

Feedback from the Independent Review Panel Review Round November 2014

Berlin, 09 December 2014

Dear Caroline Harper,

Many thanks for submitting your accountability report to the INGO Accountability Charter. Before providing specific feedback on your organisation's report, let us highlight three areas of general concern that occurred in most of the 12 reports submitted for the fall review round:

1.) **Be clear on why accountability is important for your organisation**

For Charter reports to be meaningful, it is important to start with a clear description of the organisation's *specific* understanding of accountability and how this shapes strategic decision-making and operations in regard to governance, finance, programme, fundraising, campaigning, HR etc. Be clear about whom you are most accountable to and how communication with them improves achieving your strategic goals. Find [here](#) on our website the Charter's currently used definition. Throughout the report, let us know how you use accountability to continuously add value to your organisation.

2.) **Moving from "GAP Analysis Table" to "Improvement Analysis"**

It is the key aim of the INGO Accountability Charter to support continuous organisational improvements. Against this background the GAP Analysis Table was introduced to showcase at a glance where progress has been achieved and which areas need to be further addressed. We observed that this worked quite well for some, but not for all organisations. One difficulty being that it became overloaded with information without differentiating important and much less important issues. We therefore suggest that organisations for which this instrument has worked well, keep it as a very good internal document to follow up on progress. For the purpose of the reporting and vetting exercise, however, we suggest having a much more succinct "Improvement Analysis", capturing only the most relevant issues that need to be addressed. The Panel has tried to summarise these areas for your organisation at the end of this Feedback Letter. If this does not reflect your own priorities, please let us know. The "Improvement Analysis" is also considered to be the basis for the very brief interim reports of those organisations moving to biannual reporting.

3.) **Level of Evidence**

Our sector is often criticised for having very good intentional language, but few facts and figures to prove its claims. It is against this background that the Panel asks for compliance to be proven on three levels: (i) having a written policy, (ii) providing evidence that the policy is known and applied by staff and (iii) assurance that it leads to positive management response and helps improving effectiveness in achieving your organisation's goals. While much progress has been made at the policy level, evidence for application in practice and better impact is still relatively low. While we do acknowledge that it is not an easy task to provide this evidence for very large, international organisations, we have also seen some very good attempts. Some examples include: (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.

Please ensure that all the three points listed above are taken into consideration when collecting data for the next INGO Charter report.

Organisation-specific feedback to Sightsavers

Sightsavers third accountability report to the INGO Accountability Charter can be seen as very good, comprehensive, complete and having improved from previous reports. The Panel even regards this report as an exemplary report for other Charter Members.

Sightsavers is again commended for their SIM card (Strategy, Implementation and Monitoring Card) stipulating and tracking performance against identified objectives. This is a balanced scorecard which includes a strategy map, indicators and targets for each objective and the Panel looks forward to its review in 2014. This thorough MEL system that is aligned with strategic objectives (NGO3) can be seen as **Good Practice** for other NGOs. Other remarkable areas are the fact that each Trustee has his/her own individual Key Performance Indicators to perform against (4.2), the organisation's newly developed Global Complaints Policy (NGO2) in reaction to previous Panel feedback, and a very good disclosure and acknowledgement of incidents of corruption in the organisation (SO4).

Evidence that policies and procedures work well in practice are provided for some indicators but should be more frequently referenced in the next report. Moreover, the Panel looks forward to more details about how complaints and feedback led to changes in decision-making, and were resolved or followed up upon. Another area of improvement would be to provide links to the mentioned policies throughout the report.

Institutional commitment is highlighted in the CEO's opening statement and by the fact that the report applies to the whole organisation where possible (e.g. missing data on environmental figures from offices overseas). It is appreciated that Sightsavers has put the Charter logo on their website about publications (see [here](#)) and links to the Charter website. However, the organisation is encouraged to publicise its commitment to accountability more prominently in its digital communication.

Finally, the Panel positively notes that Sightsavers submitted an updated **GAP Analysis Table** along with this report (attached to the end of this letter) and has set itself ambitious targets for the coming years. The Panel positively notes that promises made in earlier reports were followed up. As explained in the generic part of this feedback letter, the Panel decided to replace the old format of the GAP Analysis Table with a more succinct "**Improvement Analysis**". Based on this report's assessment, we have written this for you and you find it attached to this letter. From now on we will use this format serving also as a baseline for you to summarise progress made in these areas and covered in more detail in the full report. Please feel free to adjust and complement this analysis from your perspective.

