

# Finn Church Aid (FCA)

## Maintenance Audit – Summary Report MA2 2020/06/03

### 1. General information

#### Organisation

Type	Mandates	Verified	
<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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	
<b>Head office location</b>	Helsinki, Finland		
<b>Total number of country programmes</b>	11	<b>Total number of staff</b>	400

#### Audit team

<b>Lead auditor</b>	Claire Goudsmit
<b>Second auditor</b>	-
<b>Third auditor</b>	-
<b>Observer</b>	-
<b>Expert</b>	-
<b>Other</b>	-

#### Scope of the audit

Audit Stage	CHS Verification Scheme			
	Certification	Independent Verification	Benchmarking	Other
Initial audit (IA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
First maintenance audit (MA1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mid-term audit (MTA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Second maintenance audit (MA2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recertification audit (RA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Extraordinary audit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Short notice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Sampling\*

Randomly sampled country programme sites	Included in final sample (Yes/No)	Replaced by	Rationale / Comments (If random sample not included explain why and give rationale for selected country programme)	Onsite visit / remote assessment
Myanmar	No	Syria	As Myanmar was remotely assessed at MTA, next random sample was selected: Syria, which covers development and humanitarian.	
CAR	No	Cambodia	As CAR was remotely assessed at MTA,	

			next random sample was selected: Cambodia, which covers development – integrated programming.	
Somalia	Yes		Random sample, covers humanitarian and integrated development	Remote
Syria	Yes		Random sample, covers humanitarian and development	Remote
Eritrea	No	Cambodia	Eritrea not included as FCA is currently exiting from the country. Next random sample was Cambodia to replace CAR.	

**Add any other sampling performed for this audit** (for example federations, regional offices, etc.): None

*\*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

### Locations assessed

Locations (offices, projects at country programme level)	Dates	Onsite or remote
Head Office, Helsinki, Finland	06/05/2020	remote
Syria Country Office	12/05/2020	remote
Cambodia Country Office	12/05/2020	remote
Somalia Country Office	12/05/2020	remote

### Interviews

Position / level of interviewees	Number of interviewees	Onsite or remote
<b>Head Office</b>		
Management & staff	4	remote
<b>Country Programme(s)</b>		
Management	4	remote
Staff		
Partner staff		remote
Others (specify)		
<b>Total number of interviewees</b>	<b>8</b>	

### Opening meeting

<b>Date</b>	2020/05/04
<b>Location</b>	remote

### Closing meeting

<b>Date</b>	2020/05/19
<b>Location</b>	remote

<b>Number of participants</b>	9
<b>Any substantive issues arising</b>	None

<b>Number of participants</b>	10
<b>Any substantive issues arising</b>	None

### 3. Background information on the organisation

#### **Governance and management structure**

The governance and management structure of FCA has not significantly changed since the 2019 mid-term audit (MTA). Five directors, representing the: Funding, Communication and Resources Mobilisation; International Programmes (IPRO); Finance and ICT; Human Resources and Administration (HRAD) departments, form the Senior Management Team (SMT), reporting to the CEO, with oversight from the Board of Directors. International Country Offices (CO) are managed by Regional and Country Directors based in country, reporting directly to the IPRO Director, with support from the Head Office (HO) (e.g. desk officers, programme development and humanitarian aid units, security, thematic and international operations advisors).

#### **Effectiveness of the internal quality assurance systems**

FCA has a robust internal compliance audit function, supported by the Board's Audit Committee. Risk management has been integrated into its programme planning, assessment and MEAL frameworks. FCA has introduced (2019) a global level Quality and Accountability Framework, which sets out the organisational policy position and ambition in this area of work. As the policy is recently published, it has yet to be received by all country programme staff and partners.

To address current challenges that FCA has identified, with gaps and overlaps of actions and roles related to the management of quality and accountability across its operations, FCA has recently established a Quality Management System Coordination group (ToRs approved April 2020). The purpose of the group is to review the current quality management processes, functions and roles across the organisation, and from this develop a more holistic, comprehensive, organisation-wide quality management system, that could be systematically rolled-out. Alongside this a new Programme management system is planned to be launched in late 2020.

A mandatory Quality and Accountability Self-assessment (QA SA) procedure for each Country Office (CO) has been introduced, with 7 out of 11 COs having completed the process (with some postponed due to Covid-19). To support COs, FCA has developed a comprehensive workshop guide and resources to guide the self-assessment process, and which is in most cases is facilitated by staff from HO or an external consultant. The SA is an in-depth, week-long process, which includes all staff and other stakeholders (e.g. partners) in some sessions and forms a baseline analysis of how each CO is performing against the CHS and gives a comprehensive picture of their operations and practices. Accompanying this, an Accountability Improvement Plan (AIP) is developed, to be used as a tool to assess and monitor performance. The aim is that each CO integrates these plans into other MEAL plans and a progress report is to be submitted to HO on a 4-monthly basis to monitor.

