



**Accountable  
Now**

GLOBAL STANDARDS LOCAL TRUST



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

**Accountability Report 2017  
Review Round October 2018**



# International Planned Parenthood Federation Feedback from the Independent Review Panel

Review Round October 2018

16 November 2018

Dear Alvaro Bermejo,

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.

IPPF's second accountability report opens with a strong statement from new Director-General Dr. Alvaro Bermejo, indicating **institutional commitment** to learning, sharing, and improving accountability practices.

The report was comprehensive for the most part, with links to policies and examples of how processes work in practice. Some sections did not include as much detail as IPPF's previous report, or did not refer to relevant policies and procedures. The Panel has flagged this under the relevant questions in its feedback and would encourage IPPF to include these points in future reports, or provide a link to where the information can be found in previous reports.

**Good practices** identified in this report include strengthening the assessment of Council members' performance before being considered for re-election and providing assistance to member organisations which fail to meet membership standards (A4), IPPF's approach to sustainable work (B1), and efforts to ensure privacy and protect data (G3), as well as the performance dashboard in the [Annual Performance Report](#).

**Areas for improvement** include IPPF's approach to environmental stewardship (C4), identification and reaching out to stakeholders (D1 and D2), and evidence underpinning advocacy positions (F1).

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.

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 14 December 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

Jane Kiragu

Daniilo Songco



## IPPF's Accountability Report 2017

Review Round October 2018

### Opening Statement from the Head of Organisation

The opening statement by IPPF's new Director-General Dr. Alvaro Bermejo explains how IPPF defines accountability and why it is valued by the organisation. Accountability is seen as key to enabling organisational excellence, quality, and sustainability, as well as increasing support and strengthening resilience in the face of challenges to IPPF's work and funding.

Some of IPPF's achievements in the reporting period are described and examples are given of how the organisation fosters transparency and accountability to its staff.

The Panel notes positively that Dr. Bermejo continues his predecessor's approach to Accountable Now membership – placing importance on peer learning from other Accountable Now members as well as from the Independent Review Panel's feedback.

### Cluster A: Impact Achieved

#### A. The impact we achieve

1	<p><b>Mission statement and theory of change</b></p> <p>IPPF's mission and the rationale behind it are explained, and the inputs into IPPF's theory of charge are listed – through technical assistance, capacity building, resource mobilisation, advocacy, and programmes, IPPF commits to leading a "locally owned, globally connected civil society movement that provides and enables services and champions sexual and reproductive health and rights for all, especially the under-served". More information on the mission, vision, and core values are on IPPF's <a href="#">website</a> and in their <a href="#">Strategic Framework 2016-2022</a>.</p>
2	<p><b>Key strategic indicators for success</b></p> <p>IPPF has four key outcomes, each with targeted results, described in detail in its <a href="#">strategic framework</a>. While there are target figures for the first three outcomes, these are broad and span the entire seven-year duration of the strategy. IPPF's <a href="#">2017 Performance Report</a> refers to more detailed indicators</p>



	for each of the four outcomes – could IPPF provide some information about these in its next report?
3	<p><b><i>Progress and challenges over the reporting period</i></b></p> <p>The report gives a brief overview of progress against each of the four key outcomes in 2017. Key achievements include policy and legislative changes in 66 countries, and significant increases from 2016 in the provision of sexuality education programmes, delivery of sexual and reproductive health services, and support from volunteers. More details including relevant case studies and results against the indicators mentioned above can be found in IPPF's <a href="#">2017 Performance Report</a> (for the latter see Annex B: performance dashboard, which the Panel sees as a <b>good practice</b>).</p> <p>Main challenges faced were the Global Gag Rule which denies US funding to organisations which use the money to provide abortion services/referrals, and a reduction in restricted multilateral funding, both of which led to a major loss of funding in 2017. In the next report, the Panel would also be interested in an overview of non-financial challenges.</p>
4	<p><b><i>Significant events or changes regarding governance and accountability</i></b></p> <p>Several leadership changes took place in 2017, with a new President, Director-General, Governing Council, Audit Committee, and Honorary Legal Counsel being appointed/elected. Has IPPF experienced any difficulties due to this turnover and implied loss of institutional knowledge?</p> <p>Several reforms to the governing council are outlined; these all seem sound. The Panel notes positively that a third of Council members will rotate on an annual basis to minimise disruption to institutional memory – this responds somewhat to the Panel's above concern about challenges due to turnover of key positions. Are there specific systems to retain accountability-related knowledge specifically when there is turnover? Other initiatives include increasing youth representation on the Council and strengthening the assessment of Council members' performance before being considered for re-election – the Panel sees the latter as a <b>good practice</b>.</p> <p>In terms of membership, IPPF Costa Rica was suspended and IPPF Bangladesh and Rwanda's suspensions continued for failing to meet certain aspects of membership standards. It is noteworthy that IPPF is providing assistance to these organisations in order for them to regain their regular status, and the Panel commends this as a good practice.</p>



