

Dan Church Aid

Maintenance Audit – Summary Report 2022/05/09

1. General information

1.1 Organisation

Type	Mandates	Verified	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Membership/Network <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Federated <input type="checkbox"/> With partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	
Head office location	Copenhagen, Denmark		
Total number of country programmes	17	Total number of staff	Around 860

1.2 Audit team

Lead auditor	Stephen Morrow
Second auditor	Not applicable (N/A)
Third auditor	N/A
Observer	N/A
Expert	N/A
Witness / other	N/A

1.3 Scope of the audit

CHS Verification Scheme	Certification
Audit cycle	Second audit cycle
Phase of the audit	Maintenance audit (MA)
Extraordinary or other type of audit	N/A

1.4 Sampling*

Randomly sampled country programme (CP) sites	Included in final sample	Replaced by	Rationale for sampling and selection of sites	Onsite or remote
South Sudan	Yes		Covers three mandates (development, humanitarian, advocacy/peace); significant budget; DCA entry in 2010; working through partners and directly; not covered in previous audits;	Remote
Zimbabwe	Yes		Covers three mandates; significant budget; DCA entry in 2015; working through partners; not covered in previous audits;	Remote
Kenya	Yes		Covers three mandates; significant budget; DCA entry in 1992 with work through partners; working through partners and directly; not covered in previous audits;	Remote
Any other sampling performed for this audit:				

- a) The Re-certification Audit (RA) Summary Report, 2021-04-29, included a sampling recommendation for next audit: 'Include also a country programme for onsite visit where DCA implements advocacy programmes'. This recommendation remains to be implemented at the next Audit.
- b) The three CPs in this MA cover the three mandates: development; humanitarian; and advocacy.

Sampling risk: The CP sampling in this MA covers three mandates.

**It is important to note that the audit findings are based on a sample of an organisation's country programmes, its documentation and observation. Findings are analysed to determine an organisation's systematic approach and application of all aspects of the CHS across different contexts and ways of working.*

2. Activities undertaken by the audit team

2.1 Locations Assessed

Locations	Dates	Onsite or remote
Denmark, Head Office (HO)	Saturday, 5 March 2022	Remote
South Sudan CP	Wednesday 9 March 2022	Remote
Zimbabwe CP	Wednesday 9 March 2022	Remote
Kenya CP	Wednesday 9 March 2022	Remote

2.2 Interviews

Position / level of interviewees	Number of interviewees		Onsite or remote
	Female	Male	
Head Office			
Management	1	1	Remote
Staff			
Country Programme Offices			
Management	2	1	Remote
Staff			
Partner staff			
Others			
Total number of interviewees	3	2	

2.3 Opening/Introductory meeting

Date	2022/02/02
Location	Remote
Number of participants	Two
Any substantive issues arising	No

2.4 Closing/Wrap-up meeting

Date	2022/03/23
Location	Remote
Number of participants	1
Any substantive issues arising	No

3. Background information on the organisation

3.1 General information	<p>The general information about DCA remains the same as in the RA Summary Report, 2021-04-29 (with the number of CPs reduced from 18 to 17). It is reproduced here (in italics):</p> <p><i>Dan Church Aid (DCA), founded in 1922, is an independent, non-profit, faith-based organisation rooted in the Danish National Evangelical Lutheran Church, based in Copenhagen, Denmark. DCA is a member of the ACT Alliance and cooperates with the Lutheran World Federation and the World Council of Churches.</i></p> <p><i>DCA's purpose is to empower the world's poorest in their struggle for a dignified life. This effort is based on a Christian worldview as well as respect for human rights and the equal worth of all human beings. DCA organises aid and assistance at local, national and global levels, in close cooperation with churches and other partners, and engages with people's movements and political powers to influence decision-makers to improve conditions for the world's poorest.</i></p> <p><i>DCA has a country office in 17 countries, mainly in Africa, but also in Asia and the Middle East. The revised International Strategy (2019-2022) forms an integrated part of the eight years (2015-2022) Global Strategy. DCA pursues three global goals:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Save lives; strategic intervention areas include rapid humanitarian response and preparedness, emergency livelihoods and sustainable recovery, community safety and protection.</i> <i>b) Build resilient communities; strategic intervention areas include community-based disaster risk reduction and risk management, sustainable community livelihoods development and job creation, communities influence decisions for building resilient communities.</i> <i>c) Fight extreme inequality; strategic intervention areas include space for civil society and protection of human rights defenders, inclusive participation in decision-making, equitable distribution of resources through inclusive and accountable institutions, combating discrimination and promoting rights of excluded groups.</i> <p><i>All international programmes and projects in DCA are developed and implemented within the priorities of the thematic policies: Active citizenship, Right to Food, Humanitarian Action and Safer Communities in which gender and rights-based approach are mainstreamed. DCA is funded by more than 60 different international donors in addition to funding from Danida as part of a Strategic Partnership Agreement (2018-2021), ECHO FPA strategic partnership as well as contributions from individuals and companies.</i></p>
3.2 Governance and management structure	<p>DCA's governance and management structure remains the same as outlined in the RA Summary Report, 2021-04-29.</p>
3.3 Internal quality assurance mechanisms and risk management	<p>DCA's internal quality assurance mechanisms and risk management remains essentially the same as noted in the RA Audit Summary Report, 2021-04-29. It is reproduced here (in italics):</p> <p><i>DCA has internal quality assurance and control systems in place to address requirements of the CHS, and other strategic commitments. DCA has built its approach to quality management and accountability on its commitment to the CHS (DCA International Strategy 2019-2022). A systematic assessment of DCA's adherence to the CHS has been put in place by a mandatory Accountability Improvement Plan (AIP) that is congruent with the 38 CHS Key Actions for each CP to be completed in December each year. The purpose is to detect any gaps and weaknesses in the way DCA and partners work and to identify actions and steps to address them.</i></p> <p><i>Accountability focal points have been appointed in each CP, providing support regarding DCA's efforts towards accountability, transparency and enhancing quality assurance throughout the organisation, including CHS standards. The Partner Assessment Tool (PAT), which is a pre-requisite for finalising Cooperation Agreements for funded activities, now includes more explicitly CHS commitments including PSEA, Code of Conduct and Complaints and Feedback mechanisms.'</i></p>