Overall, Sightsavers is commended for a very high level of transparency and accountability to its key stakeholders and the Panel suggests **reporting every two years against Charter commitments from now on**. In a very brief **interim report** the Panel would like to see only an updated CEO statement and information on progress highlighted by the Panel in the "Improvement Analysis".

Our intention is that this letter, and any response you may wish to provide, is made publicly available on the Charter website along with your report. You can find the reports that were previously reviewed on our [website](#). 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 these comments or amendments by 10 January 2015.

If you have any other feedback or comments on our work, please share them with us by sending them to the Charter Secretariat. We look forward to hearing your views.

Yours sincerely,



Louise James



Wambui Kimathi



Michael Röska



Jane Kiragu



Rhonda Chapman



John Clark



Saeun Soeung

**Review Round November 2014
Cover Note on Accountability Report**

Sightsavers

Reporting period: Calendar year 2013

PROFILE DISCLOSURES	
I. Strategy and Analysis	
1.1	<p>Statement from the most senior decision-maker <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Sightsavers' CEO provides a strong institutional commitment to accountability and states that accountability is an underpinning theme with all their work. The statement would, however, profit from a short explanation on what specifically accountability means to Sightsavers and which role it plays in achieving the outlined ambitious top priorities for the coming years. Does it just underpin the delivery on commitments or does <i>taking into account what key stakeholders say</i>, also meaningfully translate into strategic and management decisions? In how far will active accountability for instance <i>shape</i> the development of the envisaged new Social Inclusion strategy?</p>
II. Organisational Profile	
2.1 – 2.7	<p>Name of organisation / Primary activities / Operational structure / Headquarter location / Number of countries / Nature of ownership / Target audience <i>Fully addressed</i></p>
2.8	<p>Scale of organisation <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Sightsavers provides a comprehensive overview of the organisation's scale, including relevant financial and staff figures. As in the previous year, the majority (76%) of incoming resources comes from a gifts-in-kind donation of <i>Mectizan</i> ® from Merck and Co. Inc.</p>
2.9 – 2.10	<p>Significant changes / Awards received <i>Fully addressed</i></p>
III. Report Parameters	
3.1 – 3.4	<p>Reporting period / Date of most recent report / Reporting cycle / Contact person <i>Fully addressed</i></p>
3.5	<p>Reporting process <i>Addressed</i></p> <p>The report has been compiled with cross-functional contributions within the organisation (HR, Finance, Global Fundraising, Planning and Performance, Policy and Advocacy etc.). The opening statement of the CEO furthermore shows that previous Panel feedback was taken into account and led to organisational changes. It is not clear, however, how circulation of the 2012</p>

	report to employees, partners and donors has led to relevant feedback and management responses. It would be interesting for the coming report to understand how Sightsavers uses the Charter report and review to inform strategic and management decision making.
3.6 – 3.7	Report boundary / Specific limitations <i>Fully addressed</i> At present the systems do not exist to allow reporting on carbon emissions relating to energy usage by offices outside of the UK (EN16).
3.8, 3.10 & 3.11	Basis for reporting / Reporting parameters <i>Fully addressed</i>
3.12	Reference table <i>n/a</i>
IV. Mission, Values, Governance, and Stakeholder Engagement	
4.1	Governance structure <i>Fully addressed</i> Comprehensive information about Sightsavers' governance structure is provided. Last year the Panel raised the question: which responsibility specifically rests with the global, national and local level and some useful information is provided in this regard. Strong risk management provisions are also reported. The only thing missing is a short explanation on what is specific in this governance structure as compared to other options and why this one is best suited to fulfil Sightsavers' mission. Moreover, the current number of members of the Council of Trustees varies between 15 (see 4.3) and 16 (see 4.10) in the report.
4.2 – 4.3	Division of power between the governance body and management / Independence of Board Directors <i>Fully addressed</i> The division of power between Trustees and Management is clearly described. The fact that each Trustee has their individual Key Performance Indicators to perform against can be seen as Good Practice for an effective Board.
4.4	Feedback from internal stakeholders <i>Fully addressed</i> An employee survey is held every two years and the 2013 survey reported a 94% overall response rate and increased overall positive responses compared to 2011. 75% of staff having completed the survey agreed that Sightsavers' information sharing systems are effective. It would be interesting to know if this positive assessment applies also to staff feeling they have a chance to meaningfully impact on decision-making where this is relevant. Volunteers are encouraged to provide comments on any aspect of their experience during an informal process.
4.5	Compensation for members of highest governance body <i>Partially addressed</i> The Panel encourages Sightsavers to link to the mentioned remuneration policy and to be more explicit on salary bands. Are trustees remunerated?

