



**Accountable  
Now**

GLOBAL STANDARDS LOCAL TRUST



# **International Planned Parenthood Federation Independent Review Panel Feedback**

**Accountability Report 2016  
Review Round April 2018**



# International Planned Parenthood Federation Feedback from the Independent Review Panel

## Review Round April 2018

18 May 2018

Dear Alvaro Bermejo,

We would like to thank IPPF for submitting its first Accountability Report (under Tewodros Melesse). 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.

IPPF's first accountability report was a pleasure to read, with comprehensive information, links to most of the policies mentioned, and illustrative examples provided. **Institutional commitment** to accountability is evident throughout the report, particularly in the opening statement by IPPF's CEO Tewodros Melasse.

The Panel commends IPPF's openness about areas in which it can improve and appreciates the inclusion of concrete actions it plans to take throughout the report, as well as in the self-assessment table annexed to the report. The Panel would like to highlight this as a **good practice** which it encourages other Accountable Now members to consider adopting.

Other examples of **good practice** include IPPF's accessible complaints filing mechanism and its detailed reporting on whistleblowing incidents (NGO2), a commendable approach to gender equality (NGO4), and a clear commitment on behalf of the international secretariat to encourage high standards of governance and accountability amongst all IPPF member associations (NGO6).

**Areas for improvement** include explanation of IPPF's impact on local communities (SO1) and the process by which advocacy positions and campaigns are planned (NGO5).

Finally, the Panel appreciates that IPPF has an accountability page on their [website](#), with reference to Accountable Now membership, including the [12 Accountability Commitments](#) and a link to IPPF's accountability report.

The Panel congratulates IPPF on a highly commendable first reporting effort, and looks forward to reading its next report on 2017. With the approval of this first accountability report, IPPF is moved from Affiliate to Full Membership with immediate effect.

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 8 June 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

John Clark

Louise James

Jane Kiragu

Saroeun Soeung



# International Planned Parenthood Federation's Accountability Report 2016

Review Round April 2018

## PROFILE DISCLOSURES

### I. Strategy and Analysis

1.1	<p><b>Statement from the most senior decision-maker</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The opening statement by CEO Tewodros Melasse indicates a strong institutional commitment to accountability, driven by Melasse himself and the strategic plan 2016-2022, and implemented together with the whole organisation. The Panel appreciates the fact that IPPF is eager to learn from sector-wide experience as an Accountable Now member, and the encouragement of local IPPF chapters to consider stronger accountability practices and reporting.</p>
-----	--

### II. Organisational Profile

2.1 – 2.6	<p><b>Name of organisation / Primary activities / Operational Structure / Headquarter location / Number of countries / Nature of ownership</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>All information was provided in a clear and easy-to-understand format</p>
2.7	<p><b>Target audience</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF is committed to providing sexual and reproductive rights for all, but there is a particular focus on the under-served. The Panel appreciates the explanation of how those most vulnerable and under-served are identified and reached. The breakdown of services delivered by region is helpful, as is the inclusion of a client satisfaction overview.</p> <p>Are policymakers, governments, other CSOs etc also considered part of IPPF's target group, considering the considerable advocacy work that is carried out?</p>
2.8 – 2.9	<p><b>Scale of organisation / Significant changes in the reporting period</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p>



	Some changes to organisational structure including the regional hub office and IPPF's Governing Council are highlighted, with more information detailed under indicator 4.10.
2.10	<p><b>Awards received</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The Panel congratulates IPPF's Belgian member Sensoa for the award they received in 2016.</p>
<b>III. Report Parameters</b>	
3.1 – 3.4	<p><b>Reporting period / Date of most recent report / Reporting cycle / Contact person</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p>
3.5	<p><b>Reporting process</b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF has provided a timeline of actions for the preparation of its report. The Panel points out that the timeline includes an unrealistically short period for AN pre-screening, panel review and preparation of its feedback to IPPF - which is likely to take 2-3 months (not the 1 month indicated). How is it intended that the report and Panel feedback will be circulated and discussed internally beyond management level?</p> <p>The Panel is aware that IPPF is eager to share its report with the wider public, and has uploaded the report to its <a href="#">website</a> already.</p> <p>IPPF is commended on its inclusion of a self-assessment table of their performance against each reporting indicator, including commitments to improve – and the fact that this is shared publicly as part of the report. This is identified as a <b>good practice</b> and the Panel looks forward to seeing IPPF's progress on the identified areas for improvement.</p>
3.6 – 3.8	<p><b>Report boundary / Specific limitations / Basis for reporting</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The report covers IPPF's Secretariat, as well as data from 134 out of 142 IPPF Member Associations. Is this data included in all reporting indicators, or is information from Member Associations rather used as case studies or examples in certain sections? How does the Secretariat assure themselves of the validity of performance data?</p>
3.10 – 3.12	<p><b>Significant changes / Reference table</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p>



