Global Standard:
Relevance from a Charter Board &
WV field perspective

Moving toward a global accountability standard

- ➢ As a multi mandated organization **WV has subscribed to several external and internal accountability and reporting standards** (i.e. humanitarian, development, fund raising, etc)

- ➢ These are **important lenses** that reflect our scope of work, but there are also some overlaps between those, and at times it can be confusing for our offices to manage various requirements, and for management to understand why we subscribe to different standards

- ➢ Having **a broader framework** for accountability and reporting which recognizes different scopes of work of NGO's would be helpful – i.e. organizational level and operational/sectoral level

1 - External demands for results and impact:

➢ NGOs are increasingly expected, if not required, to **demonstrate results and impact** of their work to their targeted beneficiaries – what did we promise? what did we accomplish? What worked or did not work? What will we do differently as a result? How transparent are we?

➢ Number of NGOs (local and global) has been increasing whereas there are more **questions about what we are accomplishing** – general tendency to question how resources are used and towards what results or change

➢ Our publics, donors, governments, communities we focus on, the media, increasingly **question our relevance and added value.** We also have more requirements to deal with from these sources

➢ **"Non traditional" entities** involved in non profit sector (i.e. private sector, global philanthropists, etc.) have also challenged the status quo and enhanced the focus on accountability and tend to present themselves as more effective and impactful than traditional NGO's

➢ **Technology and more direct access to information**, connections with the field means it has become easier to connect with what we do

2 - Internal and field driven demands for reporting, results and impact:

➢ At the field level, WV National Offices **face various and varying internal layers for reporting and accountability** while, as already outlined, they also have to report to local/host Governments or/and other accountability initiatives - this adds up

➢ While we need to do more in terms of reporting around results/impact and be more accountable and transparent, the **current approach, systems and requirements tend to limit if not discourage** their use and adoption by our offices. It also seems a bit bureaucratic and complicated. *As WV we are moving toward having a common accountability platform, including reporting across the organization while recognizing the importance of our field offices to be fully engaged in this area*

➢ **Internal and external reporting requirements** can at times overlap while there are some specific requirements that come with the work we do or the resources we take on. *We are working to streamline where we can*

3 – Increased demand for accountability:

➢ This is increasingly an issue for NGOs to **access** donors funding

➢ Our **publics also expect more accountability and transparency** from NGOs – not accepting what we say at face value but rather asking questions for which they expect a clear answer

➢ Those organizations that draw resources from government and other institutional sources are increasingly focusing on complying with specific standards and requirements in their respective countries

➢ However we often end up with **different if not competing reporting** requirements within and across countries

➢ For the most part though what is expected for reporting and accountability is fairly **similar in intent** even if focusing on specific areas or sectors

➢ Having said this it remains a burden to comply with different reporting/accountability guidelines

World Vision

Moving toward a global standard: The role of the INGO Charter

World Vision

Accountability lens and measures vary across organizations:

➢ While there seem to be a good understanding of the concept of accountability, **what we should focus on and how we should report on it varies across organizations**

➢ The Common Humanitarian Standard initiative is a good example where accountability is focused on a particular scope (humanitarian programming and outcomes) whereas the Global Standard promoted by the the INGO Accountability Charter looks at accountability at the organizational level and therefore is holistic in nature and can be **used across various types of organizations**

➢ It is therefore important for the INGO Charter **to further explore collaboration and synergy with the CHS and other key accountability processes while promoting** a common accountability framework across organizations which would ultimately enhance our intent to be more accountable, ensure a more systematic approach, and limit the number of processes and standards to follow

Common platform means greater adoption, recognition and influence:

➢ So for WV **synergy** and a more clearly defined approach to accountability practice and reporting through a global standard framework would be an important step forward. This also includes agreeing to a basic and common language, etc

➢ Moving toward a **common global standard** pertaining to organizational level accountability which could complement operational accountability such as the CHS would be an important step forward – with a focus on further defining complementarity of standards, practice, reporting, etc, and ensuring a bottoms up focus as well

➢ Having a more common accountability standard would also help **better leverage** what we are trying to accomplish while needing to ensure relevance for local and global organizations

➢ Therefore important for the **INGO Charter to promote the global standard**

World Vision

In summary

➢ WV is in process of developing a **standard framework for accountability reporting** in addition to using GRI, IATI, therefore enabling us to have a more consistent approach to reporting and meeting globally recognized standards

➢ We **support the intent behind the Global standard** for the reasons already outlined (better collaboration, coordination and synergy) but also for the possibility of having a set of common indicators for reporting our work around accountability and impact

➢ We **need to be realistic about what can be achieved** with the GS project while it is important to better define how we can have a sufficiently recognized and adopted accountability framework which can complement rather than compete with other processes, and eventually help minimize the need to identify more processes