World Vision International

Programme Accountability Framework

World Vision (WV) recognizes that the essence of accountability is to respect the needs, concerns, capacities and disposition of those with whom we work and to answer for our actions and decisions. Our intent is to contribute to changes that result in the improved well-being of children and communities. WV works with the most vulnerable to identify critical needs and seeks to ensure their right to receive assistance and protection on the basis of their informed consent. We recognize the importance of community involvement and participation in all activities and plans that affect the lives of communities. We reaffirm our commitment to receive and respect their opinions and ensure timeliness and appropriateness of our interventions. World Vision's preferred role is to work alongside children and communities and in partnership with governments, churches, civil society organizations and donors. WV affirms our role as a citizen of the humanitarian and development community and respects international laws and treaties as well as national laws. As a member of the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership, we are committed to a process of continuous improvement in compliance with the HAP Standard 2007.

About World Vision

World Vision International is a Christian humanitarian organization working for the well-being of poor and vulnerable people, especially children, through:

- Sustainable development
- Disaster management
- Raising public awareness and advocating for justice

Core Values

The World Vision Partnership shares a common understanding bound together by six core values. These core values are the fundamental and guiding principles that determine World Vision's actions. The core values are our aim, a challenge that we seek to live and work toward.

- We are Christian
- We are committed to the poor
- We value people
- We are stewards
- We are partners
- We are responsive

---

1 Programme accountability refers to accountability to all stakeholders across development and humanitarian interventions (including humanitarian accountability).

2 World Vision’s Christian nature provides the motivation to work with communities based on need and in a spirit of partnership according to our international commitments.
Our Commitments

World Vision is committed to abiding by international and internal standards and policies that affirm our commitment of accountability to our stakeholders and to children and communities in particular. Our programmes will incorporate and reflect the following standards, policies and frameworks.

### For All Programmes
- World Vision’s Partnership Principles
- World Vision’s Child Protection Policy
- LEAP, World Vision’s DME Framework
- World Vision’s Ministry Framework
- UN Declaration of Human Rights
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
- Do No Harm/Local Capacities for Peace Framework
- International NGO Accountability Charter
- People in Aid

### For Humanitarian Programmes
- HAP Principles
- Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP) Principles of Partnership
- Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative
- Red Cross/Crescent and NGO Code of Conduct
- The Humanitarian Charter and Sphere Standards
- World Vision Policy on Relief
- LEAP for Rapid Onset Emergencies
- Management Policy on Christian Commitments in Emergency Response and Disaster Management

### For Development Programmes
- Sponsorship Minimum Programming Standards [where sponsorship funding is used]
- Indicators for Child Well-Being Outcomes

### For Food Aid Programmes
- Food Aid Policy
- Monetization and Local/Regional Procurement policy
- FPPMG Commodities Manual and Standards

About This Framework

This is the framework for Programme Accountability in World Vision. This document seeks to define the minimum accountability standards for World Vision programmes and how we engage with communities. This framework is relevant to all World Vision programming activities and in line with the fulfilment of HAP principle #2 and benchmark #1, both which require setting of accountability standards and establishment of a quality management system.

This framework is not intended to pass judgement about how we are performing in accountability. The main purpose of this framework is to help us identify and follow up capacity building needs in a way that provides continuous improvement in relation to programme accountability in World Vision. The first page contains descriptions of the different levels that programmes can obtain in four areas of programme accountability - Providing Information, Consulting with Communities, Promoting Participation and Collecting and Acting on Feedback and Complaints. Capacity in these areas can be assessed using a self-assessment tool. The second page contains details of resources and guidance to support field practice.

Standards, Capacity and Implementation

The top part of the table contains our minimum standards in relation to Providing Information, Consultation, Participation and Feedback and Complaints. The bottom section of the table indicates how World Vision will manage implementation and capacity building of these standards in a way that enables learning and improvement and aligns with our Ministry Framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINIMUM STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communities (including partners)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAPACITY LEVELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2 (In addition to Level 1 activities)</th>
<th>Level 3 (In addition to Level 2 activities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Communities are informed about:</td>
<td>• Communities are informed about:</td>
<td>• Communities are informed about all plans and activities throughout the entire project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WV mandate, core values and its role</td>
<td>- project timeframe, goals and objectives</td>
<td>• Communities are provided with relevant progress reports/ updates and evaluation reports that are communicated in appropriate ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- planned activities including start and end dates</td>
<td>- WV and Red Cross/Crescent NGO Codes of Conduct (in emergencies)</td>
<td>• Documented consultation outcomes regularly shared with beneficiaries and communities and influence programme design and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- targeted beneficiaries (including targeting criteria)</td>
<td>- summary financial information (subject to security considerations)</td>
<td>• Project meetings are jointly convened by committees and WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- their right to complain</td>
<td>- complaints handling methods in time to influence major decisions (e.g. selection of beneficiaries, activities etc.)</td>
<td>• Communities play significant decision-making roles in the entire LEAP cycle (assessments, design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, reflection, and learning).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Methods used to share information are adjusted based on community feedback
- Information guidelines in place