IV. Mission, Values, Governance, and Stakeholder Engagement	
4.1	<p><b>Governance structure</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF's governance structure is presented in a clear diagram. All 142 Member Associations are represented in the Regional Council, and all regions are represented in the Governing Council, the highest governing body. How does the Regional Director relate to the Regional Council and Executive Committee?</p> <p>The Panel appreciates the inclusion of good governance processes and practices, which indicate a genuine commitment to compliance and improvement by IPPF's Member Associations.</p> <p>A Secretariat Risk Register is reviewed annually by the Audit Committee, and each risk has one representative of the Directors' Leadership Team assigned to it to ensure follow-up. The Panel appreciates that key risks are published openly in IPPF's financial statements. The risks listed here and in other readily-available documents only refer to financial risks. There must be other risks relevant to IPPF (not least violence or abuse to staff from those fundamentally opposed to the provision of SRH services); are these treated in the same way?</p>
4.2	<p><b>Division of power between the governance body and management</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The division of powers between the Governing Council and Directors' Leadership Team is explained, with the Governing Council appointing and reviewing the performance of the Director General. Regional Presidents and the Directors' Leadership Team also provide 360-degree feedback to the Director-General.</p> <p>The Panel requests some more details in the next report on how the regional structure works, and the decision-making delegated to this level.</p>
4.3	<p><b>Independence of the highest governing body</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The members of the Governing Council are members of the national Member Associations. There are no independent (external to IPPF) members. It is stated that Governing Council members are independent from senior management, but the Director-General is an ex-officio member of the Council and the Directors' Leadership Team attends the Council's meetings.</p>
4.4	<p><b>Feedback from internal stakeholders</b></p>



	<p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>A range of mechanisms for internal stakeholders, from Member Associations to employees, volunteers, and youth representatives and advisory experts, to provide recommendations to the Governing Council are outlined. Helpful examples are also provided illustrating how some of these recommendations have been taken up.</p>
4.5	<p><b>Compensation and benefits</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>All members of the Governing Council and Audit Committee are volunteers and are not compensated. The Director-General's salary is set by the Governing Council, and salaries of Secretariat employees are set in line with benchmarking exercises against salaries for similar roles in each location. Although it is not required by AN, most AN members now declare the salaries of the CEO and most senior executives, rather than simply describe how remuneration levels are assessed. This is becoming a good-practice norm that IPPF might consider.</p>
4.6	<p><b>Conflicts of interest</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>All Governing Council and Audit Committee members must complete conflict of interest disclosures, and the Audit Committee members are independent of the Governing Council. Is there a specific conflict of interest policy in place outlining these requirements? Is there a 100% compliance in completing the COI declarations? Does the COI form also apply to regional committee members?</p>
4.10	<p><b>Ensuring performance of highest governance body</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>In 2016 the Governing Council approved several changes to its functioning to drive high performance and accountability. Whereas previously the Chairperson's performance was reviewed annually and other Council members were reviewed from time to time, now all Council members will undergo comprehensive performance reviews before being considered for re-election.</p> <p>Furthermore, external advisers have been introduced to the Governing Council, the Council will replace a third of its members each year rather than having elections every three years to minimise disruption and loss of expertise, a third of Council members must be 25 years of age or younger upon election, and Terms of Reference for specific roles on the Council were updated.</p>



	The Panel commends these reforms and looks forward to hearing in future reports if and how this has led to improved performance of the Council.
4.12	<b>Commitments to external initiatives</b> <i>Fully addressed</i>
4.14 – 4.15	<b>List of stakeholders / Basis for identification of stakeholders</b> <i>Fully addressed</i>  IPPF's key stakeholder groups include their employees, volunteers, activists, clients, donors, governments, and organisations with similar objectives. Key facts and figures including how IPPF works with each group are provided, which the Panel appreciates.  It is stated that IPPF's five core values (social inclusion, diversity, passion, volunteerism, and accountability) guide decision-making with respect to key stakeholder groups. More information about how this works in practice would be appreciated in the next report – what are the actual processes for identifying and selecting stakeholders?

