



British Red Cross
CHS Initial Verification Report

BRC-VER-2018-002

Date: 2018-05-15

Table of Contents

1. GENERAL INFORMATION	3
2. SCOPE	3
3. SCHEDULE SUMMARY	4
3.1 VERIFICATION SCHEDULE	4
3.2 OPENING AND CLOSING MEETINGS.....	4
4. RECOMMENDATION	5
5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE ORGANISATION	5
5.1 GENERAL	5
5.2 ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	7
5.3 WORK WITH PARTNERS	7
5.4 CERTIFICATION OR VERIFICATION HISTORY	8
6. SAMPLING	8
6.1 RATIONALE FOR SAMPLING.....	8
6.2 INTERVIEWS:	9
6.2.1 <i>Semi-structured interviews (individual interviews or with a small group <6</i>	9
6.2.2 <i>Focus Group Discussions (interviews with a group >6</i>	10
7. REPORT	10
7.1 OVERALL ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE	10
7.2 SUMMARY OF NON-CONFORMITIES	11
7.3 STRONG POINTS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:	12
8. ORGANISATION'S APPROVAL	16
9. HQAI'S DECISION	17
APPEAL	17

1. General information

Organisation			
Type	<input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Membership/Network <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct assistance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> Federated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Through partners	
Mandate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy
Verified Mandate(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy
Size (Total number of programme sites/ members/partners – Number of staff at HO level)	25 bilateral (humanitarian) country programmes and partners; 11 multilateral programmes; one domestic programme.	Sampling Rate (Country programme sampled)	UK Turks and Caicos Islands
Lead auditor	Johnny O'Regan	Auditor	Annie Devonport
		Others	
	Head Office	Programme Site(s)	
Location	London	Turks and Caicos Islands	
Dates	23/11/18-7/12/18	5/3/18- 8/3/18	

2. Scope

- Initial audit
 Mid-term Audit
 Maintenance audit
 Final/Recertification audit

3. Schedule summary

3.1 Verification Schedule

Name of Programme sites/members/partners verified	Location	Mandate (Humanitarian, Development, Advocacy)	Number of projects visited	Type of projects
UK	London, Bristol	Development	3	Refugee services
UK	London, Bristol	Development	3	Independent living
TCI	Providenciales	Humanitarian	2	Hurricane response and DRR

3.2 Opening and closing meetings

3.2.1 At Head Office:

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting
Date	23/11/17	14/3/18
Location	London	Skype
Number of participants	12	5
Any substantive issue arising	Yes- misunderstanding (auditors side) re the verification not covering multilateral. This was later clarified.	No

3.2.2 At Programme Sites:

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting
Date	23/11/17	11/12/17
Location	London	Skype
Number of participants	12	8
Any substantive issue arising	No	No

3.2.2 At Programme Sites:

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting
Date	5/03/18	8/3/18
Location	Turks and Caicos Islands	Turks and Caicos Islands
Number of participants	6	3
Any substantive issue arising	No	No

4. Recommendation

In our opinion, the British Red Cross shows a high level of commitment to the CHS and its inclusion in the Independent Verification scheme is justified.

Detailed findings are laid out in the rest of this report.

Johnny O'Regan



Dublin, 23 April 2018

Lead Auditor's
Name and
Signature

Date and
Place:

5. Background information on the organisation

5.1 General

The British Red Cross (BRC), founded in 1870 and granted a Royal Charter in 1908, is a member of the International Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC) Movement, which is the world's largest humanitarian network with 17 million volunteers in 191 countries. The Movement has three main components:

- The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) helps people affected by conflict and armed violence and promotes the laws that protect victims of war.
- The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) works with National Societies in responding to disasters around the world coordinating and directing international assistance following natural and man-made disasters in non-conflict situations.
- 191 individual and autonomous National Societies dedicated to the Fundamental Principles of Humanity, Neutrality, Impartiality, Independence, Voluntary Service, Unity and Universality.

As per RCRC statutes “The components of the Movement, while maintaining their independence within the limits of the present Statutes, act at all times in accordance with the Fundamental Principles and cooperate with each other in carrying out their respective tasks in pursuance of their common mission.”

In the UK, more than 4,000 staff and 19,600 volunteers support the BRC in its role as a crisis preparedness, response and recovery organisation. As well as first response, ambulance, and independent living services, BRC helps approximately 30,000 people in the UK through the asylum process. Services include restoring family links, supporting young refugees and providing refugee support services and links to other relevant organisations.