## B. Positive results are sustained

1	<p><b><i>Sustainability of your work</i></b></p> <p>The report states that IPPF is committed to equipping its member associations with the resources and know-how to create lasting change, even after programmes have officially ended.</p> <p>An overview of various resources developed by IPPF to support Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is provided, along some examples of CSE delivered in 2017 by IPPF member associations. The Panel notes positively that a CSE toolkit allows member associations to pass on knowledge and resources to other groups who can then themselves provide CSE, and is interested in hearing about the progress in this area in the next report.</p> <p>IPPF also promotes local member associations' social enterprise programmes to diversify funding sources – this seems particularly important given the restrictions to US government funding through the Global Gag Rule, and the Panel commends IPPF on its efforts.</p> <p>The report also describes how IPPF engages target populations in its programmes and advocacy work, and that by raising awareness in, mobilising, and empowering local communities, the impact of its work continues beyond the project life cycle.</p> <p>On the whole, IPPF's approach of working at the local level, empowering and passing on knowledge and skills to local communities and organisations, seems sound and effective and is considered a <b>good practice</b>.</p>
2	<p><b><i>Lessons learned in the reporting period</i></b></p> <p>Although IPPF faced significant funding challenges in 2017, the organisation was able to increase Secretariat funding by 3% through resource mobilisation, reaffirming the effectiveness of these strategies. The situation also reaffirmed the importance of supporting IPPF member associations in developing social enterprises and the organisation hopes that by 2022 all parts of the federation will have a clear sustainability model, with more diverse income generation sources.</p> <p>The report also mentions that IPPF refined its external communications strategies to ensure its messaging is tailored to specific audiences and is clear and effective.</p>



	<p>In the next report, the Panel would like to know about any systematic learning processes and methods IPPF has in place. Are learnings drawn from project evaluations, and are these shared within the federation and externally? Does IPPF organise any learning events within the organisation?</p> <p>Good practice examples of Accountable Now members sharing learnings online include <a href="#">Sightsavers</a> and <a href="#">Restless Development</a>. Another good practice is World Vision's Fail Fest which encouraged staff to share failures and learn how they were used as a basis to expose opportunities and/or drive positive change (see their <a href="#">2016 accountability report</a>, pg. 16).</p>
--	---

## C. We lead by example

1	<p><b><i>Leadership on strategic priorities</i></b></p> <p>The report highlights IPPF's leadership through the compilation of an evidence-based report with recommendations on equitable access to modern contraception for women, the organisation's chairmanship on the Implementing Best Practices initiative on family planning and reproductive health, and partnering in the SheDecides conference. European member associations were also able to lobby governments to pledge additional funds to bridge the gap caused by the US Global Gag Rule. Can IPPF point to any feedback which indicates that its efforts are appreciated by its peers and/or affected populations?</p> <p>Earlier in the report, partnerships with major organisations such as UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, and the WHO were mentioned – more information about activities with these bodies could be included in this section in future reports. Resources created by IPPF which have been used broadly in the sector (e.g. the CSE toolkit if that is the case) could also be mentioned.</p>
2	<p><b><i>Inclusivity, human rights, women's rights and gender equality</i></b></p> <p>A key part of IPPF's mission is to enable rights for all, especially the under-served. The vast majority of IPPF's service users in 2017 were poor and vulnerable and over half of health facilities were outside of urban areas. The report explains how IPPF's Humanitarian Programme provides a model for sexual and reproductive health in crises, and examples are provided of interventions in 2017.</p> <p>IPPF has a <a href="#">Women, Girls, and Gender Capability Statement</a> which includes a commitment to promoting gender equality and empowering women and girls. It describes IPPF's gender transformative approach, which combines healthcare delivery, education, challenging gender norms, lobbying for</p>



