



**Accountable  
Now**

GLOBAL STANDARDS LOCAL TRUST



**TECHO**  
**Independent Review Panel Feedback**  
Review Round February 2018



# TECHO

## Feedback from the Independent Review Panel

### Review Round February 2018

23 March 2018

Dear TECHO,

Thank you for submitting your Accountability Report. We, the Independent Review Panel of Accountable Now, appreciate your efforts to continuously strengthen accountability to communities, local partners, supporters, staff, donors, or other key constituencies. Our key focus is on accountability to those you serve. It is against this background that we critically discussed your report and came to the individual assessment below.

In light of the recent, highly publicised allegations of NGO staff malpractice, we are aware that many of our members are working hard to review their relevant policies and procedures regarding whistleblowing, management and/or independent investigations of alleged malpractice. We ask that all members discuss these matters fully in their next report.

Whilst feedback letters – along with Members' reports – are usually made publicly available on the Accountable Now website, given the nature of this being an initial preparatory update, we would not publish it unless TECHO specifically wishes us to. If this is the case, please let the Accountable Now Secretariat know, and they will be happy to do so.

If you have any other feedback or comments on our work, please share them with us by sending them to the Accountable Now Secretariat.

Yours sincerely,

Mihir Bhatt

John Clark

Louise James

Jane Kiragu

Nora Lester Murad

Saroeun Soeung



# TECHO's Accountability Report

## Review Round February 2018

### 1. Overall convincing theory of change, strategy and evidence of impact achieved.

*Partially addressed*

The problem that TECHO is trying to tackle is well-defined. However, the theory of change is not very clearly described, including logical order of each component and the necessary conditions and assumptions for it to happen.

The strategy TECHO adopts when planning and carrying out its work is clearly outlined and is coherent with the problem defined. It is noted positively that the community is involved throughout the process, from planning to evaluation and re-adjustment of programmes. The Panel would like to know how the other stakeholders mentioned below (e.g. government, businesses, local organisations) play a role in the process.

Figures outlining TECHO's achievements are presented, as well as examples of impact achieved in different countries (are these in the past year only, or total since the beginning of TECHO's work?). It is positive to see the "follow on" impacts of providing stable housing, such as improved sleep and better study opportunities for children. Are the impact assessments made public e.g. by publishing on the website?

The Panel would like to hear more concretely about key indicators of success, how stakeholders are involved in setting these and progress on these in the reporting period - explaining any difficulties encountered and how they are overcome.

### 2. Evidence that key stakeholders are well identified, continuously included in all stages of work and have shown good engagement and ownership.

*Addressed*

The mapping of actors indicates a holistic approach, with various stakeholders at different levels involved in TECHO's work. The general role of these stakeholders is explained as well as, to some extent, how they interact with one another. The Panel would like to know how stakeholders are involved in decision-making processes and target-setting, and what processes are in place to elicit and respond to their feedback.

How are the relevant stakeholders identified when beginning work in a community? Are there any groups at risk of exclusion (e.g. nomads, street dwellers), and if so how does TECHO make efforts to include them?

TECHO puts community organisations and volunteers at the centre of its work. How are these groups involved in organisational and strategic planning and evaluation, as well as advocacy efforts? Can TECHO provide examples of ownership of projects



by its stakeholders? Does this extend beyond the life cycle of the project – i.e. is the work sustainable?

### **3. Overall evidence that the organisation has effective and responsible governance and management (i.e. is well-run).**

*Partially addressed*

The organisational structure of TECHO and the (two way?) interaction between the International Office's Regional Directors and Operative Units, and country level General Directors is thoroughly described. Their use of a matrix structure appears to harmonise values and standards across the various levels (and sections?) at which TECHO operates.

The Panel requests information on the roles of the Board of Directors (and advisors) of TECHO and the Executive Director. What are their roles, and how is oversight ensured – does the Board evaluate the Executive Director? Is the Board evaluated at all, and if so by whom?

An integrated cloud-based ERP (enterprise resource planning software) allows TECHO to coordinate resource management and monitoring of the 19 countries in Latin America in which it operates. The ERP seems to be quite comprehensive. What systems are used to guard against resource mismanagement and corruption?

It was difficult to find information about how to avoid conflicts of interest, addressing complaints and grievances, promoting equality, and talent management. Links to such policies would be appreciated in the next report.

### **4. A sound plan for which areas of accountability to improve and clarity on objectives, resources and cross-organisational responsibilities for implementation.**

*Partially addressed*

The list of actions TECHO is taking to improve their accountability practices includes a focus on resource management, transparency, understanding and strengthening staff and volunteers, and an increased focus on impact. It would be recommended to include the objectives, the actors responsible for their implementation and some initial results. For example, it would be very useful to share with the Panel the decision on how to implement the Global Standard (whilst keeping local context and urgent needs at the centre of TECHO's work), as well as the gender equality report.

The Panel would also be interested in hearing more about the challenges TECHO has faced. What has been particularly difficult, and what are the areas for improvement? Who is responsible for leading on these, in addition to the examples already listed?