

Response to Review Panel Feedback on the 2011 Report

The INGO Charter Review Panel provided formal feedback on our 2011 Accountability Report in June 2012. A summary of our response is included in the following table. Please refer to for information on the indicators referenced in the first column of this table.

	INGO Charter Review Panel Feedback	WVI Response
Ind. ¹	Strategy and analysis	
1.1	The statement provides interesting information on the approach to accountability, is however less complete than the previous one and lacks information on the organisation's overall vision and strategy, how this is linked to accountability and sustainability and views on performance. It should however be commended that the statement is signed by the Chair as well as the CEO, which can be seen as a sign of commitment to accountability.	The disclosure in our 2012 summarises significant achievements for the reporting period and outline the key issues on WV's 2013 accountability agenda.
	Organisational profile	
2.8	The answer includes good information, however as in the previous round, the answer lacks the number of member/ supporters /volunteers. In their letter to the Panel from the last review round, the organisation states that the number of children in sponsorship is an indication on the number of supporters.	Global numbers of volunteers and child sponsors (private supporters) are estimated in the 2012 report. However, these numbers do not represent all donors / supporters of World Vision. Annual reviews of WV entities should be consulted for a discussion of the scale of individual entities.
2.10	Not reported on.	Awards received by individual WV entities are not systematically tracked by WVI, for either its branch offices or independent offices of the Partnership.
	Governance, commitments and engagement	
4.1	The organisation refers to their Global Accountability Report 2010. As commented in the last review round, this report does not include information on committees under the highest governance body responsible for specific tasks. The panel would welcome a clarification as to why this information is not provided.	Information on the committee structure of the WVI board, the objectives of these committees in terms of the performance oversight, as well as the committees' high level agenda for 2012 is reported in this 2012 report.
4.4	The report only refers to "various mechanisms" which are not explained any further and as in the previous report, no information on topics raised through the mechanisms in place is provided. Providing such examples would have made the answer considerably stronger.	A high level summary of issues overseen by the board is reported in the 2012 report.
4.10	The organisation should be commended for reporting extensively on the first part of this component, which is not yet mandatory but will be as of 2014. This can be seen as Good Practice for larger organisations. However,	Information on the appointment of board members may have been omitted in the 2011 report because it was not a year for WVI Board re-election. WVI Board members were (re)-elected in 2012

¹ Indicator reference from GRI NGOSS.

	information is missing on processes for appointment and dismissal of members/officials in the highest decision making body.	and the process is described in the 2012 report. The Board Partnership Governance committee is reviewing the processes for evaluation of Board performance and more information will be provided as available, but not included in the 2012 report.
4.15	However the answer could have been more detailed on the processes for identifying stakeholders.	These processes are managed by individual entities and not by WV's Global Centre. Processes vary, often tailored to similar stakeholders but not necessarily so. National strategies outline priorities, which guide stakeholder engagement in a particular context. The Development Programme Approach describes the expectations for stakeholder engagement in programmes and projects. More details on these processes can be found throughout the performance management section of the 2012 report.
Programme effectiveness		
NGO1	The organisation can be commended for differentiating the different processes for stakeholder engagement in their different primary activities as well as having implemented "Learning Labs" and capacity building to enable stakeholders and staff to improve their competencies in this respect. The Panel looks forward to hearing more about the outcomes of these processes in future reports. The organisation states that while they have examples of good practice it is currently not in a position to assess the quality and extent to which their mechanisms are implemented across their programmes and that when more information has been gathered, the consistency of the programmes and the degree to which improved accountability also improves results will be assessed.	<p>Disclosure of management approaches in areas of programme effectiveness has been included in the 2012 report. This adds context to WV principles for managing effectiveness.</p> <p>The 2012 narrative discusses the current status of implementation of our Development Programme Approach (DPA) and Citizen Voice for Action (CVA), two important initiatives for engaging affected populations. Examples of outcomes from development, disaster and food programme contexts are supplied, illustrating promising practice concerning stakeholder engagement. WV's use of technology in project as an important enabler of stakeholder engagement is also presented in the new report.</p>
NGO2	Information is provided on the policies in place and how the organisation works to improve within this area. However information on mechanisms / procedures for assessing complaints or for determining actions required in response is lacking. Furthermore, the organisation states that while it has gathered examples of good practice it has not yet undertaken an assessment to determine quality across the organisation and acknowledges that the implementation of effective complaint and feedback mechanisms is an area for increased attention. No statistics are given on the number of complaints in various areas of their work and if they have been solved. The Panel commends the organisation for its strong elements that enable accountability, for example the hotline or giving the communities the possibility of choosing the method with which they like to work. Since the organisation sees itself as a learning organisation, it would however have been interesting to see a deeper explanation regarding how these tools are used and whether the	Monitoring of CRMs is still a challenge across the global Partnership, however the implementation of the new global information system starting June 2012, will move us ahead. New programmes and programmes redesigning are using the DPA and therefore it is assumed that CRMs are being designed into projects. Examples of promising practice are provided in the 2012 report, however monitoring above country level is not aggregated at this time.