	<p>policy change, and acting as a watchdog to hold decision-makers accountable. Examples are provided of IPPF's gender equality work in 2017, and 78% of IPPF service users in 2017 were female. IPPF is also strong on gender representation internally, with 71% of board members female in 2017.</p> <p>IPPF has a <a href="#">Gender Equality Strategy and Implementation Plan</a> which provides guidance on how to scale up gender equality programming, as well as how Member Associations and the Secretariat can contribute to this. Steps to make IPPF a gender-transformative organisation internally are also covered, with an aim to conduct regular gender learning activities, to collect meaningful data about gender work, and to appoint Gender Champions in Secretariat locations.</p> <p>Under this reporting question, the Panel would also encourage IPPF to provide any information about internal inclusion policies such as its Gender Equality Policy (policy 1.3 in the <a href="#">policy handbook</a>) identified as a good practice in IPPF's last report, which "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". It also includes guidance to reach gender parity among staff, particularly in decision-making positions.</p> <p>The Panel would like to hear about progress made on the recommendations from IPPF's 2016 Gender Audit in the next report, as well as an update on the number of Member associations with a gender equality policy in place (78% in 2016, but IPPF was encouraging the remainder to follow suit).</p> <p>Finally, the Panel requests information on other diversity factors such as age, ethnicity, disability, and race. How does IPPF ensure inclusion in these respects? Are there systems in place to identify stakeholders that risk being excluded from IPPF's work?</p>
3	<p><b>Minimising negative impacts on stakeholders</b></p> <p>The report states that IPPF's work is needs based and bottom up, with programmes designed and delivered in consultation with key stakeholders. In order to protect the wellbeing of stakeholders, risk assessments are conducted before a project begins, to allow IPPF to tailor its services to the local context. Risks are also reduced by working in partnership with local actors and sharing best practices around service delivery.</p>





	<p>Given IPPF's area of work, there can be particular sensitivities in communities with conservative social, cultural, and religious values. The report points to some examples of how IPPF acts tactfully in these cases, such as by engaging local leaders including men in their efforts to end female genital mutilation. The Panel appreciates this information, as it was something it had requested in its last feedback letter.</p> <p>IPPF's previous report had also referred to its Protecting Children, Young People and Vulnerable Adults Policy (policy 4.17 in the <a href="#">handbook</a>), which outlines how the Secretariat and Member Associations must create safe environments for these groups. This information can be included in this section of the report in future, as well as any information about IPPF's rights-based approach to working and other relevant documents such as a Code of Conduct for staff.</p>
4	<p><b><i>Responsible stewardship for the environment</i></b></p> <p>The report states that IPPF's programmes and services do not have any inadvertently adverse environmental impacts as they are carefully planned health services. All Member Associations are required to reduce harmful impacts in line with IPPF's <a href="#">Membership Standards</a>, and to provide evidence of compliance to the Governing Council – however, there is no guidance in the Standards as to how to do this, or any targets which members should aim for.</p> <p>Some good practices from members are provided, including waste disposal initiatives and the Swedish member deciding to undertake an annual environmental certification.</p> <p>In the previous report, information was provided on greenhouse emissions of the Central Office, and it was stated that carbon management and reporting software would be implemented across all Secretariat offices, allowing for consolidated reporting as well as the development of key performance indicators. The Panel would like an update on this in the next report, as well as information about whether Member Associations also track their emissions. Are there any initiatives to reduce emissions by, for example, reducing air travel; or to compensate for emissions through carbon offsetting?</p> <p>What other initiatives are in place across the Secretariat and wider federation to reduce environmental impact? The previous report had mentioned energy-saving, recycling, and reducing paper wastage.</p>



