

WORLD VISION REONSE TO INTEGRATED REVIEW PANEL
Accountability Report 2014

World Vision International

Reporting period: 01 October 2013 – 30 September 2014

PROFILE DISCLOSURES	
I. Strategy and Analysis	
PANEL FEEDBACK	WORLD VISION RESPONSE
<p>1.1 Statement from the most senior decision-maker <i>Fully addressed</i> The joint and succinct statement by Kevin Jenkins, World Vision's President and CEO, and Josef Stiegler, Chair, contains a solid commitment to accountability, understood to strengthen a culture of learning and improvement in the organisation as well as to empower communities to hold their development partners to account. In particular, World Vision's <i>Citizen Voice and Action</i> approach has contributed to spread awareness of accountability among community members by helping them to understand their rights to call for better services. It is appreciated that the statement is open about failures in regard to misappropriation of assets and cases of fraud and how the organisation aimed at learning from these mistakes.</p> <p>Later in the report, World Vision mentions that a new definition of accountability, encompassing internal and external practices, was adopted in January 2015. Please share this in the next report to underpin the Panel's understanding of how accountability reinforces and drives organisational decisions.</p>	<p><i>Noted with thanks. We will share the WV definition of accountability in our next report.</i></p>
II. Organisational Profile	
<p>2.1 Name of organisation and primary activities / Operational structure 2.6 Headquarter location / Number of countries / Nature of ownership <i>Fully addressed</i> Comprehensive information is provided per links; direct links would have been appreciated rather than links to the general homepage. A</p>	<p><i>Noted and we will provide more details and relevant links in our next report.</i></p>

concrete address of World Vision's headquarter would furthermore be appreciated.	
2.7 Target audience <i>Partially addressed</i> The report could be clearer on World Vision's target audience. World Vision mentions sponsored children here; however, in other areas of the report, the organisation says that they are specifically not targeting children. It is important to understand <i>who</i> is served with priority and <i>why</i> World Vision chose these groups over others to understand if World Vision is optimally effective and accountable.	<i>World Vision is a child-focused organisation and most of our interventions target children in their communities – with the main purpose of improving child well-being. There could have been some confusion at some point but children remain our main focus and remain targeted in almost all our interventions. We will make sure there is sufficient clarity in future reports to avoid this confusion.</i>
2.8 Scale of organisation / Significant changes to previous reporting 2.9 Fully addressed	<i>Noted.</i>
2.10 Awards received <i>Fully addressed</i> The Panel congratulates World Vision and their national entities for the awards they received during 2014	<i>Noted with thanks.</i>
III. Report Parameters	
3.1 Reporting period / Date of most recent report / Reporting cycle / Contact person 3.4 Fully addressed The report covers the period from 01 October 2013 to 30 September 2014. The date of the most previous report is not explicitly mentioned but was submitted for the fall review round 2014.	<i>Noted</i>
3.5 Reporting process <i>Fully addressed</i> The answer (page 4) describes a very solid process in place to compile the information for this report: The Global Accountability team seeks inputs from all relevant entities and the WVI Operations Committee as well as the Board's Audit and Risk Committee review the report. The Panel welcomes the fact that World Vision publishes the Charter report on its website, shares a link and shares a summary outcome with staff. It would be good if Panel feedback was clearly published. How was staff actually involved in the preparation of this report? It is moreover positively noted that World Vision initiated accountability reporting at national offices, encouraging different offices to include	<i>While feedback from IRP is published on the website of the INGO Charter, we did not publish this on our website. We will consider doing so in the future.</i> <i>We note with thanks recognition of the good practice and will update our next report showing progress on our efforts of including an accountability component in National Offices external reports.</i>

