Institutional commitment to accountability

World Vision’s report provides again updates on a large number of areas in which World Vision is developing new policies, gathering knowledge, or piloting new systems. It is evident that the organisation is working to improve within a number of areas and their openness on the identified gaps and challenges are appreciated. Developing the reporting from simple compilation of information to overall succinct and candid assessment of the larger trends is the necessary next step to underpin strong institutional commitment in future reports.

Actions taken

Incorrect cross-reference in overview table

The reference table is sometimes not accurate or incomplete (e.g. information for LA13 can be found on pages 9, 10, 37, 46 and 47 instead of 49). The next full report will not be assessed if flaws in this regard reoccur. Moreover, the use of many acronyms is not always easy to understand for the reader. Nevertheless, the format has greatly improved from the recent report which the Panel criticised for its inaccessibility for the reader. Moreover, links to mentioned policies are mostly missing.

Actions taken

Gaps in coordination with other actors (NGO6)

Local ownership and (multi-stakeholder) partnering are priority focus areas of World Vision’s understanding of sustainability. WV claims that staff has developed a good understanding of activities, power dynamics and linkages in local areas through strong partnerships. Is there evidence for this? Moreover, it is positively noted that communities apply their so-called Citizen Voice and Action (CVA) skills to also hold World Vision to account and thus ensure their voices are heard in WV programmes.

The report says that the organisation ensures that their contributions do not duplicate or undermine existing activities and resources. The Panel would be interested to know how World Vision knows that this works well in practice. The report acknowledges that there is room for improvement regarding their coordination with local partners (e.g. Vietnam). Does World Vision carry out partnership evaluations? The Panel suggests looking at CARE’s 2014 accountability report in this regard and to strengthen the idea of emerging partnerships.

In a previous response from World Vision to a Panel feedback letter, the organisation committed to addressing in this report how they ensure that partners meet high standards of accountability (e.g. in terms of financial transparency). However, this question is not answered explicitly this year and the Panel welcomes an update next year. Finally, the Policy Partnership Committee is commendable.

Actions taken
### Environmental sustainability (EN16, EN18 & EN26)

World Vision explains that their Environmental Sustainability Management System (ESMS) was finalised and submitted to senior management at the end of 2013. However, the implementation of the system is considered voluntary for WV offices and it remains a challenge to get different offices to collect carbon footprint data. What can WVI do to support implementation across the federation? What is the organisation's long-term goal in this regard?

As an illustrative example, the commendable emissions table, improvement targets and reduction activities of WV Australia is shared. Moreover, WV field offices, particularly programmes to promote livelihood, are said to have good environmental protection components in place to minimise their negative effect of programming. However, to underpin their commitment World Vision is encouraged to provide at least data for their *headquarter* if they cannot get all national entities on board as fast as they would like to.

**Actions taken**

---------

### Local hiring (EC7)

This indicator is not explicitly mentioned in the report. However, information can be found on the importance of local partnerships (page 6), local ownership (page 13), how CVA builds local skills and capacity for collective action (page 14), or building on local capacity (page 17). For matters of consistency, World Vision is asked to provide information on their approach to hiring local staff (including for senior levels) and how they ensure that these hiring practices do not undermine the local NGO and public sector but rather build capacities on the ground.

**Actions taken**

---------