booked via Oxfam's UK-based travel agent. In 2010/2011, the International Division's passenger air travel represented 1.6% of its total expenditure. This is a 9% decrease from baseline year."

Statistics on International Division flight expenditure in the finance ledgers from 2007	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Air travel (£'000)	4,569	4,245	4,185	3626	4,147
Percentage decrease vs 2007		-7%	-8%	-21%	-9%
Air travel as percentage of total expenditure	2.70%	2.20%	2.00%	1.60%	1.60%

“EN18: Initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reductions achieved.”

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 May 2009 - 31 March 2010)

“Oxfam's international regions have each produced Carbon Reduction Plans, and are now in the process of taking the actions identified in these plans.

In Great Britain investment in energy-efficient lighting and heating has been incorporated into the fitting and refurbishment of new and existing shops.

The IS department's server 'virtualisation' project had resulted in a 20 per cent reduction on server-energy consumption in Oxfam House (headquarters office).

The level of recycling from Oxfam House had risen to 64 per cent by April 2010 from a base of 30 per cent. During 2010, we introduced facilities to compost food waste.

Every Oxfam shop in the UK now has arrangements with contractors for the reuse or recycling of goods that are not of sufficient quality to sell. This has led to a significant reduction of the quantity of waste we send to landfill.

We have implemented a policy stipulating that staff travel by train within the UK and to Eurostar destinations in Europe. This has reduced short-haul flights by 47 per cent. All regional offices now have dedicated video-conferencing facilities that have been used to reduce international and national travel. 'E-learning' tools, including online training modules, are increasingly being used in order to reduce the need for travel.

While it is difficult to attribute causality to all of the emissions, we consider that the reductions in Table 1 at Indicator 10 above are probably a consequence of our initiatives. In Table 2 of Indicator 10 the reduction of short-haul flights is probably a result of the above policy. The long-haul and humanitarian freight depend more on the situations to which we have to respond, particularly emergencies, although better use of video-conferencing has also had a positive impact. The increases in 2009/10 in air travel and freight are mostly due to the continuing response to the Haiti earthquake.”

“LA13: Composition of governance bodies and breakdown of employees per category according to gender, age group, minority group membership, and other indicators of diversity.”

CBM (Reporting period: Calendar year 2010)

CBM International Office + Regional Directors	Gender %	Nationality	Age breakdown %
Senior Management/ Head of Department/ Regional Directors 16 staff	Female: 34% Male: 66%	French – 1 German – 3 UK – 1	Under 30 - 0% 30 - 50 - 40% 50 + - 60%
Middle Management/ Head of Unit 8 staff	Female: 63 % Male: 37 %	Columbia- 1 Switzerland – 1 Germany - 6	Under 30 - 0% 30 - 50 - 75% 50 + - 25%
1st line managers, specialists 19 staff	Female: 63% Male: 37%	Canada – 1 Germany – 17 UK - 1	Under 30 – 10% 30 – 50 – 54% 50 + - 36%
Administrators, support staff 29 staff	Female: 77% Male: 23%	Germany – 37 UK – 2 US – 1	Under 30 – 10% 30 – 50 – 54% 50 + - 36%
CBMeV Board 9 members	Female: 22% Male : 78%	Australia – 1 Germany– 2 France – 1 Kenya – 1 New Zealand – 2 Philippines – 1 UK – 1	Under 30 – 0% 30 – 50 – 22% 50 + - 78%

“Based on numbers of employees, not FTEs.

The average number of staff with disabilities across all offices within CBMeV is 8% and is increasing. Within the International Office 7% of staff are persons with disability.

Measures to promote the inclusion of persons with disabilities and in the further internationalization of the staff have been taken in recruitment as well as in personal development and will gradually improve the percentage of staff, management, and governance with disability. In the reporting year, management decided a qualified hiring freeze, therefore the number of staff is decreasing and ratios can't be improved short term.”

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 May 2009 - 31 March 2010)

“In this section, we provide diversity information concerning staff as a whole, staff by grade (where A is the senior grade), and by region. At the end we provide statistics for the Council of Trustees.