Further, and as detailed in the Annex Report against CAR2021-3.6, DCA is undertaking a substantive review of its risk management policy at the Organisational Responsibility level and this will be a key element in DCA's quality assurance and risk management mechanisms. As a result of DCA's ongoing quality assurance and risk management work, it has updated the PAT in October 2021 to more robustly assess partner's complaints systems and specifically to ensure that SEA is included in that assessment. Similarly, DCA continues to conduct regular quarterly webinars with CP Accountability and Complaints Focal Points as key actors in the organisation wide approach to risk management and quality assurance, particularly in work with partners.

3.4 Work with partner organisations

DCA's work with partner organisations remains essentially the same as noted in the RA Audit Summary Report, 2021-04-29. It is reproduced here (in italics):

Working with partners is a core principle for DCA and fundamental to its values and identity. DCA works with a total number of 195 local partners for project implementation (signed cooperation agreement) out of which 145 partners have long term partnerships.

As a signatory to Grand Bargain, DCA is committed to fund local and national partners directly, and systematically measure the multi-year investment to support partner capacity development. DCA uses a Partner Assessment Tool (PAT) to assess, monitor and document partner's organisational strengths and weaknesses, in order to strengthen partners' capacity building and organisational development.

DCA's partners include civil society organisations; churches; faith-based organisations; governments; academic institutions; political parties; international regional and global institutions; networks; and private sector actors.

As outlined in the Annex Report, DCA is addressing CAR 2021-5.4 and 5.7, and is strengthening its work with partner organisations particularly in terms of due diligence and capacity assessment around complaints and feedback processes.

4. Overall performance of the organisation

4.1 Effectiveness of the governance, internal quality assurance and risk management of the organisation

The effectiveness of DCA's governance, internal quality assurance and risk management remains essentially the same as noted in the RA Summary Report 2021-04-29.

DCA has determined that it's overall approach to risk management is not as consolidated as it could be and risks may not be properly assessed and mitigated in a consistent manner across all CPs. To address this, and as detailed in the Annex report against CAR 2021-3.6, DCA has initiated a substantive review and revision of its approach to risk management at an organisation-wide level.

4.2 How the organisation applies the CHS across its work

DCA continues to apply the CHS across its work as described in the RA Summary Report 2021-04-09.

4.3 Average score per CHS commitment

Commitment	Average Score*
Commitment 1: Humanitarian assistance is appropriate and relevant	3
Commitment 2: Humanitarian response is effective and timely	2.7
Commitment 3: Humanitarian response strengthens local capacities and avoids negative effects	2.6
Commitment 4: Humanitarian response is based on communication, participation and feedback	2.8
Commitment 5: Complaints are welcomed and accepted	2.1
Commitment 6: Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary	3
Commitment 7: Humanitarian actors continuously learn and improve	2.6
Commitment 8: Humanitarian response is effective and timely	2.7
Commitment 9: Resources are managed and used responsibly for their intended purpose	2.8