The BRC pursues active partnerships, including bilaterally with Host National Societies (HNS) and multilaterally with the IFRC and ICRC (see 5.3). In addition to HNS, the BRC also supports Red Cross organisations in British Overseas Territories- Overseas Branches (OSBs). The BRCs programme in Turks and Caicos Islands (TCI) was focused on strengthening Disaster Management capacity and community- based resilience, implementing the Branch fundraising strategy, and strengthening planning, monitoring, evaluation and financial management processes. In September 2017, TCI was hit by two category 5 hurricanes (Irma and Maria), which killed 40 people in the region, injured hundreds and caused widespread destruction of property. BRC supported the local TCIRC response in non-food items, cash distribution, and restoring family links.

BRC’s international strategy includes three focus areas (chronic food insecurity, protracted conflicts, migration and displacement) and skills (community engagement and accountability, and cash) in addition its core business of disaster management, first response and International Humanitarian Law. The BRC has five UK goals and four global goals.

UK Goals

1. **UK Goal 1:** We will put people in crisis at the heart of our organisation, ensuring that our services are easy to access, safe, of high quality, fully integrated, effective and efficient.
2. **UK Goal 2:** For people who experience an acute emergency, our response will save lives, reduce distress and improve recovery.
3. **UK Goal 3:** For people for whom a stay in hospital could either be prevented or shortened, our services will improve wellbeing and recovery, and enhance independence and re-connection with the local community.
4. **UK Goal 4:** For people who are displaced through forced migration, our services will increase their sense of control of their lives, reduce destitution and challenge stigma.
5. **UK Goal 5:** For those with an increased risk of experiencing a crisis, and to develop individual and community resilience, our education offer will ensure all those reached are better equipped to understand, cope and take action.

Global Goals

1. **Global Goal 1:** We will significantly strengthen our partner National Societies so that they are able to build sustainable response capacity and resilience in their own countries.
2. **Global Goal 2:** We will increase our support, and offer our expertise and skills, to strengthen the Movement’s global humanitarian response system.
3. **Global Goal 3:** We will use our reputation, position and expertise to influence and advocate with governments and other humanitarian actors so that the needs of people affected by crisis are met more effectively.
4. **Global Goal 4:** We will play an active and influential role in strengthening the coordination, management, and governance of our IFRC, and fulfilling the network potential of the whole Movement.

5.2 Organisational structure and management system

The British Red Cross is governed by a board of trustees some of whom are elected by a national electoral college comprised of senior volunteers from across the UK; others are co-opted through a competitive selection process. The board has up to 13 members- 7 elected members and up to 6 co-opted members selected for their skills and experience from sectors such as business, the diplomatic service and the health sector. The board, which meets at least four times annually, is responsible for oversight of the BRCs strategic direction, progress towards meeting its goals and financial probity.

The Chief Executive oversees seven heads of directorates (who comprise the Executive Leadership Team): International, fundraising, UK Operations, Finance, People and Learning, Communications and Advocacy, and Information and Digital Technology. The UK Operations Directorate has recently been restructured along service lines (previously it was organised geographically).

Some important international decision making fora include:

- Decision making matrix – which applies to all directorates – is designed to enable effective decision-making and provide a clear line of accountability; it outlines responsibility for corporate and strategic decisions as well as key operational and financial decisions.
- International Management Team, led by the Executive Director of International, is responsible for implementing the BRCs international strategy and the Executive Director of International sits on the Executive Leadership Team.
- Emergency task forces (ETFs) are established in anticipation of or in the immediate aftermath of a disaster to lead on BRC's response with senior representatives from programmes, HR, logistics, finance and security.
- Major programme boards (MPBs) are established to oversee ongoing programmes for all funds in excess of £5 million, multilateral programmes or high risk projects, and include senior representatives from a range of departments such as programmes, finance, and logistics.

5.3 Work with Partners

BRC works through (11 as of July 2017) multilateral arrangements with the IFRC and ICRC in 11 regions and countries. BRC only works through National Societies (and in some instances Overseas Branches – OSBs – which are semi-autonomous) of the RCRC movement and so only has one partner in each country. BRC currently works through 26 of these Host National Societies (HNS) in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. While this constrains choice of partners, BRC only engages in areas where its strategic plans align with those of the HNS. Six of eight OSBs that BRC supported at the time of sampling (including Turks & Caicos Islands) are situated in or near the Caribbean. Like the Overseas Territories themselves, the OSBs are largely self-governing, with their own constitutions and governing bodies but are part of the British Red Cross. For the purposes of this report, the term HNS also includes OSBs.