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### I. Programme Effectiveness

NGO1	<b>Involvement of affected stakeholder groups</b> <i>Addressed</i>  The response outlines how IPPF engages with staff, clients, and donors – the Panel assumes that reference to “people” includes volunteers as well as staff. IPPF's “ <i>Standards and Responsibilities of Membership</i> ” (which forms a basis for the 5-yearly accreditation review of all Member Associations) requires them, inter alia, to be open and democratic - hence being responsive to stakeholders' feedback. The report provides little evidence regarding this, however the example of how IPPF's Pakistani Member Association used stakeholder feedback to make changes to their services is noted positively. In the next report, the Panel encourages IPPF to describe any policies or systematic processes in place to ensure affected stakeholders are able to provide input into the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes.  The Panel can suggest examples from <a href="#">Oxfam</a> and <a href="#">Amnesty International</a> as good practice on this issue.  There appears to be more structured interaction with IPPF's donors, with an Annual Donors' Meeting and regular meetings with individual donor leaders.
------	--





NGO2	<p><b>Mechanisms for feedback and complaints</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF provides a link to its comprehensive and clear complaints policy and procedure. The Panel identifies as a <b>good practice</b> the focus on accessible filing mechanisms – complaints can be filed online, via email, post or telephone, and the policy (available in multiple languages) states that IPPF is happy to provide assistance in filing a complaint if necessary.</p> <p>The Panel is pleased to see that the one complaint filed regarding a Member Association in 2016 led to increased accountability amongst staff, and that IPPF is considering how to use complaints mechanisms at member Association level in future to bring about positive change.</p> <p>A detailed and transparent overview of two whistleblowing incidents in 2016 is also provided. The Panel also sees as a <b>good practice</b> the detailed explanation of how the reports were dealt with, as well as IPPF's commitment to more broadly publicise its complaints policy and mechanisms in 2017.</p> <p>Finally, the Panel would like to point out that Accountable Now also provides a complaints mechanism for issues that were not able to be solved directly between the complainant and the Accountable Now Member organisation. IPPF could include this in its policy, together with the references to the Charity Commission and Fundraising Standards Board.</p>
NGO3	<p><b>Programme monitoring, evaluation and learning</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF measures programme effectiveness and impact against four key outcomes, and publishes findings in an <a href="#">Annual Performance Report</a> which is available on IPPF's website.</p> <p>Monitoring, evaluation and learning is used to improve the performance of the Federation, with performance data used to drive improved programming, assess Member Associations' capacities, and distribute funding, with higher performing Member Associations receiving increased core funding.</p> <p>Client-based data is also being used to identify needs, restructure services accordingly, and in general improve the quality of care provided to clients.</p>
NGO4	<p><b>Gender and diversity</b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p>



	<p>IPPF has a sound and gender equality policy in place, with a progressive approach: the policy “sets out specific and targeted actions required to ensure that all individuals, who identify as women, men, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or intersex, have access to equality of outcome in the workplace and in programmes. The policy engages with the impact of social roles and norms, constructs of masculinity and femininity, and discrimination based on gender, sex, sexual orientation and gender identity”.</p> <p>78% of Member Associations had a gender equality policy in place in 2016, and IPPF is encouraging the others to follow suit. The Panel looks forward to hearing about progress in this regard in the next report.</p> <p>Gender equality is also included in IPPF’s Gender Capability Statement Strategic Framework vision statement, and core values.</p> <p>IPPF also has high female representation amongst its employees, Governing Council members, and service recipients. The Panel commends IPPF on conducting a gender audit across three offices in 2016, and being open about the findings indicating that high female employee representation does not necessarily translate to being a gender transformative organisation. IPPF outlines the key findings and recommendations, and states that they will report on progress made in their next report, which the Panel appreciates.</p> <p>Overall, IPPF’s approach to gender equality is seen as an example of <b>good practice</b>.</p> <p>In the next report, the Panel would welcome analysis of gender representation in the leadership team and management generally. It would also like to hear about how other diversity factors and potential areas of exclusion, such as age, ethnicity, disability, race, and religion are tackled. The Gender Equality Policy makes reference to several of these points. Are there systems in place to identify stakeholders that risk being excluded from IPPF’s work? Are any targets or action plans in place?</p>
NGO5	<p><b>Advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns</b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>The report states that IPPF uses evidence, research and data from reputable organisations and sources in developing their programmes. An overview of IPPF’s key successes in advocacy and communications efforts is provided, and the Panel congratulates IPPF on these efforts.</p> <p>However, more information on the process by which campaigns and public policy positions are developed is requested in the next report. Which stakeholders are consulted? Are positions reviewed periodically? How is corrective action taken when necessary?</p>