Category	2006/7	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10
Women as percentage of our UK-based workforce	67%	66%	67%	66%
Percentage of our UK-based workforce registered as disabled	2.9%	3.2%	3%	2.7%
Percentage of our international workforce from non-OECD countries	Over 90%	96.7%	87.5%	93%

Gender by Level in United Kingdom Divisions (i.e. not including our International Programme)

Gender	A and Directors	B	C	D	SMs	E	F	Grand total
Female	14	87	188	108	444	162	53	1056
Male	13	60	133	47	176	62	28	519
Grand total	27	147	321	155	620	224	81	1575

	A and Directors	B	C	D	SMs*	E	F
% Female to '10	51.9%	59.2%	58.6%	69.7%	71.6%	72.3%	65.4%
% Female to '09	48.3%	62.2%	55.0%	72.0%	73.3%	69.0%	66.3%
% Female to '08	50.0%	63.9%	57.6%	59.5%	72.9%	67.3%	67.9%

* SMs = Shop Managers

Gender	2010			2009		
	Total	Female	Female %	Total	Female	Female %
East Asia	412	208	50%	313	151	48%
HECA	845	282	33%	1053	319	30%
IDHQ	220	127	58%	233	137	59%
LAC	358	170	47%	369	180	49%
MEEECIS	208	86	41%	227	97	43%
South Asia	418	114	27%	429	119	28%
Southern Africa	256	107	42%	316	120	38%
UKPP	42	33	79%	45	33	73%
West Africa	300	88	29%	340	103	30%
Total	3059	1215	40%	3325	1259	38%

*International Division Headcount by Gender - Grades A - C only
(Includes staff in UK Departments in IDHQ)*

Region	Male in 2010	Female in 2010	Female % in 2009	Female % in 2010
East Asia	45	47	54.22%	51.09%
HECA	106	76	45.41%	41.76%
IDHQ	80	81	53.07%	50.31%
LAC	47	44	46.75	48.35%
MEEECIS	35	28	50.00%	44.44%
South Asia	62	36	40.59%	36.73%
Southern Africa	44	30	46.59%	40.54%
UKPP	7	17	62.50%	70.83%
West Africa	53	32	37.35%	37.65%
Total	479	391	47.45%	44.94%

Gender:

UK-based International Division (IDHQ and UKPP) have a much higher proportion of females than the Regions. South Asia has the lowest female representation at only 27%, whilst West Africa are 29% female. However, referring back to page to the table above, it can be seen that a larger proportion of females are in the higher grades (A – C).

Age	Apr '08	Apr '09	Apr '10
Under 18	0%	0%	0%
18 – 29	18%	18%	17%
30 – 44	59%	57%	60%
45 – 64	23%	25%	23%
65+	0%	0%	0%

There has been a 3% increase in the 30 – 44 group and a 2% decrease in the 45 – 64 group, with respective totals of 60% and 23%. This suggests that the International Division workforce profile may be aging slightly.

GB-based work force by age group

Age Group	2010	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
< 18	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
18-29	232	15%	16%	15%	16%	15%	16%	17%	16%	15%	15%
30-44	605	48%	47%	46%	46%	43%	42%	41%	41%	39%	38%
45-64	697	36%	37%	39%	39%	41%	40%	40%	41%	44%	44%
65+	41	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%
Total	1575	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The 30-44 and 45-64 age groups have 'crossed over', with the older age group having overtaken the younger. For GB-based staff the workforce profile continues to get older, with less GB-based staff in the 30-44 age group and more in the 45-64 age group. Due to individual percentages they do not always add to 100%, but the totals are adjusted to show 100%.

*Ethnicity of staff in Great Britain - all GB-based staff
Overall*

	2010		2009	
Total Ethnic Minority	153	8.4%	146	8.1%
Total White	1499	82.3%	1554	86.0%
Total Unknown	169	9.3%	108	6.0%

The number of GB-based BME staff recorded by HR has increased from 8.1% to 8.4%. However, there are more unknowns in HR GOLD (our HR database) when compared to the figures from last year. HR teams need to continue adding Equal Opportunities data to HR Gold to ensure we have a complete picture of ethnicity for GB-based staff. We will be launching an Equal Opportunities data gathering exercise, which will coincide with the Personal Data Verification audit in early 2011.