<p>an accountability component in their annual external reports. An accountability workshop took place in Swaziland where a template and guide were developed (page 5). The Panel regards this workshop as Good Practice for other Charter Members and welcomes progress updates in future reports to hear evidence how national office reporting has de facto improved due to cascading accountability through the organisation.</p>	
<p>3.6 Report boundary / Specific limitations</p> <p><i>3.7 Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Among other operational changes, World Vision has started new operations in 2014 to respond to the critical needs of people affected by war in Iraq and Syria. As mentioned in the opening statement, channelling large volumes of donor aid to sensitive locations such as Iraq poses new challenges and the Panel looks forward to hearing more about this in the next report.</p>	<p><i>Efforts to share our experience with our emergency response in Syria/ Iraq will be made in our next report.</i></p>
<p>3.8 Basis for reporting</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>This report is produced on behalf of all World Vision entities, including VisionFund International. The report does not cover community-based civil society organisations (CBOs), which in some countries are contracted to manage particular aspects of programmes.</p> <p>It is positively noted that the Global Accountability unit was set up in 2014 including a full-time Partnership Leader.</p>	<p><i>Noted with thanks.</i></p>
<p>3.10 Reporting parameters</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>During 2014, World Vision developed a new online programme management information system, Horizon 3, which brings together previously disparate systems to track and report on finance, sponsorship and programme-related data. During FY15, a second wave of implementation will include a range of enhancements such as mobile data collection, dashboards and reporting. It is said that this will significantly strengthen the organisation's ability to utilise data for timely reporting and evidence-based decision-making (see also NGO3). The Panel looks forward to being informed on progress in this regard.</p>	<p><i>Noted. Horizon 3 is a very important tool that supports monitoring and reporting of various areas of WV programs seeking to leverage a digital platform. We will share progress and challenges in implementation of Horizon 3 in our next update/report.</i></p>

<p>3.12 Reference table</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The reference table is provided on pages 56 to 60. Whereas the page references are correct in this table, the mentioned indicators under different headings are not correct (e.g. "About the report" on pages 4/5 refers to 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 and <u>not</u> to 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3).</p>	<p><i>We will continue improving our report – including the alignment of references in the document.</i></p>
<p>IV. Mission, Values, Governance, and Stakeholder Engagement</p>	
<p>4.1 Governance structure</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The overall governance and operational structure are described in more detail in the 2010 and 2012 reports, whereas this response gives relevant updates on issues raised in last year's Panel feedback. Thus, the report outlines how World Vision's federal governance structure optimally supports the efficient achievement of the organisation's mission in practice (e.g. regional and national perspectives of represented stakeholder groups form decision-making), which power is with local entities and what kind of risk management is in place. In particular how the risk management is set up (page 21) is considered Good Practice for other Charter Members. A link to the mentioned Charter for Relationships for Engagement would be appreciated in next year's report.</p>	<p><i>We appreciate recognition of the good practice.</i></p> <p><i>As indicated in our last response to the IRP's feedback on the 2013 report, some of our internal documents, including policies are posted on an internal portal accessible to all World Vision staff. Any request for specific policies from outside of WV will need to be made to the Global Accountability Partnership Leader who will avail these documents/policies. We will provide relevant links to documents that are available on our external website in our next update/report.</i></p>
<p>4.2 Division of power between the governance body and management</p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>A clear and mutually supportive process is described on how the Board supervises and evaluates the President / CEO and senior management helps the Board to function effectively.</p> <p>The work of different Board committees is mentioned throughout the report (e.g. Partnership Governance Committee on page 9 or Audit and Risk Committee on page 4) but a focused overview would be helpful. Moreover, as mentioned in last year's Panel feedback, actual results from the governance review in 2013 would have been helpful. Continuous and fast world developments necessitate ongoing</p>	<p><i>Noted and the issue raised will be addressed in the next detailed report.</i></p>

adaptation – including to ensure optimal effectiveness of our governance. What are the greatest challenges World Vision faces in this regard and how will you address them in the future? E.g. how do you work effectively with 24 diverse Board members?	
<p>4.3 Independence of Board Members</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The WVI board has 24 members, 23 being independent/non-executive.</p>	Noted.
<p>4.4 Feedback from internal stakeholders</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The answer demonstrates a systematic mechanism by internal stakeholders to communicate to the WVI Board – e.g. via senior staff which attend Board committees or via the People Committee whose key objective is to advise the Board on staff issues. Last year's report provided very good evidence and specific examples of stakeholder involvement, which would have been welcomed in this report, too.</p>	Noted. While we would like to provide more details and examples for each segment of the report we need to balance this with our commitment to reduce the size of the report.
<p>4.5 Compensation and benefits</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Apart from the President / CEO who serves as an executive member of the Board, all Board members are non-compensated volunteers. Pages 48 to 50 describe detailed procedures in place to determine and benchmark executive salaries. A table provides insights of the WVI senior executives with the five highest base salaries. A link to the Total Rewards Philosophy will be appreciated in next year's report. What are departure arrangements?</p>	Noted. As indicated above (4.1), a number of documents are posted on the WV internal portal but can be availed on request. We will however give more detail on departure arrangements in our next report.
<p>4.6 Managing conflicts of interest</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>All Board members must annually identify and disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest which also includes information about financial interests. Is this information published?</p>	We take note of the value added in publishing this information so we will consider plan making the information public.
<p>4.10 Ensuring performance and support of highest governance body</p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>World Vision describes a sound process of regular reviews after each Board meeting and comprehensive peer reviews. Practical examples of findings would have helped inform this report. How does the commendable Partnership Governance Committee use results</p>	We will give more details in our next report. However, the issue of links remains a challenge as indicated above (see 4.1).