	The Panel can point IPPF to examples of good practice in this area by <a href="#">ActionAid</a> and <a href="#">Oxfam</a> .
NGO6	<p><b>Coordination with other actors</b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF works most closely with its Member Associations, who are themselves quasi-independent and answerable to their National Boards. By setting a clear set of standards and responsibilities required of all Members, and by renewing their accreditation every 5 years, IPPF is able to promote high standards of accountability and governance throughout the global structure. This is a <b>good practice</b> for Federations and Federation-like NGOs.</p> <p>IPPF states that it only works with organisations whose mission, vision and values are consistent with those of IPPF's and contribute to the achievement of key outcomes. How is this assessed? Is there a specific policy or system in place to identify which organisations IPPF will engage with, which organisations are already working in a specific area, and how to avoid duplication of efforts?</p> <p>Case studies of some of IPPF's work with external actors provide some insight into the above questions, demonstrating how IPPF works with governments, networks and working groups, as well as businesses.</p>
<b>II. Financial Management</b>	
NGO7	<p><b>Resource allocation</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF's financial statements are prepared in line with industry standards and laws, and internal and external audits are conducted annually. The audited financial statements are available <a href="#">online</a>.</p> <p>All Member Associations are required to comply with strict rules and standards in line with financial best practices, including appropriate control frameworks, sound accounting systems, and an annual audit by external auditors.</p>



NGO8	<p><b>Sources of Funding</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>A helpful overview of IPPF's main sources of income is provided, as is a list of IPPF's five largest donors in 2016. IPPF is increasing its efforts to raise income through social enterprise-type activities, with half of all Member Association income raised in this way in 2016. The Panel commends the example of the Honduras Member Association using this method to turn around their funding situation and increase their service output.</p>
<p><b>III. Environmental Management</b></p>	
EN16	<p><b>Greenhouse gas emissions of operations</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF has implemented a carbon management and reporting standard and provides an overview of emissions since 2014. Business travel accounts for the majority of emissions.</p> <p>The greenhouse emissions reported are limited to the Central Office, but IPPF will implement the carbon management and reporting software across all Secretariat offices (Central Office plus regional offices) to allow for reporting as a Secretariat. IPPF will then also set key performance indicators. The Panel looks forward to reading about this in the next report.</p> <p>Do Member Associations also track their emissions?</p>
EN18	<p><b>Initiatives to reduce emissions of operations</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF supports policies which aim to contribute to sustainable development, but the organisation is open about the fact that Secretariat offices have not historically had strong processes and procedures in place to reflect the commitments made in internal policies.</p> <p>Improvements are being made, and a number of initiatives to reduce emissions in Secretariat offices are outlined. The majority of these focus on energy-saving, recycling, and reducing paper wastage. Given the fact that business travel makes up the main proportion of IPPF's emissions, are there efforts in place (beyond the European Network) to reduce this?</p> <p>The Panel notes that the self-assessment table in Annex A includes a commitment to reduce non-essential employee travel, and looks forward to reading more about this, as well as any other systematic efforts to reduce negative environmental impacts (including any targets if applicable) in the next report.</p>