4.6	Conflicts of interests <i>Fully addressed</i>
4.10	Process to support highest governance body's own performance <i>Partially addressed</i> Relevant information is provided on the Trustees' appointment, term limits and responsibilities. The Council usually evaluates itself every other year. Sightsavers is encouraged to provide evidence that these performance evaluations have been used to further improve the effectiveness of the body.
4.12	Social charters, principles or other initiatives to which the organisation subscribes <i>Fully addressed</i> It is positively noted that Sightsavers complies with a number of different accountability and transparency standards.
4.14	List of stakeholders <i>Fully addressed</i>
4.15	Basis for identification of stakeholders <i>Fully addressed</i> The answer gives sound information about the basis for identification and selection of stakeholders. As in last year's feedback, Sightsavers is encouraged to provide a link to the mentioned Programme Partnership Policy and Corporate Engagement Policy. Moreover, the Panel looks forward to progress on the roll-out of the research governance framework, setting out governance principles for all research activities that Sightsavers supports. It is assumed that this will provide guiding information on which stakeholders to engage with in research activities.
4.16 – 4.17	<i>Moved to NGO1.</i>

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
I. Programme Effectiveness	
NGO1	Involvement of affected stakeholder groups <i>Fully addressed</i> The report provides detailed information on donors, country offices, affected stakeholders, governments, partners and local actors being engaged in the design and implementation of programmes and advocacy work as well as the development of Sightsavers policies. Sightsavers is again commended for tracking the engagement of its stakeholders through its SIM Card. In 2013, the organisation had a 75.15% achievement in its global indicator for measuring progress on stakeholder engagement against a set target of 85%. The Panel looks forward to the development of metrics to measure qualitative impact that stakeholder feedback has to positively affect the decision making process or reshaped policies.
NGO2	Mechanisms for feedback and complaints <i>Fully addressed</i>

	<p>Panel feedback from previous years was taken on board and a new Complaints Policy (can be downloaded via their website) including thorough Complaints Handling Procedures has been developed in 2013 and is being rolled out in 2014. The Panel is glad to read that this development was supported by and that Sightsavers has learnt from other Charter Members as part of the Peer Advice Group on complaints handling. The Global Complaints Policy itself, the fact that there are no restrictions how complaints can be made and the timeliness (responding within 30 days) can be seen as Good Practice for other organisations. The Panel is interested to hear more information on the kinds of complaints received, how complaints will be dealt with in the future and how this will improve stakeholder information to be used by decision makers. It is further advised to think about complementing the “Complaints” handling with inviting in “Feedback”. As such stakeholders are invited in to comment and give feedback in order to help continuously improve performance.</p>
NGO3	<p><i>Programme monitoring, evaluation and learning</i> <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Sightsavers is again commended for its thorough MEL system that is aligned with strategic objectives. All programmes are monitored using the SIM card and a harmonised programme implementation manual (PIM) was developed providing good grounding for organisational MEL processes. Sightsavers seems committed to internal and external knowledge sharing, including internal learning newsletters (“Signpost”), actively engaging in Charter webinars with other Member organisations, and publications in peer-review journals. The whole answer can be seen as Good Practice as in the Panel’s last feedback. However, evidence that Sightsavers’ MEL led to positive management response would be welcome in the next report.</p>
NGO4	<p><i>Gender and diversity</i> <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Evolving from Sightsavers’ mission their projects are often focussed on the disability aspect of diversity. Nevertheless, gender, age, and ethnicity are also systematically included in all programme design and implementation. Gender disaggregation was an area noted for improvement in recent audit recommendations and the Panel looks forward to progress in this regard. Finally, Sightsavers aims at developing a statistical tool to help measure the impact of programmes on beneficiaries of different diversity groups. It will be interesting to be informed on these developments as well as on any set targets in the next report.</p>
NGO5	<p><i>Advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns</i> <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Comprehensive information is provided on the involvement of staff, beneficiaries and external experts to develop policy positions. To ensure optimal alignment across the organisation these are coordinated by an International Advocacy Coordination Team. A commitment is made to fair, balanced and evidenced based policy positions derived from verifiable sources. It is not clear, however, if this commitment is supported by a published policy and sign off process for adopting public policies. Neither is there a formalised process for corrective adjustment where necessary or exit strategies for all campaigns. Sightsavers is encouraged to look into this systematically.</p> <p>It is stated that the recruitment of a Social Media Manager has helped to reach out</p>