## Cluster B: Stakeholder Involvement

### D. Key stakeholders are identified with great care

1	<p><b>Key stakeholders and how they are identified</b></p> <p>IPPF's key stakeholders include their employees, volunteers, clients, activists, donors, and governments. The report did not however explain how stakeholders are identified.</p> <p>The previous report had stated that IPPF's five core values (social inclusion, diversity, passion, volunteerism, and accountability) guide decision-making with respect to key stakeholder groups. The Panel repeats its request for more information about how this works in practice – what are the actual processes for identifying and selecting stakeholders? Is stakeholder mapping/analysis undertaken when initiating a project or campaign? Is there a policy or any guidance on stakeholder identification?</p>
2	<p><b>Reaching out to those impacted or concerned by your work</b></p> <p>The report states that IPPF uses a range of media and strategies to communicate with those interested in their work, and that 140.7 million people were reached in 2017 – an impressive 25% increase from 2016. IPPF targeted high profile media platforms such as the BBC and Al Jazeera, but still reached over half of its audience through offline means such as publications, public events, and drama.</p> <p>In future reports, the Panel would also like to hear how IPPF reaches out to affected populations and other key stakeholders such as governmental authorities. An example is provided of sensitization sessions regarding child marriage with communities in Malawi. Are there systems or processes guiding engagement with stakeholders throughout programmes or campaigns, from planning and implementation to feedback and monitoring? Does IPPF employ any particular methods to appeal to particularly vulnerable or marginalised people, or on the other hand to community leaders who might initially be opposed to IPPF's work?</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement in strategic planning and decision making could also be addressed under this section of the report in future.</p>
3	<p><b>Maximising coordination with others operating in the same space</b></p> <p>An overview is provided of IPPF's efforts in partnership with organisations such as the WHO, UNESCO, and Marie Stopes International in 2017. It is stated that</p>



	<p>IPPF seeks to develop mutually beneficial working relationships with actors that share their values, mission, and ethos.</p> <p>In future reports, the Panel would like to know more about overarching policies or processes guiding partnerships. Does working through UN (and other) coordination mechanisms help avoid duplication and create synergies with others operating in the same space?</p>
--	--

## E. We listen to, involve and empower stakeholders

1	<p><b>Stakeholder feedback</b></p> <p>The report presents the various methods via which employees, volunteers, clients, member associations, partners, activists, and donors can provide feedback to IPPF. Overall these appear sound. The Panel notes with interest the decision to conduct an employee engagement survey via an independent company in future, and looks forward to reading about this in upcoming reports. The Western Hemisphere Region's participation in a Keystone Accountability survey is also noteworthy, and the Panel would be interested in reading about the outcomes and actions taken in future reports.</p> <p>Regarding IPPF's clients, the report only mentions surveys about the quality of services IPPF provides. Are there other opportunities for clients to provide feedback, particularly on programmes, campaigns, and the organisation's strategy? How adaptive or flexible are the programmes to meet local needs?</p> <p>IPPF's <a href="#">complaints process</a> is also relevant here and is discussed in detail under section J3 of the report.</p>
2	<p><b>Stakeholder engagement</b></p> <p>IPPF states that it strives to promote a participatory culture in seeking feedback on how it operates. Two examples are given, of how IPPF staff were consulted on the creation of its People Strategy, and how young people were involved in the drafting stage of a Youth Plan guide. Regarding the latter, it was not clear whether the young people involved were staff or external; how were they chosen, and were they consulted beyond the drafting stage? IPPF could make the examples it provided even more illustrative by pointing to specific decisions which arose due to the input of stakeholders.</p> <p>On the whole, the response was focused on consultation, which is one aspect of engagement, but the Panel would have liked to see more about how stakeholders are involved in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of IPPF's programmes and strategy as well. Are there any</p>