<p>from these performance evaluations to improve the effectiveness of the Board? Please provide practical evidence that the described processes lead to greater effectiveness in practice.</p> <p>A link to the <i>Standing Policies Manual</i> would be helpful in order to access actual information on appointments, term limits or responsibilities. Furthermore, as suggested in last year's Panel feedback, a link to the Policy on Board and Advisory would be appreciated in the next report.</p>	
<p>4.12 Social charters, principles or other initiatives to which the organisation subscribes</p> <p>Fully addressed</p>	<p><i>Noted.</i></p>
<p>4.14, 4.15 List of stakeholders / Basis for identification of stakeholders</p> <p>Addressed</p> <p>Stakeholders and partnering are outlined on pages 13/14; some more information is given on page 34 ("clients are primarily poor women and men with dependent children in their household") and World Vision provides the age group of children they specifically target. However, an overall comprehensive overview is missing and the process for prioritisation of stakeholders could be more explicit. Moreover, the 2012 report provided a list of criteria determining the value of external relationship which was highly commended by the Panel at the time.</p>	<p><i>Information that is provided in detail in our 2012 report remains valid. In the spirit of cutting the size of the report, it has not been possible to replicate the same details in this report. We will improve our next report with a more comprehensive overview of stakeholders' identification and prioritisation or by providing a link / reference as an alternative.</i></p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
I. Programme Effectiveness	
NGO1	<p>Involvement of affected stakeholder groups</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The Development Programme Approach (DPA) is designed to empower local stakeholders to lead the development process from the beginning – including relevant community members and focusing on the most vulnerable children.</p> <p>Social accountability whereby citizens are given a voice versus their governments but also World Vision as a service provider has been considerably widened in the activities. Findings from baselines and evaluations are shared with communities, partners and project staff to validate (or question) and discuss the findings.</p> <p>The report provides anecdotal evidence that improving WV's accountability has led to increased trust between WV and communities, enabling them to manage their projects better (page 15). However, the average rating of below 1.5 out of 3 is not too high overall. This might be due to being the baseline for a new accountability system but World Vision should explain this in more detail.</p> <p>Furthermore, the organisation revised its Policy on Child Sponsorship in 2014, allowing for more empowerment of children in this regard. A link to this policy would be welcome in the next report.</p> <p>To enhance organisational accountability to communities, and strengthen programme effectiveness, WV is also piloting an annual community review process to discuss progress, successes and challenges, including results from monitoring and complaints and feedback mechanisms, and to validate or update programme implementation plans for the next year (page 19). The Panel welcomes to be kept informed on these commendable developments and outcomes.</p> <p>Overall, less information on</p>

	<p>processes and more on outcome / evidence is welcome in the next full report.</p>	
NGO2	<p>Mechanisms for feedback and complaints</p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>In 2014, complaint response mechanisms (CRMs) remained a critical standard in the implementation of food programmes. Moreover, numerous examples are given of cross-sector collaboration of improving accountability including feedback mechanisms (e.g. WV Sudan). Efforts were made in 2014 to introduce technology into accountability mechanisms e.g. the commendable Photo Voice tool allows collecting children's feedback and complaints during evaluations. Contextualised beneficiary feedback mechanisms have been developed in a pilot for seven countries.</p> <p>While this is all very interesting anecdotal information, it falls short of laying out a succinct and federation wide approach on how World Vision ensures feedback and complaints are systematically invited, collected, analysed and acted upon.. The report omits information on the different types of complaints received. Why were 15% of the complaints not responded to?</p>	<p><i>World Vision adopted the PAF (Programme Accountability Framework). This has been included in different processes/tools for programs to enhance our accountability. The PAF is being implemented in various programs at the field level, easily adopted by our humanitarian programs but with more limited implementation in our development operations. While this challenge is not unique to World Vision, efforts continue to be made to enhance programme accountability across all our programs. . We will continue sharing our experience on how we progress in this area in future reports. At the same time, we don't have a system to collect all complaints by type from all implemented programs-as this can take much time to compile. The commitment to respond to all complaints remains strong but some may not be fully responded to by the reporting period.</i></p>
NGO3	<p>Programme monitoring, evaluation and learning</p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>World Vision's move from individual project design and funding towards more integrated country level planning and monitoring sounds like it has the potential to significantly improve the data available for learning and improving outcomes. The rollout is expected for FY17 and the Panel looks forward to evidence how this will turn out in practice. The newly introduced online information system "Horizon 3" bringing together previously disparate tracking systems should support this. Please provide evidence in the next full report that improvements have been secured in practice.</p> <p>It is also positively noted that WV is</p>	<p><i>Noted. We will provide details in our next report.</i></p>