	to public more effectively (e.g. using Twitter). It will be interesting to hear if this also prompted more of a two-way communication, allowing stakeholders a stronger engagement in the advocacy work.
NGO6	<p>Coordination with other actors <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Based on the Programme Partnership Policy, Sightsavers has a complex partnership network that is divided into different categories: Global strategic alliances, international programme partnerships, and implementing project partnerships. The organisation is commended for ensuring that their partners meet high standards of accountability through carrying out capacity and financial assessments. Finally, the Panel welcomes set targets and planned actions to improve the evidence-base to demonstrate that the partners have the increased capacity to sustain programme activities and that optimal effectiveness is leveraged.</p>
II. Financial Management	
NGO7	<p>Resource allocation <i>Fully addressed</i></p>
NGO8	<p>Sources of Funding <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Sightsavers has a strategic objective of growing and diversifying income, e.g. increasing income from institutional donors. About ¾ of Sightsavers' overall income comes from a gift-in-kind contribution from Merck and Co. In light of how Merck might present their charitable contribution, it would be interesting to know if the value listed are the actual market prices or the value prices that Merck provides.</p>
III. Environmental Management	
EN16	<p>Greenhouse gas emissions of operations <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>It is stated that all of Sightsavers' emissions are indirect and incidental to their operations. Business air travel is broken down in a very detailed manner. The figures provided only apply to the head office in the UK and the Panel looks forward to improvements in the oversea offices.</p>
EN18	<p>Initiatives to reduce emissions of operations <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>A variety of useful initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is identified and the Panel looks forward to the introduction of a new policy regulating air travel bookings. The office moving has shown positive progress in this regard.</p>
EN26	<p>Initiatives to mitigate environmental impact of activities and services <i>Fully addressed</i></p>
IV. Human Resource Management	
LA1	<p>Size and composition of workforce <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>There is a slight inconsistency in figures: The overall number of workforce in 2013 is stated as 389 here (p.29) but LA13 lists 398 (p.33).</p>

EC7	<p>Procedure for local hiring <i>Fully addressed</i> A link to the described recruitment policy and Global Diversity and Equality Policy, making the commitment to employ a workforce that reflects the diversity of local contexts and culture, would be highly useful in next year's report. Overall, Sightsavers can be commended for high percentages of locally hired staff (between 90% and 100% of senior managers throughout the different regions).</p>
LA10	<p>Workforce training <i>Fully addressed</i> During 2013, there has been an increase in investment in development hours, although this is not been reflected in the average training hours reported. Training needs are identified at the individual level, i.e. through Development Reviews, and 40% of volunteers have received training in 2013. Evidence is e.g. provided for participants of the leadership development group having demonstrated a significant uplift in specifically identified leadership competencies.</p>
LA12	<p>Global talent management <i>Fully addressed</i> 93.4% of overall Sightsavers staff have received a Performance and Development Review (PDR) in 2013. More detailed information on the low numbers from Europe-based staff (67%) would have been interesting to know. Evidence that these reviews are generally positively received by staff is provided via the employee survey 2013.</p>
LA13	<p>Diversity of workforce and governance bodies <i>Fully addressed</i> The answer provides a detailed breakdown of employees according to different diversity factors. Sightsavers is encouraged to provide a link to the Disability in the Workplace Policy in the next report.</p> <p>In addition to the inconsistency of numbers mentioned under LA1, the Panel would like to mention that the break-down of female employees according to regions adds up to 200 (and not to 187 as stated in the table) which would account for an overall workforce of 409 in 2013.</p>
NGO9	<p>Mechanisms to raise grievances <i>Partially addressed</i> Sightsavers does not have a formalised policy in place but mechanisms for staff to raise grievances such as a Grievance Procedure. The organisation is encouraged to provide evidence in the next report that concerns raised were resolved satisfactorily.</p>
V. Responsible Management of Impacts on Society	
SO1	<p>Managing your impact on local communities <i>Fully addressed</i> Impacts of Sightsavers activities on the wider community were described in more detail in last year's report and this year also in NGO6. In strategic alignment, Sightsavers is currently developing its exit strategies and has identified areas of improvement, e.g. longer timeframes for close-out and greater partner consultation.</p>