HR GOLD holds Equal Opportunities data configured by country according to local diversity monitoring requirements. Therefore when an employee moves to a different work base their Equal Opportunities data needs to be refreshed. All GB-based staff records should show GB-specific Equal Opportunities data.

Whilst this analysis is restricted to GB-based staff, there are 158 staff who have no GB Equal Opportunities data held, whilst the other 11 have GB Equal Opportunities data but with an ethnicity recorded as 'unknown'.

International Division Diversity by Region

Non-OECD	2010						2009		
	Total	OECD	Non-OECD	OECD unknown	(1) Non-OECD of total (inc unknowns)	(2) Non-OECD % of staff where nationality is known	Total	Non-OECD	Non-OECD %
East Asia	412	9	168	235	40.8%	94.9%	313	206	93.2%
HECA	845	26	384	435	45.4%	93.7%	1053	845	95.4%
IDHQ	220	129		91	0.0%	0.0%	233	46	20.1%
LAC	358	28	156	174	43.6%	84.8%	369	262	86.8%
MEEECIS	208	27	30	151	14.4%	52.6%	227	169	83.7%
South Asia	418	5	287	126	68.7%	98.3%	429	386	96.5%
Southern Africa	256	6	158	92	61.7%	96.3%	316	238	94.4%
UK Poverty Programme	42	24		18	0.0%	0.0%	45		0.0%
West Africa	300	8	178	114	59.3%	95.7%	340	283	91.0%
Total	3059	262	1361	1436	44.5%	83.9%	3325	2435	85.7%

Non-OECD:

In 2008 and 2009 around 86% of staff employed across the international regions were from non-OECD countries.

The % of staff who are from non-OECD countries has been shown in two ways:

(1) Non-OECD % of total headcount including unknowns (this is the lowest possible % of non-OECD staff) – gives an overall figure of 44.5%.

(2) Non-OECD % of staff where nationality is known (this is likely to be a much better estimate, but assumes that all new staff are in the same OECD/non-OECD ratio as existing staff) – gives us an overall figure of 84%.

Comparing the estimate of non-OECD staff again to last year's figure, non-OECD staff seem to have dropped slightly from 86% to 84%.

Staff Numbers by Region (as at end March 2010): See table at Indicator 12.

Governance bodies:

Oxfam's highest governance body is the Council of Trustees. It consists of 12 members, all of whom are volunteers. Six are women, and six are men. One is Indian, resident in India. One is African, resident in Senegal. One is British-Asian and nine are white British.

The age brackets are:

*20 - 30: 1 Trustee
30 - 40: None
40 - 50: 2 Trustees
50 - 60: 3 Trustees
60 - 70: 6 Trustees*

None have declared themselves to be registered as disabled.

The top executive board is the Corporate Management Team, consisting of four women and four men. The names of all and further information about their roles are in our Annual Report and Accounts (see 2.3)."

“SO1: Nature, scope, and effectiveness of any program and practices that assess and manage the impacts of operations on communities, including entering, operating and exiting.”

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 May 2009 - 31 March 2010)

“Prior to entering the community

All Oxfam programmes and projects start with either Oxfam or partner engagement with representative members of the communities to be affected by our programmes – Programme Framework and Project Cycle Management guides.

Programme Implementation Plans need a logic model attached as this is the ‘backbone’ of the programme and authorisation will not happen without it. A logic model must take into consideration the risks and assumptions associated with the programme. Risks we take to be situations or actions over which we have no control that could adversely affect the programme or people associated with it.

Project plans need a logical framework analysis – again this looks at risks and assumptions. Ideally, both a logic model and a logframe will be drawn up in conjunction with partners and the communities that the programme or project is targeting.