	<p>piloting an annual community review process to discuss progress, successes and challenges, including results from monitoring and complaints and feedback mechanisms, and to validate or update programme implementation plans for the next year.</p> <p>Moreover, the global national office dashboard (GNOD) was recently implemented and measures national office performance and capability to deliver on programming outcomes. It will be interesting to compare national offices' performance and trends by region over the coming years to see how they migrate from <i>consolidating</i> to <i>maturing</i> to <i>established</i>. In addition, the mentioned Child Sponsorship Research project (page 12) sounds commendable and the Panel looks forward to hearing more about future outcomes.</p> <p>Finally, it is appreciated that after two years of piloting the Child Well-being (CWB) Targets, every field office reported in 2014 on progress towards child well-being in line with its strategy. Overall, has MEL feeding back into good decisions and management response? Is data shared with others (page 19)?</p> <p>World Vision invests in their MEL systems and uses a sound system of global measurements for programme progress and national entity capacity improvement (see also page 28 or evidence of child-well-being improvements on page 34). It will be important to report against the same parameter in future years to compare developments over time.</p>
NGO4	<p>Gender and diversity</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The Panel congratulates World Vision on the release of their <i>Learning through Evaluation with Accountability and Planning</i> (LEAP) 3 in 2014, which stresses gender as essential to improving and sustaining the well-being of girls and boys. Therefore, national offices' strategies, technical approaches, technical programmes and area programmes are all expected to consider gender carefully</p> <p><i>Our next report will give more details on other diversity factors, including disability.</i></p> <p><i>On the issue of links to policies, these are posted on WV's internal portal (as indicated in our response to the IRP's feedback last year). However, they are available on request from the Partnership Leader for Global</i></p>

	<p>in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Offices are expected to report on progress towards these sustainability drivers. What other diversity factors <i>besides</i> gender and age does World Vision consider in their systems?</p> <p>As requested in last year's Panel feedback, a link to the Gender Equality Policy would have been helpful for the reader.</p>	<i>Accountability.</i>
NGO5	<p><i>Advocacy positions and public awareness campaigns</i></p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>WV's advocacy work is governed by the Promotion of Justice Policy which outlines the principles, development of policy positions and advocacy campaigns and how this works in WV's federal partnership. A link to this policy will be crucial in the next report in order to better understand how policy positions are evidence-based and respectful of people's dignity. How are corrective actions taken and how is a campaign exited. World Vision is commended for the fact that the global national office dashboard (GNOD) has been updated to include indicators for advocacy performance at the local and national level. And it is positively noted that the number of programmes in which World Vision supports communities in their advocacy activities has gone up from less than half to two thirds of total advocacy programmes.</p> <p>It is positively noted that advocacy is systematically embedded in the organisation's strategy, programme, systems and processes (see opening statement) to achieve sustainable change. Finally, the report mentions that campaigns such as Child Health Now (CHS) reached millions of children and triggered millions of actions and numerous policy changes.</p>	<i>Noted. The issue of link to policy is addressed above.</i>
NGO6	<p><i>Coordination with other actors</i></p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>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</p>	<i>We value and typically focus on partnerships with communities and community-based organisations we work with as well as peer organizations and at times the private</i>

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>sector. This has been our main focus in programming. While we plan to enhance partnerships with other organisations, we have limited sub-grants/field-based partners to whom we delegate implementation of programs at the field level. This may be different to approaches to partnerships of other organisations. This contributed to not highlighting the expected details on how partners meet World Vision standards of accountability – including evaluation of such partnerships.</p> <p>At the same time, World Vision programming takes into consideration coordination and collaboration with other agencies at the field level. We will give more details on this coordination and collaboration in our next report.</p>
--	--	--