SO3	<p><i>Anti-corruption practices</i> <i>Fully addressed</i> As reported last year, Sightsavers does not have a stand-alone training programme for employees on the anti-corruption procedures that have been adopted but rather includes the relevant organisational policies regarding fraud, money laundering and corruption into general staff inductions. Sightsavers believes that this approach and the policies are well known and effective – evidenced by the fact that fraud reports have been received in line with the provisions of the fraud reporting policy. The answer would profit from being more specific in terms of systematic risk analysis carried out on a regular basis.</p>
SO4	<p><i>Actions taken in response of corruption incidents</i> <i>Fully addressed</i> Sightsavers can be commended for a very good disclosure and acknowledgement of incidents of corruption in the organisation. This is regarded as Good Practice in terms of downward accountability.</p>
VI. Ethical Fundraising	
PR6	<p><i>Ethical fundraising and marketing communications</i> <i>Addressed</i> Sightsavers does not have an organisational policy on fundraising but the organisation and its entities adhere to a broad number of legal national standards and voluntary codes. The number of complaints received, broken down by activity for 2013, is provided. However, information how these were resolved is missing.</p>

Sightsavers Gap Analysis Table – Areas of Commitments and Progress achieved

Accountability is a process of continuous improvement. Each year Charter Members in their accountability reports identify and prioritise areas for improvement and corrective actions they plan to take. As of reports submitted in 2014, Members are asked to capture these commitments in this Gap Analysis Table. The Independent Review Panel may suggest the Member to add further issues when reviewing the Member's report. Each year following, the table shall be submitted along with the accountability report and will then be used as a basis to demonstrate progress. The table will be published on the website along with the accountability report and the feedback from the Panel.

NOTE: The Panel decided to replace the old format of the GAP Analysis Table with a more succinct “Improvement Analysis”. Based on this report’s assessment, we have written this for you and you find it attached to this letter. From now on we will use this format serving also as a baseline for you to summarise progress made in these areas and covered in more detail in the full report.

GRI – Performance Indicators	Reporting year 2011	Reporting year 2012	Reporting year 2013	Reporting year 2014
Programme Effectiveness				
NGO1: Processes for involvement of affected stakeholder groups.		<p>In report covering 2012: <i>“Developing a system of engagement with patients and pupils will take time, but Sightsavers will (...) encourage it to happen (...)”</i></p> <p><i>“Sightsavers’ plan for 2013 is to build (...) a network of affected individuals and organisations, across the countries of operation (...). (...) particularly in the design of these positions by providing their viewpoints and feedback.”</i></p>	<p>In report covering 2013: <i>“The new education strategy and standards (developed in 2013, but yet to be published) commits Sightsavers to the participation of local stakeholders (particularly pupils with disabilities and their parents) in Sightsavers-supported education programmes. (...)”</i></p> <p><i>“In all our education programmes, regular meetings are held involving staff from Sightsavers Country Offices and staff from our partner organisations and these partnerships are sustained through MOUs.”</i></p> <p><i>“(…), in 2014 we will be reviewing key</i></p>	