	<p>policies or systematic processes guiding a common approach in the federation?</p>
3	<p><b>Main likes/dislikes from stakeholders and organisation's response</b></p> <p>Key likes and dislikes from employees of the Central Office, clients, and member associations are listed. At member association and client level for "on-site", various feedback formats as well as the topics they relate to are presented under "likes" but for the most part specific likes weren't specified. In the next report the Panel would encourage IPPF to share more specific feedback, and to link points to the actions taken in response. E.g. The point about clinics extending their opening hours could be linked to specific feedback received about opening hours not being accessible to clients who work full time. Given IPPF's policy/lobby work and engagement with government/authorities, how does IPPF engage with this stakeholder group?</p> <p>While a response from the Ghanaian Member Association to low client satisfaction levels was provided, actions taken (or a timeline therefore) in response to points for improvement raised by employees were not specified – the Panel would be interested in seeing progress made on these areas in the next report. The Panel looks would also be interested in knowing whether stakeholders have expressed satisfaction with IPPF's responses to their feedback.</p>
4	<p><b>People and partners have gained capacities that last beyond your immediate intervention</b></p> <p>This is covered under IPPF's response to question B1 above. Does IPPF conduct evaluations to measure the sustainability of its efforts, or collect information about this from its partners?</p>
<p><b>F. Our advocacy work addresses the root cause of problems</b></p>	
1	<p><b>Evidence regarding the root causes of the problems you address</b></p> <p>The report states that IPPF uses data from reputable government, private, civil society and sexual and reproductive health sector sources when designing advocacy and policy positions. Well-researched positions are said to increase the effectiveness of IPPF's initiatives.</p> <p>However, the Panel repeats its request from its previous feedback letter to provide more information on the actual process by which advocacy and policy positions are developed. Which stakeholders are consulted? Are positions reviewed periodically? How is corrective action taken when necessary?</p>



	<p>The Panel suggests IPPF refer to CARE International's <a href="#">Advocacy Handbook</a>, which details their advocacy planning and implementation process, as an example. CARE identifies problems and their root causes using tools such as problem trees, conducts contextual analysis and ongoing research to stay abreast of any changes to the issue, and considers other actors and CARE's added value in addressing the issue.</p>
2	<p><b>Stakeholders support your advocacy work and value changes achieved</b></p> <p>In 2017 IPPF began an advocacy strategy development process based on consultations with internal and external stakeholders. A list of who was consulted is provided, and it appears that many actors were consulted, though it wasn't so clear how affected populations/clients were involved – were they included in the questionnaires provided by regions? It would also be helpful to know more about the process – are stakeholders consulted once, or are they able to comment on drafts of the document and then provide feedback on implementation?</p> <p>It is stated that by achieving high-profile results such as advocating for the inclusion of specific text in documents of the UN Commission on the Status of Women and the Global Financing Facility, external stakeholders are able to see how IPPF contributes to meaningful change. Are there examples of positive feedback received on IPPF's advocacy work, or good practice examples in the success of advocacy work at Member Association level?</p> <p>Ideally, stakeholders would not just be consulted on the development of the advocacy strategy, but also its implementation. The Panel suggests reference to <a href="#">CIVICUS' approach</a> (pp. 20-21) as a good practice example: Advocacy positions are co-created in consultation with partners and voices on the ground and published with mutual consent. Efforts are made for members or partners to feature centrally in external discussions, and CIVICUS supports civil society representatives to speak for themselves in high-level discussions such as at the UN Human Rights Council. Interviews are conducted with local civil society leaders to amplify their voices.</p>
<p><b>G. We are transparent, invite dialogue and protect stakeholders' safety</b></p>	
1	<p><b>Availability of key policies and information on your website</b></p> <p>Information about IPPF's structure, funding and finances, strategy, accountability, and <a href="#">complaints process</a> are available on its <a href="#">website</a>. Performance against IPPF's key outcomes is published in an <a href="#">Annual Performance Report</a> and key federation-wide policies are available in their</p>



	<p><a href="#">Policy Handbook</a>. Key documents, such as the strategic framework, policy handbook and complaints policy, are also translated into French, Spanish, and Arabic. Financial information on certain programmes is also published under the <a href="#">International Aid Transparency Initiative</a>.</p> <p>Overall, the Panel is pleased with the availability of relevant information and documents on IPPF's website. Further information which could be provided include evaluations and learning reports, as done by <a href="#">Restless Development</a>.</p>
2	<p><b>Pay scale, gender pay gap and top salaries</b></p> <p>Salaries for Secretariat employees are benchmarked against median salaries for similar roles with international NGOs and the UN. Is there also benchmarking against local salaries, particularly for employees of Member Associations, or are there any guidelines to ensure salaries are in line with (and do not undermine) local conditions?</p> <p>It is mentioned that IPPF's financial statements disclose the number of Secretariat employees earning above US\$78,000: In future reports, is IPPF able to report the salaries of the five most senior positions (or corresponding salary bands as done by Sightsavers on pg. 89 of their <a href="#">annual report</a> or by <a href="#">Restless Development</a>), and the ratio between top and bottom salaries?</p> <p>While the Secretariat has not measured the gender pay gap in the past, it began a process to do so going forward, and an external review of its 2017 payroll data was conducted. A median gender pay gap of 8.13% was identified, which is attributed to higher representation of males in senior management roles and higher representation of females in lower salaried roles.</p> <p>The report outlines measures IPPF will implement to bring about fair and equitable pay. While this is noted positively, more details are requested in the next report, such as whether leadership development programmes will be targeted at females, or what a Secretariat-wide approach to equality, diversity and inclusion will look like. The Panel looks forward to hearing about progress in future reports.</p>
3	<p><b>Ensuring privacy rights and protecting personal data</b></p> <p>The response indicates a sound approach to privacy and data protection. IPPF's Governing Council approved a policy on Ethical, Efficient and Effective Health Systems in 2017 (policy 4.11 in IPPF's <a href="#">Policy Handbook</a>) which guides the collection, storage and management of client information. The Panel commends IPPF on the creation of a video in English, French and Spanish to provide a simple overview of the policy for clinic-based</p>



