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Seriousness in regard to acting on weaknesses pointed out in earlier reports
Generally, the Panel wonders about EEB’s institutional commitment since the limited progress on matters flagged previously by the panel indicates this is a low priority. The Panel does not suggest that there are serious governance deficiencies but strongly demands speedy progress on the identified weaknesses. The Panel is disappointed that it largely includes very similar answers with sometimes the same exact language as in the 2014 Accountability Report. In terms of institutional commitment, the Panel encourages EEB to highlight new content (in particular new measures relating to accountability and governance) rather than simply duplicating previous report. For example, the opening statement by Jeremy Wates, EEB’s Secretary General, is copied from their Accountability Report 2014.

Actions taken

Basis for reporting / Raising accountability among network (3.8)
EEB cannot and is not mandated to ensure quality assurance of its members’ compliance with the Accountability Commitments but continues to endorse voluntary commitment amongst their membership. The minimum viable requirement from the Panel’s point of view, as outlined in the last feedback letter, is to have a functioning complaints handling mechanism through which external actors can submit complaints concerning members of EEB regarding activities conducted in EEB’s name. This can be part of the general mechanism for feedback and complaints under NGO2.

Actions taken

Mechanisms for feedback and complaints (NGO2)
This continues to be an area of weakness area and the Panel finds it alarming since this was envisaged to be addressed in 2016 (based on the 2014 Accountability Report) but in this report, it was rescheduled to 2017. In 2014 report, EEB committed that it “will make this a priority in the current reporting period, taking into account the requirements of the Charter”. In this report, EEB “has not yet established and
publicised a more formal complaints mechanism though the afore-mentioned anti-corruption policy provides some elements of such a mechanism.” As outlined under 3.8 (Basis for Reporting), the Panel expects the complaints policy and processes to address complaints regarding EEB itself or members activities conducted in the name of EEB. The Panel strongly flags that having a functional feedback and complaints mechanism is a minimum requirement of Accountable Now membership. The Panel refers EEB to good practice (pages 51-53) from Educo, Islamic Relief and Sightsavers.

**Actions taken**

**Programme monitoring, evaluation and learning (NGO3)**
EEB provides the same answer to that provided in the 2014 Accountability Report, using almost the same language. Monitoring and evaluation efforts take place at staff and membership levels via meetings and reports. EEB’s Medium Term Strategy 2016-2019 only includes activities without reference to indicators. In addition to internal monitoring, the Panel would be interested to know if EEB undertakes external evaluation of their projects and if so how they use the findings of these evaluations. The Panel refers EEB to good practice (pages 54-63) from several Accountable Now Members.

**Actions taken**

**Greenhouse gas emissions of operations (EN16)**
An EEB staff working group called ‘Greening the EEB’ aims to strengthen internal policies and measures for assessing and limiting the EEB’s ecological footprint. Progress of the working group is monitored during staff meetings. However the fact that the report uses the same language as the 2014 report implies a lack of progress. Also, the commitment to put the “greening” guidelines, once completed, on EEB’s website has been dropped. In 2015, EEB started to require its staff to report on their greenhouse gas emissions when travelling. The Panel looks forward to more progress in this regard including benchmarks since this area is of utmost importance for an environmental CSO.

**Actions taken**