	<p>Finally, the Panel would like to know, as with the above indicator, whether Member Associations also have policies or procedures in place to reduce emissions.</p>
EN26	<p><b><i>Initiatives to mitigate environmental impact of activities and services</i></b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The report states that IPPF's programmes and services do not have adverse environmental impacts, as they are carefully planned and executed health services, and waste is disposed of in accordance with local best practices.</p> <p>All Member Associations commit to reducing harmful impact on the environment, and agree to comply with IPPF's Medical and Service Delivery Guidelines. They are also required to provide evidence of compliance. Examples of good practice from the Member Associations are provided.</p> <p>The Panel also appreciates that IPPF considers the family planning services it provides, such as contraception, a key factor in reducing the impact of climate change.</p>
<p><b>IV. Human Resource Management</b></p>	
LA1	<p><b><i>Size and composition of workforce</i></b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The number of employees in IPPF's Secretariat Offices (Central Office plus regional offices) is provided, broken down by contract type (full/part time), geographic region, seniority (management/regular employee) and gender. It would also be interesting to know the gender breakdown within management level.</p>
EC7	<p><b><i>Procedure for local hiring</i></b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF considers its recruitment policies to reflect best practices and comply with local employment laws. The Gender Equality Policy emphasises equal opportunity for all, and sets out ways to ensure recruitment policies are non-discriminatory. However, these do mainly focus on gender – are there any specific policies encouraging local recruitment?</p> <p>The report does state that local hiring is undertaken for all key support functions, which the Panel commends. The Panel would also like to know what proportion of management positions are filled by local hires, and appreciates that IPPF will provide this information in the next report.</p>



	<p>Finally, the Panel notes that, due to the small size of the regional offices, there is limited impact on local NGO/public sector recruitment. Nonetheless, the Panel would like to know whether employment conditions, including salaries, are set in line with local standards.</p>
LA10	<p><b>Workforce training</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Learning and development is provided through study support, seminars, workshops, conferences, and coaching. IPPF signed up to an online training portal for the benefit of all Secretariat staff, and the Panel notes positively that training is offered in multiple languages and remotely.</p> <p>A People Strategy was designed in 2016 to provide greater support for organisational development across the Secretariat, and was due to be finalised and launched in 2017. The Panel looks forward to an update in the next report. Particularly, the Panel is interested in learning how key training needs are identified, what proportion of staff make use of training opportunities, and whether IPPF collects feedback from participants about courses' effectiveness.</p>
LA12	<p><b>Global talent management</b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF has not invested in a global talent management system due to the small size of the Secretariat. However, an enterprise-based system will be adopted in 2017, which should allow a more integrated approach to people planning, training and performance reviews across the Secretariat. To what extent is succession planning addressed? The Panel looks forward to an update in the next report.</p> <p>All Secretariat employees are required to complete an annual performance review, with a 79% completion rate in 2016. The result was negatively affected by restructuring in the European office, and the number is expected to be higher in 2017. Apart from this factor, how is management trying to move towards a 100% completion rate? The Panel notes positively that informal half-yearly appraisals and regular feedback is also encouraged.</p> <p>An overview of the typical performance review process is provided, which appears thorough and has a focus on future planning and improvement. Has IPPF considered implementing 360-degree reviews for all employees, not just members of the Directors' Leadership Team?</p> <p>Finally, the Panel notes that Member Associations also require annual performance reviews of their employees, and the accreditation review includes a check on this.</p>



LA13	<p><b>Diversity of workforce and governance bodies</b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF has targets in place to ensure gender equality and youth-centred values are reflected in its organisational structure, and both were met or exceeded in 2016. Information on age and gender in the Governing Council from 2014-2016 is presented, and the Panel notes positively that female representation was on average 67%. It is also good to see that IPPF has youth representation at 25%, and encourages an increase here given IPPF's focus on reproductive health.</p> <p>IPPF is again open about the fact that high female representation does not necessarily equate to strong organisational gender equality, and management has committed to implementing various measures to improve in this regard. A strategy was planned to be published in 2017, and the Panel looks forward to reading an update in the next report.</p> <p>IPPF also has support groups in place for employees, on sexual and gender diversity, as well as those living with HIV.</p> <p>Similar to indicator NGO4, the Panel would again like to see information about other diversity factors in the next report. Are there any initiatives or targets relating to, for example, employees from the Global South, with disabilities, or belonging to other minority groups?</p>
NGO9	<p><b>Mechanisms to raise grievances</b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF has several policies in place, including on bullying and harassment equal opportunity, health and safety, grievances and whistleblowing. These do not appear to be in the IPPF Policy Handbook – therefore, links would be appreciated in the next report.</p> <p>In general, people are encouraged to report incidents to their managers, who should provide immediate as well as longer-term support. HR managers are also available to provide support. A confidential Employees Assistance service was made available to most Secretariat offices in 2016, and is being extended to cover all locations. All of these structures and procedures seem to be sound – is IPPF able to provide evidence that they are well-known to staff and work well in practice?</p> <p>The report states that there were no grievance issues that were not resolved satisfactorily in 2016. The Panel would nonetheless be interested to know how many grievances were raised in the reporting period, and what issues they related to.</p>