II. Financial Management

NGO7	<p>Resource allocation</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>World Vision publishes their annual, consolidated, audited, financial statements on their website. A direct link would be appreciated. The same strong controls apply as mentioned in the two previous reports. Moreover, a detailed overview of resource collection and allocation per by region is provided (page 44).</p>	<p><i>Noted with thanks.</i></p>
NGO8	<p>Sources of Funding</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The report provides clear information on income from the five largest single donors.</p>	<p><i>Noted with thanks</i></p>

III. Environmental Management	
EN16, EN18, EN26	<p>Greenhouse gas emissions of operations / Initiatives to reduce emissions of operations / Initiatives to mitigate environmental impact of activities and services</p> <p><i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>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 WV do to support implementation across the federation? What is the organisation's long-term goal in this regard?</p> <p>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.</p>
IV. Human Resource Management	
LA1	<p>Size and composition of workforce</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>Interesting and relevant information is shared in regard to World Vision's workforce. Data is provided for three years in comparison on different contract types, volunteers, gender and age ratios, region, and turnover rates. However, the table on page 19 could be more comprehensive (e.g. > 41 years < is not very clear). How much staff is transitional?</p>
EC7	<p>Procedure for local hiring</p> <p><i>Not addressed</i></p> <p>Although this indicator is not explicitly mentioned in the report, 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</p>

	<p>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.</p>	
LA10	<p>Workforce training <i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>On pages 16 to 17, World Vision explains their generic commitment to building (local) staff capacity and shares illustrative training examples. Other trainings, e.g. on child sponsorship or risk (page 23), are mentioned throughout the report. However, a systematic approach is missing. As a matter of consistency, the Panel strongly encourages World Vision to describe how they identify training needs, how much they invest (as % of overall administrative budget) into training their workforce, and to provide evidence that this is successful.</p>	<p><i>As indicated in our 2013 report, we don't have a holistic system of tracking all training(s) conducted in the organisation – recognising the value and efforts invested towards conducting staff training for the success of our operations. It would take additional resources and staff time to track this information. However, we will continue sharing some of our good practices and training events conducted in selected entities/ departments in WV.</i></p>
LA12	<p>Global talent management <i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>World Vision's Total Rewards Philosophy covers both financial and non-financial rewards to attract, motivate and retain staff. A link would be appreciated. However, the report omits information on the number of staff that have received official appraisals in 2014. Appraisals and development reviews are key for a successful workforce and the Panel urges World Vision to provide evidence in this regard.</p> <p>Last year's response to the Panel's feedback on the previous report provided interesting information on how World Vision measures success in global talent management and that their staff survey shows positive feedback from staff. It would be interesting to learn more about this survey and the results in the next report – as suggested by the Panel last year.</p>	<p><i>All World Vision staff undergo an annual (formal) performance evaluation. More details on this process will be provided in our next report – together with information on global talent management and staff surveys.</i></p>
LA13	<p>Diversity of workforce and governance bodies <i>Partially addressed</i></p> <p>On page 9, World Vision mentions that policies in place require that not less than one-third of the Board be represented by</p>	<p><i>Noted. We will provide more information on diversity in our workforce and boards in our next</i></p>

	<p>either gender; however, it is challenging that suitable volunteers meet all relevant criteria and only 75% of all national boards and advisory councils meet this standard. These boards are held accountable for improvements. In addition, it is aimed to recruit qualified members from younger age groups to expand the diversity range.</p> <p>Pages 46/47 provide a detailed breakdown of staff by gender in the different regions World Visions operates. Whereas, the gender ratio is overall 57% male as opposed to 43% female, regions in Africa show up to between 72% and 79% male employees and support offices are set up by 70% female staff.</p> <p>14% of the global staff are not Christian. More importantly though, how does World Vision incorporate other diversity dimensions in their workforce and boards (e.g. minority groups or disabilities)?</p>	<p><i>report – recognising opportunities and challenges of hiring personnel from certain segments or groups. . .</i></p>
--	---	--