	<p>stakeholders. A handbook was also created to support Member Associations in adopting clinic management information systems and maintaining client confidentiality.</p> <p>Regionally, risk assessments were piloted to measure the vulnerability of data – the Panel looks forward to hearing about actions taken to improve in future reports.</p> <p>While IPPF does not have a stand-alone data protection policy, this is flagged as an area they are looking to rectify. They have also begun to work towards compliance with the European General Data Protection Regulation. Again, the Panel looks forward to an update in the next report, and can suggest CBM's <a href="#">privacy policy</a> as an example.</p>
--	--

4	<p><b><i>Largest donors and their contributions</i></b></p> <p>The report lists IPPF's five largest government and non-government donors together with the amounts of their contributions. Donations are also reported in the Secretariat's Financial Statements, including institutional gifts, gifts in kind, and the institutional donors providing restricted funding.</p> <p>The report lists CBM International's five largest donors – these all being CBM member associations as CBM International does not raise funds itself – together with their contributions. The five largest donors to member associations are also listed, though the amount of their contributions is not.</p>
---	---

## Cluster C: Organisational Effectiveness

### H. Staff and volunteers are enabled to do their best

1	<p><b><i>Recruitment, employment and staff development is fair and transparent</i></b></p> <p>The report states that IPPF's Secretariat has “best practice recruitment processes” in place – what do these entail? The organisation's gender equality policy (policy 1.3 in the <a href="#">policy handbook</a>) includes guidelines on recruitment and promotion with the aim of reaching gender parity, particularly in decision-making positions. More on how the policy guides the equal treatment of staff is outlined in the Panel's feedback on question C2 above.</p> <p>Policy 4.7 on Meeting the Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights of Young People also encourages active recruitment of young people. Is there further guidance on equal recruitment with regard to other factors such as race, ethnicity, disability, etc? For reference, Restless Development has a very</p>
---	---



	<p>comprehensive Equal Opportunity policy (Section 5 of their <a href="#">employee handbook</a>).</p> <p>The Panel would like to see an overview of staff composition in this section of the report, with a breakdown based on contract type (full/part time), seniority, local hires, disability, gender, and age. This will provide an indication of how the recruitment policies work in practice.</p> <p>In terms of staff development, all Secretariat employees are required to complete an annual performance review which includes feedback from colleagues. Description of the review process in IPPF's <a href="#">previous report</a> (pg. 31) had more details about what is discussed, and the Panel had found this to be thorough, especially the focus on future planning and improvement. That report also stated that Member Associations require annual performance reviews of their employees, and the accreditation review includes a check on this.</p> <p>87% of employees completed performance reviews in 2017, up from 79% in 2016. The figures were somewhat skewed due to informal discussions replacing formal reviews in the European Office – with these included, the completion rate would be 97%.</p> <p>The previous report had mentioned that an enterprise-based global talent management system would be adopted in 2017, and would allow a more integrated approach to people planning, training and performance reviews across the Secretariat. The Panel would like an update on this in the next report.</p> <p>Finally, in terms of learning, IPPF offers staff study support, seminars, workshops, conferences, online training, and coaching. How widely are these offers taken up, and are staff satisfied with the learning and development opportunities they receive?</p>
2	<p><b>Staff development and safe working environment</b></p> <p>IPPF has policies to support the reporting of incidents (covered in more detail under J3) and takes a zero tolerance approach to bullying and harassment. Is there a code of conduct staff need to abide by in this regard? Gender-related aspects of harassment are covered under IPPF's gender equality policy, but is there guidance around other behaviour? Again, Restless Development is a good example – see their Dignity at Work Policy (Section 6 of their <a href="#">employee handbook</a>).</p>





