

## Improvement Analysis BRAC International March 2015

### Institutional commitment and understanding of accountability (1.1)

BRAC is strongly encouraged to describe how accountability is essential to achieving their mission. How will strong accountability help BRAC achieve better impact? Once the strategic role of accountability is established: How does that translate into clear consequences for BRAC's programming, finance, human resource policies, advocacy etc.

#### **Actions taken**

Statement has been prepared as per requirement. In INGO Accountability Report 2014, statement has been given by BRAC's Chairperson.

### Business model and for-profit subsidiaries (2.3 & 2.6)

Whereas the Panel commends BRAC for their self-sustainable social business model, it would also welcome clarification on the proportion of not-for-profit parts of the organization and for-profit enterprises to support the non-profit section and how BRAC ensures that accountability commitments are also upheld in their for-profit enterprises. This includes more information on e.g. relatively high returns on the microfinance loans.

#### **Actions taken**

Explained as per requirement. In Report of 2014 Separate schedule of Income, Expenditure, Surplus, Assets, Liabilities for all enterprises are included in section 2.8

### Reporting process (3.5)

The report provides relevant information on BRAC's governance structure (see also the organogram on p.42), on responsibilities and committees of the governing body as well as on BRAC's risk management. It is not clear, however, who the 28 members of the general body are, how they are elected and how they are represented with regard to voting rights in the general body – especially in relation to the governing body consisting of 10 members. Executive vs. oversight functions should be separated more clearly. Please also provide information on how this specific governance structure supports the achievement of BRAC's mission in practice or where BRAC sees challenges.

#### **Actions taken**

Explanation given in section 3.5 as per requirement in the report 2014.

### Governance body (4.1)

The report provides relevant information on BRAC's governance structure (see also the organogram on p.42), on responsibilities and committees of the governing body as well as on BRAC's risk management. It is not clear, however, who the 28 members of the general body are, how they are elected and how they are represented with regard to voting rights in the general body – especially in relation to the governing body consisting of 10 members. Executive vs. oversight functions should be separated more clearly. Please also provide information on how this specific governance structure supports the achievement of BRAC's mission in practice or where BRAC sees challenges.

#### **Actions taken**

General body related information has been given in section 4.1 as per requirement.

### Advocacy positions (NGO5)

The report provides again interesting information on the plentiful areas of BRAC's advocacy work

covering issues such as the rights of women, children and the poor (e.g. community Popular Theatre Group for illiterates). However – as already addressed by the Panel in last years’ feedback – the question here is not on the topics and messages of BRAC’s advocacy work but how you ensure an accountable approach to advocacy work. This includes ensuring advocacy claims are based on robust evidence, adequately reflect the needs of people whom it speaks for, and that policies and practices ensure corrective action is taken where necessary. To what extent, for instance, has the Popular Theatre Group feedback been captured/advanced in BRAC’s advocacy themes and messaging and/or received a policy or resource response by duty bearers on their claims? In this regard, the Panel looks forward to learning more about the linkages of BRAC’s community engagement with their advocacy work.

**Actions taken**

Required update will be provided in next year report.

**Environmental Sustainability (EN16, EN18 & EN26)**

The report does not include any numbers on the organisation’s greenhouse gas emissions and no aspiration to engage in environmental sustainability reporting in the future. While it is understood that it is a huge challenge for a large and dispersed organisation like BRAC to document precise figures on CO2 emissions of its overall organisation, it would be appreciated to see that BRAC starts by appointing a person responsible for this issue and reporting to the CEO. He/she should start by systematically identifying the largest environmental implications of BRAC and developing a suggestion on how to minimise these systematically over time. This plan should be reviewed, approved and resourced by senior management.

**Actions taken**

Required update will be provided in next year report.