			<i>programmatic policies and will involve relevant affected stakeholders in the redesign of internal policies.”</i>	
NGO2: Mechanisms for feedback and complaints.	In report covering 2011: <i>“As part of the increased focus on quality, Sightsavers is appointing a Quality Systems Advisor, due to start in late April 2012.”</i>	In report covering 2012: <i>“Sightsavers recognises that there is more work to do in ensuring that complainants are clear about where to direct their complaint.”</i> <i>“Sightsavers is intent on improving its complaints process (...) in 2013.”</i>	In report covering 2013: <i>“Sightsavers has redeveloped its complaints process through engagement with other Charter members. This has been launched.”</i> <i>“2014 will be a year of running the policy (...). We will use the this knowledge to refine the policy and process to ensure that it operates effectively.”</i>	
NGO3: System for program monitoring, evaluation and learning.	In report covering 2011: <i>“To date, only a handful of countries and projects have developed these robust plans [M&E] and further work will be undertaken in 2012 and beyond to embed this practice in line with new organisational project planning processes.”</i>	In report covering 2012: <i>“In 2013, Sightsavers will be developing its first (...) Knowledge Sharing and Learning Strategy, so as to formalise and attach accountability to learning from evidence generating activities, including the M&E system.”</i>	In report covering 2013: <i>“The framework was partially developed and halted due to other organisational change processes taking place.”</i> <i>“An indicator dictionary will be rolled out in 2014.”</i>	
NGO4: Measures to integrate gender and diversity into program.	In report covering 2011: <i>“In 2012, the country offices will also be asked to disaggregate data by age group.”</i> <i>“Currently Sightsavers does not have specific tools or recommended processes to undertake specific gender and diversity analysis but these will be provided (...) in 2012.”</i>	In report covering 2012: No progress reported. <i>“Sightsavers will review the output information captured to ensure that it best captures programme performance.”</i> <i>“Sightsavers is investing in the development of a programmes’ database.”</i> <i>“Gender policy guidance will be launched in 2013.”</i>	In report covering 2013: <i>“During 2013, Sightsavers conducted an internal output statistics audit (...). Gender disaggregation was an area noted for improvement (...). In response to this recommendation, all country teams were engaged in discussions to build on the quality of data collection and the output collection guidance was rewritten with greater emphasis on collection of disaggregated data”</i> <i>“In 2013, Sightsavers invested in the</i>	

			<p><i>development of a programmes' database to improve the recording of outputs at the country level as well as central consolidation. The database will be rolled in 2014."</i></p> <p><i>"Following significant structural and technical changes, the gender policy guidance is currently on hold although activities are ongoing as detailed in the report."</i></p> <p><i>"The Programme Implementation Manual was successfully launched at Sightsavers' programme meeting in June 2013. The operational manual includes guidance to programme staff about how to ensure adequate attention is given to gender and diversity in all stages of the programme cycle."</i></p>	
<p>NGO5: Advocacy.</p>	<p>In report covering 2011: <i>"In 2012 it may be necessary to develop a clearer process for corrective adjustments of advocacy positions and campaigns, (...)."</i></p> <p><i>„In 2012 a policy campaign will be developed and as part of this a clear exit strategy from the campaign will be designed."</i></p>	<p>In report covering 2012: <i>"(...) a new Director of Global Advocacy has been appointed and will start in June 2013."</i></p> <p><i>"In 2013 it may be necessary to develop a clearer process for corrective adjustments of advocacy positions and campaigns (...)."</i></p> <p><i>"Sightsavers will develop a 5 year campaigning strategy."</i></p>	<p><i>"Sightsavers' Director of Global Advocacy, Elizabeth Kurian was appointed. The global advocacy team was thereafter strengthened with the addition of Gertrude Oforiwa-Fefoame, Africa Social Inclusion Advisor; a highly experienced professional from the sector."</i></p> <p><i>"The organisation is currently drafting an advocacy strategy."</i></p> <p><i>"To date no process has been put in place as the need for such a process has not arisen."</i></p> <p><i>"Sightsavers has developed and is</i></p>	

			<p><i>implementing a five-year campaign strategy.”</i></p> <p><i>“In May 2015, after the successful completion of the first policy campaign we will evaluate its progress against objectives, successes to date and review whether an exit strategy is required or whether the organisation will continue to use policy campaigning (...).”</i></p>	
NGO6: Coordination with other actors		<p>In report covering 2012: <i>“In 2013, all countries where Sightsavers has an office will be developing new country strategies to guide operations through to the end of the extension of the global strategy and clearly articulate the contribution to responding to the specific development challenges of that country.”</i></p> <p><i>“From 2013, PDAs will be more involved in the conceptualisation and design of new programmes.”</i></p>	<p>In report covering 2013: <i>“All country strategies will be guided by organisational & thematic strategies as part of the strategic alignment process, superseding the need for each country to develop individual strategies. The PDAs are currently working with each country to create an approach based on the specific country context to operational organisational strategy.”</i></p> <p><i>“PDAs are now responsible for initial programme approval based on level of strategic alignment, and work with country offices to conceptualise and design programmes.”</i></p>	
Economic				
-				
Environmental				
EN18: Greenhouse gas emission.			<p>In report covering 2013: <i>“Sightsavers hopes to see electricity reductions in the next report.”</i></p> <p><i>“In 2014, we will explore ways to work with country offices to improve on this.”</i></p>	