	<p>In 2017, IPPF strengthened its Safety and Security Risk Management System, which includes a Directors' Leadership Team that monitors risks to staff, travel safety advice for those travelling on business, and online trainings on travel health and safety.</p> <p>The report outlines steps IPPF will take going forward, which include the creation of a Safeguarding Taskforce to protect internal and external stakeholders, creation of an external incident reporting service, mandatory safeguarding training, and a review of IPPF's safeguarding policy. Secretariat offices will also appoint Champions to tailor the new People Strategy to local contexts to help develop of a shared culture of engagement, performance, and trust. The Panel appreciates IPPF's commitment to furthering their practices in this area and looks forward to updates in the next report.</p>
<p>I. Resources are handled effectively for the public good</p>	
<p>1</p>	<p><b>Resources are acquired in line with your values, globally accepted standards and without compromising independence</b></p> <p>IPPF is committed to investing in social enterprise programmes to diversify their funding sources, operate more effectively, and achieve greater sustainability. The report provides examples from social enterprise programmes in 2017, which the Panel notes positively. Do members have access to social impact investment?</p> <p>The Secretariat is required to report donations and declare institutional gifts and gifts in kind by name. Are there any specific guidelines around fundraising, such as a fundraising policy?</p>
<p>2</p>	<p><b>Monitoring of progress and re-allocation of resources</b></p> <p>IPPF's Governing Council monitors performance against key outcomes and allocates funds based on the performance dashboard of results in the <a href="#">Annual Performance Report</a>.</p> <p>Resources are allocated based on Member Associations' level of need and performance. Funding is awarded in three instalments, based on the submission of half-yearly and annual reports, to mitigate the risk of misuse of funds. The performance-based part of the system provides bonus funding to members that are most effective in implementing programmes and delivering services. The aim is to drive improvements relative to their own past results, and to boost regional performance. 5% of IPPF's unrestricted income was awarded to high-performing members in 2017.</p>



	<p>IPPF also assists Member Associations in monitoring their performance through the development of monitoring and evaluation handbooks, and encouraging effectiveness through automation and the removal of duplicated processes. The DHIS2 platform for monitoring funding has allowed real-time feedback and analytical dashboards, and a business analytics service helps members monitor performance and make programmatic and management decisions.</p> <p>A bit more information on the monitoring and (re)allocation of resources in projects would be helpful in the next report. How do the processes and tools mentioned above work in this sense? Are there monthly or quarterly checks? When/how can budget items be reallocated during programme implementation?</p>
3	<p><b>Minimising risk of corruption, bribery and misuse of funds</b></p> <p>IPPF has policies on fraud, effective financial management and reporting, and bribery (pp. 66, 97, 100 in the <a href="#">policy handbook</a>). An internal Fraud Response Plan provides guidance on fraud prevention, detection, and reporting. The report describes the processes for investigation of reported fraud cases, which the Panel sees as sound. IPPF's previous report had also mentioned the inclusion of anti-bribery/corruption clauses in agreements with external suppliers, which the Panel notes positively.</p> <p>Are staff and key stakeholders (including partners/suppliers) trained on the policies in place and how to report any incidents?</p> <p>One incident of fraud was reported in 2017 and was resolved. The report states that IPPF has implemented measures to mitigate the risk of a similar incident occurring in future.</p>
<p><b>J. Governance processes maximise accountability</b></p>	
1	<p><b>Governance structure and recruitment of trustees/board members</b></p> <p>A diagram of IPPF's global governance structure is provided. The Council has representatives from each of IPPF's six regions, with at least one representative under 25 years from each region. At least 50% of council members must be women. The IPPF website states that the Governing Council "receives, discusses and approves financial and audit reports, and has ultimate responsibility for overseeing, developing and agreeing IPPF's strategy, policy and priorities." The <a href="#">website</a> also explains the make-up and role of the Directors' Leadership Team and Regional Directors – inclusion of this information in the next report would be helpful.</p>