	work is successful.	
NGO3	Information is provided on the rigorous systems in place and the percentage of development programmes in which these have been implemented. This part of the answer could be seen as Good Practice for larger organisations. As in the previous report, however, examples of adjustments of policy/ programmes as a result of these or how such changes were communicated is lacking. In their comment to the feedback from the previous review round, the organisation states that they include reference to adjustments made elsewhere in the report.	As a global organisation, WV has been increasing investment in monitoring, evaluation and learning systems since 1997. The organisation is on a critical path of developing programme management systems, global metrics to measure operational efficiency, consistency and programme effectiveness, implementation of a global online programme information system and global reporting of child well-being outcomes, which takes time across such a large Partnership. About 35 national offices are poised to produce reports on new child well-being outcomes in 2013. The programme effectiveness section of the 2012 report offers increasing understanding of WV's commitment in this area.
NGO4	Information is provided on the systems in place and the work done in 2011 to ensure that gender issues are addressed effectively. It is good that this includes not just headcounts but also issues of power and control in relation to gender and how messages have to be contextualised. As in the previous report, however, information on other types of diversity is lacking. In their comment to the feedback from the previous review round, the organisation refers to other places in the report where they included such information.	WV's attention to issues of gender and diversity are well developed and cover development, disaster management and advocacy programming. The lens we use is children and our main concerns are around gender, child protection, child well-being & rights, sexual and gender based violence, disability and HIV / AIDs. However, this is still one of the weaker areas of this report. Our mechanisms are reporting on these issues are dispersed and it is challenging to aggregate information. The advent of the new information system will improve our capacity for reporting in this area from 2014 onwards.
NGO5	Information is provided on the organisation's principles and process with regards to advocacy; however information is lacking on how the organisation ensures consistency or fair public criticisms; on corrective actions taken; on where advocacy positions are published; or on the process for exiting a campaign. A vague commitment to improvement was made in the previous report but not commented on here.	More detailed explanation and references on processes to formulate, communicate, implement and change advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns are provided in the 2012 report.
NGO6	Information on the rigorous systems in place for identifying potential for duplication or opportunities for partnerships with other organisations is provided; however it could have been stronger on the organisation's process for promoting learning from the work of others. A commitment to improve the evaluation of local partnerships was made in the previous report but not commented on here. The answer would have been stronger with a discussion around potential synergies through working with others.	The 2012 report offers additional information on partnerships at the local level and those that the organisation cultivates at the global level. Evaluation of the former is part of our development programme approach and is the purview of each programme and National entity, guided by contextual strategy. Our global partnerships are guided by our Global Capitals strategies and sector leads. The discussion in the 2012 report, illustrates an extensive desire for, level of and commitment to engagement with partners. This extends both to the contribution of experience, intellectual property and material resources.