HNS frequently have many partners – Partner National Societies (PNS) from across the RCRC movement. The Code for Good Partnership, in force throughout the Movement, enables PNS and HNS to strengthen their partnerships, and work together more efficiently and effectively. BRC also uses risk management tools to monitor challenges and potential risks of partnership. One of the main challenges for BRC is the lack of control in multilateral arrangements, which it addresses through supporting evaluations and other exercises. Capacity building is an important component of BRC partnerships. It supports HNS to undertake Organisational Capacity Assessment and Certification (OCAC) and Branch

Organisational Capacity Assessment (BOCA), which are self-assessments and peer assessments.

Where BRC encounters significant challenges with a HNS, escalation procedure (for example country manager to Executive Director International and CEO) are defined. BRC procedures for communicating resolutions and decisions to staff are not so clearly defined.

5.4 Certification or verification history

BRC was certified as compliant with People in Aid code of good practice in 2015. It has ISO 14001 certification for its environmental management systems. The BRC was previously a member of the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership but unaudited.

6. Sampling

6.1 Rationale for sampling

The auditors excluded a number of countries based on security or access issues (e.g. Iraq, DPRK, South Sudan). Other countries did not have sufficient programmatic range/scale (e.g. Djibouti, Guinea).

The audit team originally selected Zimbabwe as the programme site but could not travel there due to political unrest; the team then selected the Antilles (Turks and Caicos Islands) because it presented an opportunity to review a recent natural disaster with a bilateral response.

The UK was selected as it was an opportunity to examine accountability and programme quality in a domestic setting where it has greater control, contextual understanding, and potential for oversight.

Projects at programme sites were selected by the auditors based on their representativeness of the overall programme and mandates, scale, and ability to be audited within the proposed timeframe. Volunteers were invited by BRC and community members were generally self-selected in UK and TCI.

BRC recommended (programmatic, financial, human resources) management and staff for interview based on their knowledge and responsibility for implementing CHS commitments and the auditors selected interviewees based on these recommendations. The auditors randomly selected further interviewees.

Disclaimer:

It is important to note that the audit findings are based on the results of a sample of the organisation's documentation and systems as well as interviews and focus groups with a sample of staff, partners, communities and other relevant stakeholders. Findings are analysed to determine the organisation's systematic approach and application of all aspects of the CHS across its organisation and to its different contexts and ways of working. The audit team would like to draw attention to the small sample in TCI, which presents an additional risk of not being representative of international programming.

6.2 Recommended sample size for the mid-term audit

The team recommends a sampling size of two programmes for the mid-term audit, one of which should be a multilateral programme.

6.2 Interviews:

6.2.1 Semi-structured interviews (individual interviews or with a small group <6

Type of people interviewed	Number of people interviewed
Head Office	
Management and staff	19
Programme sites	
London- Main office	7
London- Hackney- staff and volunteers	2
London- St Pancras- staff	3
London – St Pancras- Service user	1
London- West Croydon University Hospital- Staff	2
London- West Croydon University Hospital – Service User	1
London- Hammersmith Young Refugee services- Staff	2
Bristol- Refugee services- staff and volunteers	3
Bristol- Royal Infirmary - staff	2
Bristol- Royal Infirmary – Independent living service user	1
Providenciales- Staff- IRMA response and DRR	5
Providenciales- Volunteers- IRMA response and DRR	8
Providenciales- Partners- IRMA response and DRR	5
Grand Turk- community members- IRMA response and DRR	7
Total number of interviews	65

6.2.2 Focus Group Discussions (interviews with a group >6)

Type of Group	Number of participants	
	Female	Male
Refugees- Hackney	6	5
Young refugees- Hammersmith	3	3
Refugees- Bristol	4	5
Grand Turk- volunteers	4	3
Total number of participants	17	16

7. Report

7.1 Overall organisational performance

BRC is a well-established member of the RCRC movement, which provides strong linkages with a network of RCRC organisations, whose role as auxiliary to government frequently provides access to sites that other international organisations cannot reach. RCRC organisations are accepted in conflict zones and other inaccessible/ challenging operational settings because of their reputation for independence and their community-based volunteer network. This volunteer-based structure provides a significant operational platform that also enhances efficiency of operations. However, membership of the movement also presents challenges. The volunteer base sometimes lacks the skills and experience of paid staff. BRC supports HNS to develop systems and procedures that contribute to quality and accountability during crises. However, support diminishes as the crises recedes in severity and the public consciousness, which threatens the sustainability of the investment. The level of duplication within the RCRC movement is an issue that BRC is working to influence, for example through consortia. BRCs commitment to quality and accountability is evident although some specific commitments which require enhanced effort, particularly around complaints handling.