NGO9	<p>Mechanisms to raise grievances <i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The answer (pages 50/51) provide a comprehensive overview of mechanisms in place for staff to raise concerns or feedbacks: Integrity and Protection Hotline, normal management channels, and whistleblower hotline. 57 reports were received in 2014 which were mostly about financial or general misconduct, employee matters or conflict of interest. Information on their resolution or where challenges arise is provided.</p>	<p><i>Noted with thanks.</i></p>
------	--	----------------------------------

V. Responsible Management of Impacts on Society

SO1	<p>Managing your impact on local communities <i>Addressed</i></p> <p>World Vision's approach to sustainability is based on the understanding that their contribution to a community's journey will always be temporary. Sustainability is defined as "the ability to maintain and improve upon the outcomes and goals achieved with external support after that support has ended". The challenge is indeed to make sure that the positive changes to child well-being achieved as a result of a WV programme last beyond its transition. It is reported that so-called 'key drivers of sustainability', including an intentional drive to build ownership and to partner effectively and appropriately with local stakeholders, need to be built into associated technical programmes. More information beyond</p>	<p><i>Noted. More details on feedback from communities and impact information will be provided in our next report.</i></p>
-----	---	--

	<p>generic promises as well as on concrete exit strategies will be appreciated in the next full report. It is suggested to look at SOS Children's Villages long-term evaluation called "Tracking Footprints" which measures the experiences of people who grew up in SOS Children's Villages facilities.</p> <p>Results from Citizen Voice and Action (CVA) showed positive results; improvements in communities' services and increased development outcomes. Additionally, the Panel would be interested in other general feedback from communities to World Vision – some of which was mentioned throughout the report (e.g. external evaluation by communities).</p>	
SO3	<p>Anti-corruption practices</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>An Anti-Corruption Policy is in place to ensure that World Vision is accountable and transparent. World Vision states that "risk is high"; however, they and the VisionFund have solid risk management practices in place. Indeed very extensive risk management processes are described on pages 21ff. of the report, but it is not specified which specific risks are covered. It is understood that these may be different in different offices, but corruption is certainly a cross-cutting risk probably covered. Please make it explicit in next report.</p> <p>A series of anti-corruption training modules was implemented in 2014 and 680 staff members from different functions and levels participated in these courses. This figure seems low in relation to over 40.000 staff members globally. The Panel nevertheless appreciates this development and looks forward to evidence that training has improved staff skills and practice.</p>	<p><i>Noted with thanks. In our next report, we will share more details on anti-corruption training for WV staff and how this is improving knowledge of the policy and more importantly practices within the organisation.</i></p>
SO4	<p>Actions taken in response of corruption incidents</p> <p><i>Fully addressed</i></p> <p>The 2013 report provided thorough information on the internal auditing system and steps taken to strengthen fraud investigation systems. As in the previous year, an overview of the total confirmed fraud loss and different fraud types is openly disclosed in this report (page 53 and in the opening statement).</p>	<p><i>Noted with thanks.</i></p>
VI. Ethical Fundraising		
PR6	<p>Ethical fundraising and marketing communications</p> <p><i>Addressed</i></p> <p>World Vision can be commended for their new Child Sponsorship Policy Principles with guidance for sponsorship marketing. A link to</p>	<p><i>Noted with gratitude. We work towards providing relevant information on breaches. This</i></p>

<p>this policy would have been very helpful; however, it is overall evident that this establishes a more responsible fundraising practice by clearly communicating the vision for change to communities, amplifying their voices as well as better explaining World Vision's value proposition to the child's community.</p> <p>The Sponsorship Transformation Programme helped to support staff with training and best practice. Moreover, World Vision has invested in improved processes and updated their data privacy and security systems – such as the new Rich Media Transfer system to facilitate fast and secure transfer of photos and videos from field site to global user or the <i>Keeping Children Safe Online</i> project. This is a very relevant area and the Charter has initiated the <u>Digital Accountability project</u> to be at the forefront of developments in this regard. It is appreciated that World Vision also offered to create a Peer Advise Group with other Charter Members, which is currently being set up with the Charter Secretariat.</p> <p>Finally, as highlighted by the Panel in their feedback letters, it would be good to collect some aggregated information on any breaches of standards in place in order to obtain a better picture at the global level of how often breaches occur (apart from the five breaches of the digital protocol reported through Ethics Point), in which areas, and how they were acted upon.</p>	<p><i>will however be limited in coverage/standard. Some of the breaches to standards and policies are detected through audits. These cover selected offices and programs. It will therefore not be possible to track and report on all breaches to standards and policies for the organisation.</i></p>
---	--