* *Note: Average scores are a sum of the scores per commitment divided by the number of indicators in each Commitment, except when one of the indicators of a commitment scores 0 or if several scores 1 on the indicators of a Commitment lead to the issuance of a major non-conformity/ weakness at the level of the Commitment. In these two cases the overall score for the Commitment is 0.*

5. Summary of non-conformities / weaknesses


Corrective Action Requests (CAR)* / Weaknesses	Type	Resolution due date	Date closed out
2021- 3.6: DCA does not consistently identify and monitor risks, including unintended negative effects, to act in a timely and systematic manner.	Minor	2023-03-10	Pending
2021 - 5.4: DCA processes do not sufficiently ensure that all its partners have functioning complaints handling mechanisms in place.	Minor	2023-03-10	Pending
2021 - 5.7: DCA has no formal referral mechanisms in place for complaints that do not fall within the scope of the organisation or its partners.	Minor	2023-03-10	Pending
Total Number			3

* *Note: The CARs are completed by the audit team based on the findings.*

6. Sampling recommendation for next audit

Sampling rate	As per number of CPs at the time of the audit – ensuring the advocacy mandate is included in the sample.
Specific recommendation for selection of sites	Nil.


7. Lead auditor recommendation

<p>In my opinion, DCA has demonstrated that it continues to conform with the requirements of the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability.</p> <p>Based on the evidence obtained, I confirm that I have received reasonable assurance that the organisation is implementing the necessary actions to close the minor CARs identified in the previous audit, and continues to meet the requirements of the Core Humanitarian Standard.</p> <p>I recommend maintenance of certification.</p>	
<p>Name and signature of lead auditor: Stephen Morrow</p> 	<p>Date and place: 2022-04-09</p> <p>Sydney, Australia</p>

8. HQAI decision

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certification maintained <input type="checkbox"/> Certificate suspended	<input type="checkbox"/> Certificate reinstated <input type="checkbox"/> Certificate withdrawn
<p>Next audit: Surveillance audit before 9th May 2023</p>	
<p>Name and signature of HQAI Executive Director:</p>  <p>Pierre Hauselmann</p>	<p>Date and place:</p> <p>9th May 2023</p> <p>Châtelaine</p>

9. Acknowledgement of the report by the organisation

<p>Space reserved for the organisation</p>	
<p>Any reservations regarding the audit findings and/or any remarks regarding the behaviour of the HQAI audit team:</p> <p><i>If yes, please give details:</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Acknowledgement and Acceptance of Findings:</p> <p>I acknowledge and understand the findings of the audit</p> <p>I accept the findings of the audit</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Name and signature of the organisation's representative:</p> <p>Birgitte Qvist-Sørensen</p> 	<p>Date and place:</p> <p>10 May 2022</p> <p>Copenhagen</p>

Appeal

In case of disagreement with the decision on certification, the organisation can appeal to HQAI within 14 days after being informed of the decision. HQAI will investigate the content of the appeal and propose a solution within 10 days after receiving the appeal.

If the solution is deemed not to be satisfactory, the organisation can inform HQAI in writing within 30 days after being informed of the proposed solution, of their intention to maintain the appeal.

HQAI will transmit the case to the Chair of the Advisory and Complaint Board who will constitute a panel made of at least two experts who have no conflict of interest in the case in question. These will strive to come to a decision within 30 days.

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

Annex 1: Explanation of the scoring scale*

Scores	Meaning: for all verification scheme options	Technical meaning for all independent verification and certification audits
0	Your organisation does not work towards applying the CHS commitment.	<p>Score 0: indicates a weakness that is so significant that the organisation is unable to meet the commitment. This leads to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent verification: major weakness; • Certification: major non-conformity, leading to a major corrective action request (CAR) – No certificate can be issue or immediate suspension of certificate.
1	Your organisation is making efforts towards applying this requirement, but these are not systematic.	<p>Score 1: indicates 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 it. This leads to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent verification: minor weakness • Certification: minor non-conformity, leading to a minor corrective action request (CAR).
2	Your organisation is making systematic efforts towards applying this requirement, but certain key points are still not addressed.	<p>Score 2: indicates an issue that deserves attention but does not currently compromise the conformity with the requirement. This leads to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent verification and certification: observation.
3	Your organisation conforms to this requirement, and organisational systems ensure that it is met throughout the organisation and over time – the requirement is fulfilled.	<p>Score 3: indicates full conformity with the requirement. This leads to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent verification and certification: conformity.
4	Your organisation's work goes beyond the intent of this requirement and demonstrates innovation. 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>Score 4: indicates an exemplary performance in the application of the requirement.</p>

* Scoring Scale from the CHSA Verification Scheme 2020