	<p>In the next report, the Panel requests information on the terms of council members as well as any policies guiding their recruitment. Apart from the gender and age targets, are there skills assessments to guide who is appointed? How are the non-voting expert advisers selected?</p>
2	<p><b>Board oversight of adherence to policies, resource allocation, potential risks, and complaints processes</b></p> <p>The report explains how the Governing Council oversees finances and risk, resource allocation, and compliance and accreditation of Membership Associations. Does the Council also oversee adherence to IPPF's policies within the Secretariat?</p>
3	<p><b>Complaints handling mechanisms and overview of complaints (internal and external)</b></p> <p>IPPF has a <a href="#">complaints page</a> on their website which explains and links to their <a href="#">complaints policy</a> (available in English, French, Spanish and Arabic, and complaints can be filed in all four languages). The policy describes what constitutes a complaints, how complaints can be filed (online, via email, phone, or post), response times and appeal options. The policy is for use by IPPF staff as well as stakeholders and the general public. Does IPPF have a separate whistleblowing mechanism?</p> <p>Three complaints were filed, investigated and resolved in 2017. In future reports, can IPPF provide a breakdown of the broad nature of complaints? It would also be interesting to know how many of the complaints were internal and external.</p> <p>The number of complaints received in 2017 seems rather low. How does IPPF actively promote its complaints policy and procedure both internally and externally? Are there special ways of promoting it to children, young people, and vulnerable adults? The Panel would also like to know more about complaints systems in Member Associations. Do they have their own, or do they use the general IPPF complaints system?</p> <p>The report states that IPPF will soon implement an external incident reporting service that will be accessible 24/7 in multiple languages. An independent service provider will handle complaints and liaise with an IPPF Incident Reporting Unit. Will this service cover Member Associations or just the IPPF Secretariat? The Panel looks forward to an update in the next report, and to learning whether this service leads to more complaints being filed.</p>



## K. Leadership is dedicated to fulfilling the 12 Commitments

1	<p><b><i>The governing body and management are held accountable for fulfilling strategic promises</i></b></p> <p>In 2017, IPPF introduced reforms whereby all Governing Council members must undergo an annual performance review which includes self-assessment, peer review, and review by global and regional presidents. The review includes an assessment of abidance by IPPF's Code of Good Governance as well as how members have evaluated IPPF's achievement of its strategic and operational plans. Is there also a review of the performance of the Council as a whole, in addition to the reviews of individual Council members?</p> <p>The Directors' Leadership Team must also complete an annual performance review where it is assessed whether they fulfil key functions, including accountability. Who completes this review – is it the Governing Council?</p> <p>Are staff also able to provide feedback to the Governing Council and Directors' Leadership Team?</p> <p>IPPF's previous report had also explained that the Governing Council reviews the performance of the Director General and that Regional Presidents and the Directors' Leadership Team provide 360-degree feedback to the Director-General.</p>
2	<p><b><i>Inclusion of staff in discussing progress toward organisational accountability</i></b></p> <p>The report states that staff are engaged in the discussion around accountability through individual and team meetings in local offices, monthly Secretariat-wide staff meetings, and discussions with managers during annual performance reviews. Is accountability proactively put on the agenda, and is staff feedback sought on these issues, or is it expected that staff will bring up relevant points if they wish?</p> <p>The Panel would also like to know how staff are involved in the accountability reporting process. Is a draft of the report shared with key staff members in advance for comments? Is the final report and the Panel's feedback shared and discussed with staff?</p>
3	<p><b><i>Scope of this accountability report and influence over national entities</i></b></p> <p>The report covers the activities and operations of the IPPF Secretariat. While IPPF's member associations are not covered under the scope of the report, some examples of their programmes and services are included in the report</p>



– these examples are helpful in illustrating how federation-wide policies are implemented locally.

Member associations are required to demonstrate good governance and accountability in order to comply with membership standards, and the Governing Council oversees compliance. The Panel appreciates that IPPF will encourage its member associations to have in place the approaches covered by Accountable Now's 12 Accountability Commitments, and looks forward to updates in future reports on how this has been taken up.