Prior to engagement with the community Oxfam spends time and resources to enter into good partnership arrangements. Partners need to share Oxfam’s values and beliefs and a ‘good partnership conversation’ will take place that results in an MoU to be jointly agreed upon and signed. In addition to partners being chosen because they espouse Oxfam’s values and beliefs, they are also chosen because they adequately and purposefully represent and work with the communities targeted by a programme or project; often partner organisations will comprise or be solely staffed by members of that community.

While operating in the community

Oxfam’s Monitoring and Evaluation system requires that partners and Oxfam staff implementing programmes and projects meet, on a six-monthly basis in a Monitoring Review. The purpose of this review is to look at progress against targets in any given programme and also to look at unintended consequences of the work that we are doing. This information is gathered both from partners and, ideally, community members.

While making decisions to exit the community

Exit plans, on the whole, are required as part of the programme and project planning processes – i.e. they are discussed and their inherent risks explored before the programme even starts. Both partners and community representatives would, ideally, be included in these discussions and decision-making and monitoring processes.

How data is collected and by whom

Data is collected by staff, partner organisations or the community themselves depending on the nature of the programme. On occasion (big, humanitarian responses being a case in point) data is collected by individuals specialised in data collection such as students or social researchers.

Information on intended AND unintended consequences should be collected throughout the lifetime of any project or programme through discussion with those that the programme affects.

How community members are selected

Community members are selected by communities, partners and Oxfam together; often as the result of criteria discussed and agreed jointly. Effort is made to reach the most marginalised and vulnerable who otherwise might not have a voice in decision-making or judgement of programme/project impact. Community members are selected because they are deemed to represent the voice of the whole community. This means that we make an effort to ensure that half the community representatives are female.

Number and percentage of operations to which the above applies

The above are the intended actions, but we are at the early stages of implementation, so only a few programmes do so. This should improve as the MEL system is increasingly understood and 'managed'.

It is difficult to make an overall judgement and we know that we lack adequate attention to some important areas important to the overall environment in which we work. We have anecdotal evidence that we can be very good at this, but only anecdotal. See below.

We do also have better than average adherence and management of Health and Safety activities (see Accountability Report 2010), excellent security management that is based upon our ability to know and understand how communities are feeling about our presence and activities, and an accountability approach based upon listening to the perceptions and realities of the lives of people our work affects.

An increasing number of our programmes do look at the issue of protecting civilians both from ourselves and from others. We do make provision for managing our staff so that they do not, intentionally, harm others in any way. Increased resources will be put to this in the coming year.

Working through partners and in partnership contributes, in many cases, to making this easier for us but we are aware that this is not a given."

OTHER GOOD PRACTICES

The Collection of Accountability Objectives

OXFAM GB (Reporting period: 1 July 2009 – 30 June 2010)

Accountability Objectives (2010-13)	Progress in 2010/11
<p>Governance We will become an increasingly effective and accountable organisation</p>	<p>We reviewed the Open Information policy and will publish it in July 2011. We published a Global Reporting Initiative report (http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/accounts/downloads/accountability-report-1011.pdf) and publicised the report in sector magazines and conferences.</p>
<p>People and Communities We will make demonstrable improvements in our ability to give account to, take account of, and be held account by, our primary stakeholders</p>	<p>Good progress was made in establishing new programme design processes which will support greater inclusion of people, communities and partner organisations, in the programme planning process. Evidence of more accountable ways of working with disaster-affected communities was seen in the Haiti and Pakistan emergency responses; and overall Oxfam staff have shown increased awareness of, and commitment to, improving our accountability.</p> <p>With other Oxfam International affiliates, we continued to develop and implement impact assessment tools which strengthen our accountability to people affected by our programmes. Work with other organisations, such as UN Agencies, Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International and various other International NGOs has focused on identifying the most effective approaches to ensure increased accountability in the different contexts within which we work.</p>
<p>Women in the communities we work with and women's rights organisation We will put women's rights at the heart of everything we do</p>	<p>Good progress was made in how we monitor and evaluate 'putting women's' rights at the heart of everything we do'. Renewed organisational commitment to women's rights has inspired reviews at international, regional and country levels with systematic feedback from partner organisations and other external stakeholders.</p> <p>We used opportunities, such as supporting community partners to attend the UN Commission on the Status of Women, to share information about our work on women's rights – both achievements and challenges.</p>
<p>Partners We will make demonstrable progress in consistently putting into practice the values and principles embodied in our Partnership Policy</p>	<p>The 2010 review of our Partnership Policy included an internal audit, a partnership peer review in four regions and feedback from partners on our performance through an online survey.</p> <p>Significant progress was made during the year in further embedding the values and principles of our Partnership Policy in our development work; all regions undertook to ensure consistent application of partner assessments, more effective ways of working with others and stronger feedback loops.</p>
<p>Supporters We will remain committed to ensuring that we communicate with our supporters in a clear and transparent</p>	<p>We continue to offer supporters the chance to communicate and feedback to us. In 2010/11 we received 42,500 calls, 43,000 emails and 4,300 letters from our supporters, which included 12,500 enquiries and 6,700 pieces of feedback.</p> <p>This year we have increased the methods in which supporters can give and receive feedback, such as the online hub, and have</p>