BRC's broadness of remit (multilateral and bilateral, domestic and international, first response and resilience building) is partly derived from its mandate. However, resource constraints mean that there is a danger that BRC is spread too thin and attempts to cover too many programmes with too little resources. Internationally, BRC's level of removal from communities makes it more difficult to identify issues. Working multilaterally confers advantages in efficiency and effectiveness but diminishes BRCs control over programmes. In addition, BRC must engage with national RC societies or other movement members if it wants to operate in a particular country. This presents BRC with dilemmas where partners are underperforming, are not sufficiently tackling corruption or are not sufficiently independent from national governments. BRC has generally shown a willingness to take a stance and withdraw from partnerships where there is insufficient will to tackle such issues.

7.2 Summary of non-conformities

Non-compliance	Type	Time resolution for
2018 - 2.4 Programmes are not systematically planned and assessed using relevant technical standards	Minor CAR	12 months
2018 - 3.6 BRC has limited formal procedures for identifying the full range of unintended negative effects	Minor CAR	24 months
2018 - 4.1 BRC does not systematically provide information on the Red Cross principles or expected behaviour to communities or service users	Minor CAR	24 months
2018 - 4.3 BRC does not systematically ensure inclusive representation, engagement and participation of communities	Minor CAR	24 months
2018 - 5.1 BRC does not consult with communities regarding the design, implementation and monitoring of complaints-handling processes and does not support partners to undertake consultation processes	Minor CAR	24 months
2018 - 5.3 BRC does not manage complaints systematically	Minor CAR	24 months
2018 - 5.4 BRC does not systematically work with partners to develop complaints mechanisms and does not have a global analysis of the extent to which partners have documented complaints mechanisms.	Minor CAR	24 months
2018 - 5.6 BRC does not ensure that service users are aware of the expected behaviour of humanitarian staff. It is not systematically working with partners to develop information sharing plans that describe expected staff behaviour.	Minor CAR	24 months
2018 - 7.2 BRC does not systematically incorporate learning into programmes	Minor CAR	12 months
TOTAL Number	9	

7.3 Strong points and areas for improvement:

Commitment 1: Humanitarian assistance is appropriate and relevant

Score: 2.3

BRC commits to impartial assistance based on needs (though less so on capacities). This commitment is taken very seriously although domestic needs assessments are sometimes basic and the quality of international needs analysis varies. BRCs context and stakeholders analysis processes are well established but the quality of analysis in international programming is variable. Internationally, BRC sometimes struggles to provide sufficient support to partners to improve the quality of needs assessments and context analysis. BRC changes (domestic and international) programmes based on evidence of changes in needs/ capacities/ circumstances.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 1

BRC is very focused on ensuring impartiality in delivery of assistance. BRC adapts programmes when needs or circumstances change and its assistance is appropriate to vulnerabilities and capacities.

Commitment 2: Humanitarian response is effective and timely

Score: 2.2

BRC designs programmes that are realistic although they are not systematically planned using relevant technical standards. Furthermore, the safety of communities is not always included in the design of international programmes. BRC is generally timely in its delivery of humanitarian assistance. It refers needs which fall outside of its scope to statutory or other voluntary providers in its domestic programme but not systematically in international programmes. Policies commit to ongoing monitoring and evaluation and to use of information to improve programmes but BRC does not do this systematically.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 2:

BRC provides service users and communities with the assistance they need in a timely way. Services are highly appreciated.

Commitment 3: Humanitarian response strengthens local capacities and avoids negative effects

Score: 2.4

BRC's way of working (through community-based volunteers) develops resilience and helps strengthen local capacities and its programmes promote early recovery and support the local economy. Internationally, BRC supports partners to develop preparedness plans and focuses on developing partners' capacity as first responders. BRC's systems require exit/transition strategies, and practice has recently improved. BRC does not systematically identify the range of potential or actual unintended negative effects of its programmes although practice domestically is more advanced than internationally.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 3:

BRC's partners support resilience building and the local economy; no negative effects were identified as a result of its interventions.