Economic		
NGO8	The answer does not include the five largest donors but only mentions the source of funding by category and national office.	Information is provided on the top five institutional donors but World Vision does not consolidate information on the largest individual donors which is held by Support Offices.
EC7	Information on the percentage of staff hired locally is provided, however information on these numbers for senior management and on whether the organisation has a global policy for local recruitment in place is lacking. The Panel would have found it interesting to see the numbers of locally recruited staff in senior management positions.	WV is currently implementing a global human resource information system. Information on the numbers of local hired staff in senior management positions is not aggregated to a global level at this time. It is the Partnership's practice that countries need to look first within their country before opening up a role to international hires. In restricted or relief context, senior management roles are usually internationals. Our Partnership Management policy on Recruitment & Selection doesn't specifically speak to giving preference to local candidates.
Environmental		
EN16	The organisation mentions that an Environmental Management System has been developed for the organisation and gives examples of some parts of the organisation reporting on emissions, but states that although encouraged to do so, the organisation's offices are not required to report their emissions. The Panel however acknowledges the progress made in this area.	This year's report has increased the visibility on environmental performance in the hope of encouraging more offices to report their emissions and to consider the implementation of the Environment Sustainable Management System
EN18	The organisation states that it has a number of approaches to promote good stewardship of the natural environment, but does not provide more detailed information on what they are or the reductions achieved through these approaches. The Panel encourages the organisation to be more explicit on activities and commitments with regard to the environment.	Offices must determine their own strategies for improvements in environmental sustainability, including greenhouse gas emissions. At this time however, environment issues are not mainstreamed across the organisation as a cross-cutting theme and resources are not available to track what individual offices are voluntarily doing.
Labour		
NGO9	Information on the mechanisms in place is provided, however the response could have been stronger on the key components of the feedback and their resolution.	As explained in the body of the report, World Vision is prepared to share this information but does not believe that accountability purposes are well served by disclosure of specific incidents in advance of consultation within the NGO community on common definitions and reporting standards. Incident information is reported in this year's report.
LAI	Information on the total workforce broken down by contract type is provided, however it does not indicate the number of employees broken down by employment type, or information on volunteers.	World Vision is currently implementing a global human resource management information system. This data will be readily available once offices have deployed "OurPeople". At this time this data is not being aggregated to global level because the utility doesn't match resources required to do so.
LA10	Good information is provided on the kind of training the organisation offers; however it does not provide total hours of training or average hours of	Individual offices may keep this information, but data on total hours of training or average hours of training is not available at a

	training per employee or volunteers. The organisation mentions that a Partnership Orientation Programme for all employees will be launched in 2013.	globally aggregated level again for 2012. We recognise the utility of this data to the operations; however our investment continues to be in the deployment of the HR MIS, "OurPeople".
LA12	The Panel would however like the organisation to re-confirm that 100% of the staff received performance and career development reviews during the reporting period.	Yes, 100% of staff are meant to receive performance and development plan reviews twice a year. This has been the practice in WV for over 20 years.
LA13	The answer includes a list of the organisation's Board members, however does not provide a breakdown with regard to gender or ethnicity. With regards to employees, the answer provides information on gender (under LA1), but lacks information on ethnicity and age.	World Vision International's Board members come from 19 different countries, so identifying and tracking their ethnicities makes little sense. WV has not considered providing a breakdown.
Society		
SO1	Information is provided on policies and procedures in place for assessing and managing the impacts of operations and refers to other documents where these are described in more detail, however without providing specific page references on where to find the information.	Reference is made back to the Programme Effectiveness performance disclosures. There are references to documents, some of which are in the public domain at www.wvdevelopment.org
SO2	The organisation mentions that there is now a greater focus on fraud and corruption risks in their audit, however information on the total number of percentage of programmes or units analysed for risks related to corruption is lacking. A policy and guidance material on the area of anti-corruption is expected to be finalised during 2012. The response could have been strengthened by adding e.g. examples of complaints linked to corruption.	Disclosures on management approach to corruption and fraud have been added to this year's report. Policy and training materials were developed in 2012. High level information is available on specific incidents.
SO3	Information on mechanisms in place to promote awareness of problems related to fraud and corruption is provided, however it does not include information on the percentage of employees receiving anti-corruption training. A self-study module on fraud/bribery is scheduled to be finalised in 2012. The Panel wishes to encourage the organisation to strengthen its work around anti-corruption procedures.	Significant development of anti-corruption training materials was undertaken in 2012 and now in 2013 self-directed and face-to-face training is taking place. While the focus has been on Finance staff, other businesses are taking advantage of training opportunities. Some of this is mentioned in disclosures this year.
SO4	Information is provided on strong mechanisms in place to reduce corruption and protect children – in particular a hotline which is active 24/7 and operated in 180 languages. The organisation also reports on the number of incidents related to child protection investigated and acted upon in the reporting period. However, complete information on number of incidents, actions taken or whether people were dismissed as a consequence is lacking.	As explained in the body of the report, World Vision is prepared to share this information but does not believe that accountability purposes are well served by disclosure of specific incidents in advance of consultation within the NGO community on common definitions and reporting standards.
Product Responsibility		
PR6	Information on codes in place is provided, however information on the frequency with which it reviews its compliance with its code or on the number of complaints received for breaches of its internal code of conduct is lacking.	There is more information throughout the society and product responsibility disclosures this year on compliance, audit and frequency of reviews.