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Dear Rainer Brockhaus,

Thank you for submitting your Accountability Report. We, the Independent Review Panel of Accountable Now, appreciate your efforts to continuously strengthen accountability to communities, local partners, supporters, staff, donors, or other key constituencies. Our key focus is on accountability to those you serve. It is against this background that we critically discussed your report and came to the individual assessment below.

CBM’s interim report demonstrates continued strong institutional commitment to accountability and improvement in many areas. The opening statement from the most senior decision-maker shares positive organisational developments and transformation processes, most notably the CBM Federation Strategy 2021, which involves implementing a new operational model, reviewing key internal processes and further developing the organisational structure.

The open and self-reflective identification of areas for improvement and a more thorough development in environmental sustainability is positively noted, as elaborated below. We understand that management pressures have led to a pause in calculating your carbon footprint and welcome your decision to develop an "environmental sustainability roadmap" (including carbon footprint) in 2017. You will, no doubt, give us more on this in your next report.

An example of good practice is CBM’s Individual Development Dialogue (IDD), which offers a comprehensive career development plan for employees who have performed particularly well for three consecutive years or more.

Minor areas of weakness are to be found in SO4 (Actions taken in response of corruption incidents) in terms of more satisfactory reporting on the occurred incidents and PR6 (Ethical fundraising and communication) concerning the open disclosure of the policy on the ethical and respectful use of pictures, as well as more detailed reporting on fundraising and communications incidents/complaints.

The promotion of CBM’s membership with Accountable Now on their website, including a prominent link to CBM’s complaints mechanism, is commended.

Our intention is that this feedback letter, and any response you may wish to provide, is made publicly available on the Accountable Now website along with your report – as it is the case with all previously reviewed reports. However, should there be errors of fact in the feedback above or in the note below; we would of course wish to correct
these before publication. Please share any comments or amendments by 15 January 2018.

If you have any other feedback or comments on our work, please share them with us by sending them to the Accountable Now Secretariat.

Yours sincerely,

Mihir Bhatt  Rhonda Chapman  John Clark  Louise James

Jane Kiragu  Nora Lester Murad  Saroeun Soeung
CBM’s interim accountability report opens again with a strong statement from Rainer Brockhaus, CBM’s Chair of the International Leadership Team. He refers to CBM’s new Federation Strategy 2021, which aims to redesign the organisation by implementing a new governance model, bringing accountability to the forefront of CBM’s work again. Strong commitment to accountability is also demonstrated in the Strategy’s new operating model, which aims to improve internal processes, as well as to bring CBM’s partners and donors closer together.

The Panel appreciates CBM’s commitment to environmental sustainability as an integrated concept and the fact that CBM is devoted to a more thorough development of the approaches concerning the organisation’s carbon footprint reporting. The Panel looks forward to updates on this endeavour in the organisation’s next accountability report.

The need to improve accountability reporting as a vital component of CBM’s transformation process is highlighted, as well as the wish to start implementing Accountable Now’s new reporting framework in line with the Global Standard for CSO Accountability, for CBM’s next full report. The Panel recognises and welcomes both initiatives and looks forward to CBM’s 2017 report.

Providing Multiple Sources of Evidence

In consideration of CBM’s request to provide more clarity on the evidence required, the Panel provides examples with reference to some of the questions posed in last year’s feedback:
4.4

CBM has various mechanisms in place to engage internal stakeholders – i.e. Member Associations and employees. The organisation regards the advantage of combined representation and competency-based International Board as to generate higher ownership of CBM’s international work. Is there evidence for this? And are there concrete examples that staff and/or Member recommendations have shaped decision-making of the EMT?

Here, evidence could be examples pinpointing broader discussions or specific decisions that were taken by the EMT in response to issues or suggestions raised by employees.

NGO6

Overall, the revised Global Programme Strategy (GPS II) strengthens the organisation’s collaborative work approach. The report further mentions under 2.2 (page 8) that CBM’s Emergency Response Team supports partners to implement a beneficiary satisfaction survey (infused feedback during and after the end of the project) which is positively noted. Nevertheless, evidence that these systems work well in practice and how success is tracked are welcome in the next report.

Can you provide evidence that these processes are functioning well in practice: for example what percentage return do you have from the “beneficiary satisfaction survey” and what proportion of these are favourable/disappointed? CBM is on the right track with its statement that more evidence will be provided in future reports. Sometimes evidence might seem obvious or be hidden behind a link on the organisation’s website; however, it needs to be brought to the attention of the reader of the report in order to support the organisation’s statements.

It is commendable that CBM is going to introduce an independent survey to gather partner feedback on CBM, such as the one facilitated by Keystone Accountability. The Panel looks forward to an account on that.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

I. Programme Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO2</th>
<th>Feedback and complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CBM has given a good explanation of its internal definition of a complaint. Does the information you have provided on complaints cover all your national members, or just the complaints that come to the attention of the
international secretariat? If the latter, do you have a process to receive and review globally complaints handled by your national members?

The organisation has further undertaken the necessary actions in order to develop its feedback and complaints mechanisms, which has brought some positive results with regard to awareness raising amongst key stakeholders about the existing mechanisms. The Panel acknowledges this effort, as well as the fact that a Feedback Officer from CBM participates in Accountable Now’s peer advice group on feedback and complaints mechanisms. The Panel highly recommends continuous monitoring, evaluation and learning activities to further simplify and make those mechanisms more accessible and safe to use.

IV. Human Resource Management

LA12 Performance development process
Fully addressed

A good and thorough answer is given on both questions posed in the Improvement Analysis in addition to a question that has been asked by the Panel previously. It is positively noted that the implementation rate of the performance appraisal forms has risen from 64% in 2014 to 83% in 2016. In your next report, please explain to the panel how your new strategic goals are impacting the performance and objective setting processes.

The introduction of a competency dictionary for a better guidance through the performance appraisal criteria is a good step towards guiding staff through the appraisal process. Also positively noted is the training of staff members to obtain common understanding of expected behaviours.

The Individual Development Dialogue (IDD) is explained and its difference from performance appraisals clarified. The IDD supports the longer term career development of employees who have performed well on their annual performance appraisals for three consecutive years. This is recognised as a good practice by the Panel.

V. Responsible Management of Impacts on Society

SO3 Effective anti-corruption policies
Fully addressed

The Panel recognises CBM’s efforts to disseminate the e-learning module “Preventing Corruption and Fraud”, which has shown some positive results in 2016.
### SO4
**Actions taken in response of corruption incidents**
*Addressed*

Whistle-blower reports and critical incidents are classified confidential and thus published on SharePoint with limited access to a designated group within CBM, since they contain sensitive data on partner organisations as well as on the global CBM structure. However, information on the nature of complaints and whether these incidents were resolved satisfactorily for both parties, would be appreciated.

### VI. Ethical Fundraising and Communication

**PR6**
**Ethical fundraising and communication**
*Addressed*

CBM gives a detailed response to this indicator, although the policy on the ethical and respectful use of pictures requested by the Panel has not been shared in the report.

It is further not clarified how many in total and what kind of complaints have been received by CBM with regard to their fundraising and communications activities.