- Communities are sensitized about their right to be consulted about key project decisions
- Communities are consulted on project activities through community meetings and programme assessments

- Community capacities are identified in assessment/planning process
- Communities participate in the development of targeting/beneficiary selection criteria and the targeting/selection process
- Beneficiaries and communities contribute project inputs, such as labour, skills, materials etc

- Communities are given the opportunity to chose preferred method for complaints handling, including for filing confidential complaints
- Method(s) for complaints handling documented in local language and put in place based on community preference (including updates of revisions)
- Feedback and complaints handling guidelines in place
- Staff and communities trained on complaints handling guidelines

- Communities are sensitized about their right to provide feedback and complain
- Feedback and complaints are welcomed, recorded (using a logbook or similar), analyzed, action taken and feedback provided

- Communities are informed about: their role
- Communities are informed about: their right to complain
- Communities are informed about: their right to be consulted about key project decisions
- Communities are regularly consulted through focus group discussions, surveys, and other methods and feedback documented
- Communities are regularly consulted through focus group discussions, surveys, and other methods and feedback documented

- Community organizations or structures – such as programme committees – serve as a vehicle for community consultation, decision-making and information sharing to beneficiaries and communities.

- Community organizations or structures – such as programme committees – serve as a vehicle for community consultation, decision-making and information sharing to beneficiaries and communities.

- Method(s) for complaints handling, including for filing confidential complaints
- Method(s) for complaints handling documented in local language and put in place based on community preference (including updates of revisions)
- Method(s) for complaints handling documented in local language and put in place based on community preference (including updates of revisions)

- Communities are sensitized about their right to provide feedback and complain
- Feedback and complaints are welcomed, recorded (using a logbook or similar), analyzed, action taken and feedback provided

- Communities are sensitized about their right to provide feedback and complain
- Feedback and complaints are welcomed, recorded (using a logbook or similar), analyzed, action taken and feedback provided

- Communities are sensitized about their right to provide feedback and complain
- Feedback and complaints are welcomed, recorded (using a logbook or similar), analyzed, action taken and feedback provided

- Communities are sensitized about their right to provide feedback and complain
- Feedback and complaints are welcomed, recorded (using a logbook or similar), analyzed, action taken and feedback provided
- Chairing of meetings takes place on a rotational basis

### IMPLEMENTATION RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Development Programmes</th>
<th>For Humanitarian Programmes</th>
<th>For Food Aid Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good Enough Guide</td>
<td>- H-Account Accountability Field Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Guide to the HAP Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programme Accountability Framework Self Assessment</td>
<td>- HEA Scorecard</td>
<td>- FPMG Operations Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency Capacity Building Project (ECB) baseline, annual review and peer review</td>
<td>- Emergency Capacity Building Project (ECB) baseline, annual review and peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Programme Accountability Framework Self Assessment</td>
<td>- Programme Accountability Framework Self Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level 1: This is the minimum starting level. According to LEAP, this level of accountability should be established during the design of a programme (Step 1 of IPM’s critical path).</td>
<td>- Level 1: This is the minimum starting level. In Level 2 &amp; 3 emergency responses, this level of accountability should be achieved within 90 days. Effort should be made in Level 1 responses to integrate these capacities into the response strategy. In disaster management programmes, these capacities should be integrated into the NO HEA strategy and NDPP.</td>
<td>- Level 1: This is the minimum starting level. All FPMMG supported projects will be expected to meet and comply with this level within the first 6 months of introducing programme accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level 2: This is the next level. All programmes should achieve this level during the first year of implementation, following agreement of a programme design. (Steps 5&amp;6 of IPM’s critical path).</td>
<td>- Level 2: This is the next level. In Level 2 &amp; 3 emergency responses, this level of accountability should be achieved within the first year. In disaster management programmes, achievement of these capacities should be incorporated into revision of the NO HEA strategy and NDPP and implemented during the course of the next year.</td>
<td>- Level 2: This is the next level. All FPMMG supported projects will be expected to meet and comply within the first 12-24 months of introducing programme accountability and as they document learning demonstrate evidence of improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level 3: This is the highest level so far. All programmes should achieve this level by the beginning of a second programme cycle. (Steps 7&amp;8 of IPM’s critical path).</td>
<td>- Level 3: This is the highest level so far. Level 3 responses should meet these capacities during year 2 of the response. In disaster management programmes, achievement of these capacities should be incorporated into the next revision of the NO HEA strategy and the NDPP and implemented during the course of the following year.</td>
<td>- Level 3: This is the highest level so far. All FPMMG supported projects will be expected to meet and comply within the first 24-36 months of introducing programme accountability as they continue to improve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>