V. Responsible Management of Impacts on Society	
SO1	<p><b>Managing the organisation's impact on local communities</b></p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF cites its Protecting Children, Young People and Vulnerable Adults policy, which outlines how the Secretariat and Member Associations must create safe environments for these groups.</p> <p>In the next report, the Panel would also like to hear whether IPPF considers potential unintended consequences or negative experiences for local communities in certain contexts, due to e.g. cultural norms.</p> <p>Some examples of how IPPF supported the wider community in 2016 are provided. Is there also information on how those communities felt about IPPF's work? Was feedback collected?</p>
SO3	<p><b>Anti-corruption practices</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>IPPF has a zero-tolerance approach towards fraud and corruption, with strong disciplinary action taken and incidents reported to law enforcement. These stances are codified in the anti-bribery and fraud policies which can be found in IPPF's <a href="#">policy handbook</a> (sections 3.11 and 3.12).</p> <p>A number of anti-corruption measures are explained, including strong governance, good financial management and reporting, and the inclusion of anti-bribery/corruption clauses in agreements with external suppliers.</p> <p>The Panel notes positively that fraud detection and prevention is seen as the responsibility of all staff, not just management and leadership. Are staff and key stakeholders trained on the policies in place and how to report any incidents? Is there evidence that the policies and processes are well known and work well in practice? This could include reference to rates of training or reporting.</p>
SO4	<p><b>Actions taken in response of corruption incidents</b></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>A confidential email reporting mechanism is in place, and published on IPPF's <a href="#">website</a>. Including a link to the whistleblowing policy, which is mentioned on the page, would allow people to better understand the protections they are afforded in these situations.</p> <p>In general, the process outlined seems sound. Reports of fraud or corruption are reviewed by a member of the Directors' Leadership Team,</p>





	<p>and independent internal auditors investigate the matter. Details of reports are also reported to the Audit Committee and the Governing Council. Serious incidents are also reported to the UK Charity Commission.</p> <p>No incidents of fraud were reporting in 2016. IPPF plans to publicise its zero-tolerance approach to fraud in 2017 to ensure all stakeholders are aware of the reporting mechanism. The Panel appreciates this effort and looks forward to learning whether this leads to increased use of the reporting mechanism.</p>
<p><b>VI. Ethical Fundraising</b></p>	
<p>PR6</p>	<p><b><i>Ethical fundraising and marketing communications</i></b></p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>A commitment to ethical fundraising is expressed, and each office should comply with local laws and regulations in this regard. IPPF’s Secretariat is required to report donations in its financial statements (available online) and report institutional gifts and gifts in kind by name. Gifts in kind are externally audited. Donors’ names are only disclosed if explicit consent is provided, and the Western Hemisphere office has a sound privacy policy.</p> <p>The Panel would like to hear more about how fundraising activities are carried out and how funds are used appropriately. A global policy on ethical fundraising does not seem to exist. Is IPPF considering creating one?</p> <p>IPPF also refers to internal policies governing the use of content relating to clients, volunteers and donors in external communications. More information on this – or a link to the relevant policies – would be helpful. To protect the dignity of those being featured in communications efforts, release forms specifying how the content (images, videos, case studies etc.) will be used must be signed by those featured.</p> <p>Reference is also made to the fact that although IPPF is committed to transparency, information is not disclosed in some instances, such as when it was provided under a duty of confidentiality.</p> <p>No complaints or breaches relating to fundraising or communications were reported in 2016.</p>