<p>way, and seek their feedback.</p>	<p>expanded our community fundraising activities.</p>
<p>Staff and Volunteers We will remain committed to seeking feedback from staff, volunteers, Trustees and members of the Association about our effectiveness in achieving Oxfam's mission and reflecting its values</p>	<p>A major staff consultation exercise was carried which identified three key areas for improvement: reflecting Oxfam's values in the way we work, management behaviour, and communications about Oxfam</p> <p>We started improving accountability to staff through developing the effectiveness of performance management, with a particular emphasis on staff and managers being open to feedback on their performance from a range of sources</p> <p>In the Trading Division (responsible for Oxfam Shops) the views of shop volunteers were systematically sought, to inform management decision-making (through conferences, working groups and online discussion groups)</p> <p>Feedback was regularly sought from Trustees and Association Members. The Association comprises a cross section of committed Oxfam supporters who have an understanding of governance issues and Oxfam's history and values.</p>
<p>Health and Safety</p>	<p>We successfully delivered a stretching action plan, focusing on incident reporting from international teams, training and safe driving awareness. Retaining a focus on Health and Safety remains challenging when priorities are being set, and we need to ensure learning and review is consistent and shared across the relevant parts of the organisation.</p>
<p>Government and regulators We will be accountable for our activities in the countries where we have programmes. We will have constructive engagement with host governments and our UK regulators.</p>	<p>We developed a new incident reporting framework, and worked with our key UK regulators (Charity Commission, Electoral Commission, Fundraising Standards Board and Advertising Standards Authority).</p>
<p>Advocacy Our advocacy and campaigns work will follow the core principles of our global campaigning and advocacy model.</p>	<p>Progress was made against three of our four advocacy priorities. We have elicited feedback on draft policy papers before publishing; engaged with private sector organisations to ensure the factual accuracy of Oxfam publications and published our overall campaigning objectives for our UK work online (see http://oxf.am/advocacy).</p>
<p>The environment We will develop appropriate, challenging targets that reflect the 35% reduction in our CO2 emissions achieved during 2007-10.</p>	<p>Mitigation: We introduced a 5% reduction target for the first year. Although we decreased our footprint in nine categories, increased air travel, electricity and paper consumption resulted in an overall 4% increase. Projects are in place to address these areas. Our study into the carbon benefit of selling donated goods estimates that Oxfam enabled its consumers to reduce their collective footprint by 22,500 tonnes in 2010/11.</p> <p>Adaptation: We supported the development of the weADAPT online knowledge platform and created Oxfam's Climate Change Adaptation Initiative in April 2011.</p>

Declaration of salary ranges

TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL (Reporting period: Calendar year 2010)

"Our salary ranges are published on our website at:

www.transparency.org/content/download/51164/818583/Salary+Structure+of+TI-S+01+05+07.pdf"

The reporting model

WORLD VISION (Reporting period: 1 October 2009 – 30 September 2010)

The organisation has chosen to produce a narrative report with thematic chapters in which the GRI indicators are mentioned in footnotes throughout the report and a table disclosing where the information for all indicators is found in the end of the report. This model might be seen as more user-friendly.