Commitment 4: Humanitarian response is based on communication, participation and feedback

Score: 2.3

BRC has a strong set of policy commitments to support accountability and engagement with communities and to ensure they are accurately represented in external communications. Participation is largely through volunteers, who are drawn from the community but wider participation is not systematic. BRC does not systematically ensure that policies and guidance is followed in practice in relation to the provision of information, and systems for gathering feedback are not sufficiently strong. However, internationally, project templates now query whether accountability mechanisms are in place so the data to support this analysis is becoming available though is not yet well developed.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 4:

Communities and service users knew about the Red Cross and what it stands for but had not specifically been made aware of the values of the organisation or of the expected behaviours of its staff and volunteers.

Commitment 5: Complaints are welcomed and addressed

Score: 1.4

BRC's organisational culture regarding complaints mechanisms is growing but domestic complaints are not collated centrally and so the organisation does not have a comprehensive overview of complaints received. Internationally, BRC does not currently have a systematic approach to helping partners develop complaints mechanisms. Therefore, complaints mechanisms are not in place in many projects and BRC does not currently analyse the extent to which complaints mechanisms are in place in projects it supports. However, project templates now query whether accountability mechanisms are in place so the data to support this analysis is becoming available. Internationally, BRC has undertaken limited formal work with partners to help them consult with communities, develop complaints mechanisms, manage complaints or refer out-of-scope complaints to relevant parties. Domestically, BRC has not consulted with service users regarding the design, implementation and monitoring of complaints mechanisms. Service users and communities (domestically and internationally) were not well aware of expected behaviour of BRC or partner staff.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 5:

Communities were not consulted on how they would like to complain and have limited understanding of expected staff behaviour, how to access BRC's partners' complaints

mechanisms or the scope of the policy. However, they are satisfied with the behaviour and commitment of staff and volunteers.

Commitment 6: Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary

Score: 2.8

BRC coordinates most effectively with other members of the Red Cross Movement for international responses. Strategies to improve coordination and complementarity, where more than one partner Red Cross is supporting a response, include a consortium approach and One Movement response plan. However, the BRC does not always provide National Societies with sufficient support to enable them to attend coordination meetings. BRC coordinates well with statutory and other voluntary services in their domestic work.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 6:

Service users of domestic services experience good complementarity with other services, statutory and voluntary, and were not aware of other similar services. International programme communities did not experience duplications in the services provided.

Commitment 7: Humanitarian actors continuously learn and improve

Score: 1.8

BRC is committed to learning and it supports partners to improve their own monitoring and evaluation systems. However, domestically and internationally, it sometimes struggles to incorporate prior lessons and experience into programme design, and does not systematically use learning to drive programmatic change. Domestically, this is because statistical data is not rich enough. Qualitative data is generated about individuals and not aggregated. BRC's international knowledge management system is more navigable than the domestic system but does not consolidate learning, which remains primarily at an individual level.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 7:

BRC shares knowledge and experience with volunteers, which is shared with other community members; otherwise there were limited examples of sharing learning within communities.

Commitment 8: Staff are supported to do their job effectively, and are treated fairly and equitably

Score: 2.6

BRC has a suite of strong HR policies which are generally perceived by staff to be fair and transparent. All staff and volunteers have job descriptions and annual appraisals and most managers have sufficient support to manage their staff. All international staff have signed a Code of Conduct. BRC has only recently launched a Code of Conduct which applies to staff, volunteers and those working

on their behalf. The Code of Conduct has not yet been rolled out for domestic staff and volunteers to sign. BRC does not support partners to put in place a Code of Conduct for their staff and volunteers.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 8:

Service users and communities expressed confidence in the staff and volunteers who were supporting them and find them skilled and knowledgeable in their areas.

Commitment 9: Resources are managed and used responsibly for their intended purpose

Score: 2.5

Policies and processes governing the use and management of resources are generally robust for expenditure under the control of BRC. This includes expenditure in UK and under bilateral agreements. BRC has limited control over funds channelled through the IFRC [multilateral expenditure]. BRC generally designs programmes efficiently with expenditure monitored against budget and implements other controls/processes to manage resources to achieve their intended purpose. BRC takes appropriate action where misuse of funds is suspected or discovered although it does not always react swiftly where there are concerns relating to partners because of the nature of relationships in the Movement. BRC has comprehensive environmental policies but does not ensure these are implemented by partners.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 9:

Communities and service users were not aware of the available resources but were also not aware of any misuse or inappropriate use either.

