

Improvement Analysis

CIVICUS

June 2016

Evidence

Our sector is often criticised for voicing good intentional language, but with few facts and figures to substantiate them. The scarcity of information on how the various policies generate positive effects in practice and achieve impact is a weakness in CIVICUS' report.

While we acknowledge that it is not easy to provide this evidence, we see some good efforts in other Charter Members' reports such as: (a) reporting the percentage of national entities which comply with certain standards, (b) leveraging existing surveys that provide relevant hard data, (c) thorough globally set parameters, evidenced by random national level controls or d) illustrative case studies. The Panel also suggests to have a look at the [latest Sightsavers' report](#) as good practice in this regard.

Actions taken

.....

Feedback and Complaints Handling Policy (NGO2)

The Panel appreciates that CIVICUS has got a well-established practice of receiving and dealing with feedback and complaints which is also part of quarterly or biannual performance reports of all projects and departments. It is positively noted that results from the Annual Constituency Survey are published in CIVICUS' Annual Report.

However, there is still no formal feedback and complaints handling mechanism in place which is *mandatory* for all Charter Members (see [membership criteria](#)). A formal policy and well evidenced practice on this indicator is also the basis to be allowed for the biannual reporting cycle for Charter reports. CIVICUS states that complaints logging mechanism will be introduced as part of their new CRM by end-June 2016. Moreover, a Feedback and Complaints Handling Policy is currently developed and shall be published by 01 July 2016. The Panel will closely track developments in this area, in particular:

1. How does CIVICUS actively invite feedback of a significant multitude of stakeholders to co-create activities – is it e.g. published on their website?
2. What is the formal process in which any feedback/complaint can be given (e.g. via email address on website?), is processed, attended to, and resolved where necessary?
3. How does CIVICUS ensure aggregated feedback is meaningfully fed into decision-making?

Actions taken

.....

Wider diversity dimensions (NGO4) and diversity of the Board of Directors (LA13)

The Panel supports CIVICUS' view to improve the organisation's mainstreaming of gender and diversity efforts throughout its programmes (e.g. the new [Gender Working Group](#) or Youth Advisory Group). However, it is overall not clear what CIVICUS does to drive overall inclusion in their work beyond gender and youth. The Panel suggests implementing systems to identify stakeholders that

are potentially excluded from CIVICUS' work due to e.g. disability, ethnicity, poverty, or illiteracy. In addition, a link should also be provided to CIVICUS' gender and diversity policy (mentioned in NGO5) along with evidence that this policy works well in practice.

Moreover, actual figures for Board Members are missing, i.e. the table remains empty for this category. Please clarify the diversity of CIVICUS' Board in future reports.

Actions taken

.....

Anti-corruption practices (SO3)

CIVICUS states that they are informed by their external auditors annually on the latest fraud and corruption schemes as well as by their bankers on phishing schemes etc. Does this equal a systematic risk analysis on where CIVICUS' work might be exposed to corruption, bribery, nepotism, fraud or conflict of interest? CIVICUS is advised to look also internally at potential bad practices as corruption is an external and internal threat.

Unfortunately, the link to the Staff Handbook does not work so that CIVICUS is again asked to directly link to the Fraud Prevention Policy and to the Information Privacy Policy. Evidence that these policies are known by staff and work in practice is also welcome in the next report.

Actions taken

.....