<p>EN18: Initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reductions achieved.</p>	<p>In report covering 2011: <i>"In addition, by the end of Q1 2012 Sightsavers will have transferred to a green energy tariff from an appropriate electricity supplier, which will further reduce the greenhouse gas emissions."</i></p> <p><i>"In 2012 Sightsavers will introduce desktop videoconferencing facilities and make them available to all staff in all offices globally."</i></p>	<p>In report covering 2012: <i>"As of autumn 2012, Sightsavers has transferred to a green energy tariff, which will further reduce the greenhouse gas emissions."</i></p> <p><i>"Sightsavers is actively seeking to sell the existing UK headquarters building (...) to seek more energy efficient office premises (...)."</i></p> <p><i>"In 2012 Sightsavers introduced desktop videoconferencing facilities and made them available to all staff in all offices globally."</i></p>	<p>In report covering 2013: <i>"Sightsavers has sold the existing UK headquarters and is moving to new, more energy efficient premises in quarter one 2014. The new premises are located in closer proximity to public transport links, which provides staff the opportunity to choose alternative transport."</i></p> <p><i>"(...) however this will be improved in 2014 by introduction of a new policy requires our overseas offices to book their air travel (...) through the central travel process."</i></p>	
Labor				
<p>LA10: Workforce training.</p>	<p>In report covering 2011: Sightsavers committed to provide more information on the composition of governing body in its next report.</p>	<p>In report covering 2012: <i>"Over the next 12 to 24 months Sightsavers will be running three Management Development Programmes entitled 'Changing Gear'."</i></p> <p>More information on the composition of governing body is given.</p>	<p>In report covering 2013: <i>"The Management development programme will conclude at the beginning of Q2 2014. The first group completed in Dec 2013. By the end of the programme, each of the managers will have completed on average 84 hours of leadership development. This is in follow up to a significant staff development programmes in non-management programme staff in the previous two years."</i></p>	
<p>LA12: Percentage of staff receiving performance/career development review.</p>		<p>In report covering 2012: <i>"However, further formal feedback data on PDRs will be collected during the Employee Survey in 2013."</i></p>	<p>In report covering 2013: <i>"The 2013, employee survey reported an increase in in positives responses to employee satisfaction with the performance review process."</i></p> <p><i>"Our HR department are focusing on the development of a new organisation"</i></p>	

			<i>wide induction programme in 2014, which will be implemented during quarter one 2015</i>	
LA13: Diversity within the organisation.		In report covering 2012: <i>“Over the long term, Sightsavers will be working to develop global data on ethnic origin.”</i>	In report covering 2013: <i>“The figures for the UK and Ireland and Middle East now have more detailed breakdown for each ethnicity. Progress still needs to be made for in country teams. This should be addressed with the introduction of the new HR information system which will be fully implemented by Q4 2014.”</i>	
Responsible Management of Impacts on Society				
SO1: Nature, scope, and effectiveness of any programs		In report covering 2012: <i>“Sightsavers will be expanding its range of quality standards in 2013.”</i>	In report covering 2013: <i>“Quality standards covering all key areas of our work except Social Inclusion are now in place. 85% (28members) target staff has received a training of trainers course on the current standards and will lead country roll out in 2014.”</i>	
SO3: Percentage of employees trained in organization’s anti-corruption policies and procedures.		In report covering 2012: <i>“In light of the Anti-Bribery Principles and Guidance for NGOs produced by Transparency International, Sightsavers will review its approach to the Act and anti-corruption more broadly during 2013, including to training.”</i>	In report covering 2013: <i>“Sightsavers has begun the process of updating its induction procedures as a result of a review in 2013. (...) It is expected that others will follow in 2014.”</i>	
Ethical Fundraising				
-				