8. Organisation's approval

Acknowledgement and Acceptance of Findings

(Organisation representative – please cross where appropriate)

I acknowledge and understand the findings of the audit

I accept the findings of the audit

I do not accept some/all of the findings of the audit

Please list the requirements whose findings you do not accept

Organisation's
Representative Name
and Signature:




Date and Place:

29/6/61

2018-05-15

9. HQAI's decision

Independent Verification Decision	
Quality Control by: Elissa Goucem and Pierre Hauselmann	Quality Control finalised on: First Draft: 2018-04-17 Final: 2018-05-15
Next audits Maintenance Self-Assessment before 2019-07-01	
Approval of the report	
Pierre Hauselmann Executive Director Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative 	Date: 2018-07-02 

Appeal

In case of disagreement with the conclusions and/or decision on certification, the organisation can appeal to HQAI within 30 days after the final report has been transmitted to the organisation.

HQAI will investigate the content of the appeal and propose a solution within 15 days after receiving the appeal.

If the solution is deemed not to be satisfactory, the organisation can inform in writing HQAI within 15 days after being informed of the proposed solution of their intention to maintain the appeal.

HQAI will take action immediately, and identify two Board members to proceed with the appeal. These will have 30 day to address it. Their decision will be final.

The details of the Appeal Procedure can be found in document PRO049 – Appeal and Complaints Procedure.

Annex 1 - Detailed description of scores

0	<p>A score of 0 denotes a weakness that is so significant that it indicates that the organisation is unable to meet the required commitment. This is a major weakness to be corrected immediately.</p> <p>EXAMPLES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational activities and actions contradict the intent of a CHS commitment. Policies and procedures contradict the intent of the CHS commitment. Absence of processes or policies necessary to ensure compliance at the level of the commitment. Recurrent failure to implement the necessary actions at operational level make it impossible for the organisation to ensure compliance at the level of the commitment. Failure to implement to resolve minor non-conformities in the adequate timeframes More than half of the indicators of one commitment receive a score of 1 (minor non-conformity), making it impossible for the organisation to ensure compliance at the level of the commitment.
1	<p>A score of 1 denotes a weakness that does not immediately compromise the integrity of the commitment but requires to be corrected to ensure the organisation can continuously deliver against the commitment.</p> <p>EXAMPLES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a significant number of cases where the design and management of programmes and activities do not reflect the CHS requirement. Actions at the operational level are not systematically implemented in accordance with relevant policies and procedures. Relevant policies exist but are incomplete or do not cover all areas of the requirement/commitment. Existing policies are not accompanied with sufficient guidance to support a systematic and robust implementation by staff. A significant number of relevant staff at Head Office and/or field levels are not familiar with the policies and procedures. Absence of mechanisms to monitor the systematic application of relevant policies and procedures at the level of the requirement/commitment.
2	<p>A score of 2 denotes an issue that deserve attention but does not <u>currently</u> compromise the conformity with the requirement.. This is worth an observation and, if not addressed may turn into a significant weakness (score 1).</p> <p>EXAMPLES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the requirement varies from programme to programme and is driven by people rather than organisational culture. There are instances of actions at operational level where the design or management of programmes does not fully reflect relevant policies. Relevant policies exist but are incomplete or do not cover all areas of the requirement/commitment.
3	<p>The organisation conforms with this requirement, and organisational systems ensure that it is met throughout the organisation and over time.</p> <p>EXAMPLES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant policies and procedures exist and are accompanied with guidance to support implementation by staff. Staff are familiar with relevant policies. They can provide several examples of consistent application in different activities, projects and programmes. The organisation monitors the implementation of its policies and supports the staff in doing so at operational level. Policy and practice are aligned.
4	<p>The organisation demonstrates innovation in the application of this requirement/commitment. It is applied in an exemplary way across the organisation and organisational systems ensure high quality is maintained across the organisation and over time.</p> <p>EXAMPLES:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field and programme staff act frequently in a way that goes beyond CHS requirement to which they are clearly committed. • Relevant staff can explain in which way their activities are in line with the requirement and can provide several examples of implementation in different sites. They can relate the examples to improved quality of the projects and their deliveries. • Communities and other external stakeholders are particularly satisfied with the work of the organisation in relation to the requirement. • Policies and procedures go beyond the intent of the CHS requirement, are innovative and systematically implemented across the organisation.
5	<p>On top of demonstrating conformity and innovation, the organisation receives outstanding feedback from communities and people. This is an exceptional strength and a score of 5 should only be attributed in exceptional circumstances</p> <p>EXAMPLES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions at all levels and across the organisation go far beyond the intent of the relevant CHS requirement and could serve as textbook examples of ultimate good practice. • Policies and procedures go far beyond the intent of the CHS requirement and could serve as textbook examples of relevant policies and procedures.