#### **Work with partner organisations**

FCA is a member of the ACT Alliance and participates in working groups with other members to share experiences, challenges and develop good practices or advocacy (e.g. CRM Group). Approximately 50% of FCA projects are implemented through national partners, which are supported by each regional and country office.

## 4. Overall performance of the organisation

### Effectiveness of the management system, internal quality assurance and governance

FCA have taken a number of steps to address the weaknesses identified in the organisation, and which were in part highlighted through the CHS audits. FCA is putting in place the systems it requires to improve how it meets its commitments consistently across its work. FCA recognise that a lot of information (e.g. policies, procedures, guidelines, tools) is produced at the global level and there are high expectations placed on the COs to fully implement and make necessary changes. FCA has improved on how it rolls-out new and revised pieces of work, with increased support and guidance from HO and across CO teams. Communities of Practice (e.g. MEAL) include a cross-section of staff from different offices and participation rates are high. FCA shows significant effort to establish a strong quality management system (QMS), and a new QMS Coordination Group is formed to oversee and monitor FCA's improvement plans.

Although not all CO's have completed FCA's full SA and AIP process, FCA is using the results gathered so far to identify key issues (e.g. uptake and proficient use of new tools that are rolled-out from HO), systemisation glitches, and trends across the organisation. For example, understanding and communicating with communities in FCA's development programming is stronger than humanitarian programming. Findings are being integrated into FCA's Annual Planning process (2020).

### Overall organisational performance in the application of the CHS

FCA has set out a plan to address all the weakness and CARs 3.8 on data protection and 5.6 on communication with communities regarding expected behaviours of staff. The organisation has taken a comprehensive view of where their weaknesses lie, and which components of their processes need to be improved so that the identified gaps can be addressed concretely. FCA is considering the MTA findings holistically, taking all weaknesses in to account that impact upon the CARs. For example, FCA is re-approaching it's 'thinking' on safeguarding to develop a more holistic view and practice across the organisation, incorporating Do No Harm, data protection, risk management etc. FCA is implementing activities according to its implementation plan, however, Covid-19 is delaying some areas of its work.

Although not all activities have yet been implemented at the time of the MA2, and therefore remain outstanding, FCA has made progress.

Significant developments include the introduction of FCA's global Quality and Accountability Framework and the publication of its Annual Complaints Report for 2019 (which is the first time FCA has produced such a report). FCA is in process to revise its Code of Conduct policy, to update it in line with other policies and guidance, and ensure it is clear and understandable for all staff. FCA's Complaint Policy was revised, a Standing Complaint Committee established at HO (to ensure that sensitive complaints are addressed appropriately and in a timely manner at all times, and a Complaint Handling Task Force was established to support complaint handling between HO and country programmes. A new (mid-2020) Safeguarding Officer will be at HO to support FCA's PSEA approach (e.g. policy development, facilitate and manage SEA investigations, support safeguarding procedures in country programmes).

FCA has also developed a comprehensive Climate Approach, which includes climate action and environmental protection in programming. A number of tools and guides have been developed or revised to ensure that FCA's Climate Approach becomes integrated into the assessment planning and delivering of FCA's work (e.g. FCA's Climate Tool, Climate Action intranet support resource, guidance, tools, checklists and revised project management formats).

Based on learning, FCA has recognised that roll-out to country teams from HO is not always as expected, which has caused issues, for FCA staff and partners (e.g. risk assessment process not fulfilled). The country SA process has, already shined a light on where FCA needs to increase its support to COs and its partners, if it wants to perform better and reach its goals. Through taking a more comprehensive, steady and methodical approach to implementing changes and introducing new policies and procedures, FCA expects that country teams, and partners, will be more able to implement the work.

FCA has identified the main areas to work on, has made a clear plan of action and documents its progress. A number of new and revised tools and guidelines have been prepared e.g. for project planning and monitoring, risk assessment, quarterly, final and annual reporting, information sharing guideline, data protection guidelines. Nevertheless, to date, these have

not all been finalised nor distributed to country teams. This is in-part due to delays experienced from Covid-19, and in part due to the time required to ensure that country teams are clear and supported to implement new processes in a systematic way. FCA's next audit (Recertification 2021) will review its performance against all the CHS commitments and its global and country level implementation plans (AIPs, MEAL, Annual Plans etc.).

## Average score per commitment

CHS Commitment	Average score*
<b>Commitment 1:</b> Humanitarian assistance is appropriate and relevant	2.3
<b>Commitment 2:</b> Humanitarian response is effective and timely	2.4
<b>Commitment 3:</b> Humanitarian response strengthens local capacities and avoids negative effects	2.5
<b>Commitment 4:</b> Humanitarian response is based on communication, participation and feedback	2.6
<b>Commitment 5:</b> Complaints are welcomed and addressed	1.9
<b>Commitment 6:</b> Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary	2.7
<b>Commitment 7:</b> Humanitarian actors continuously learn and improve	2.3
<b>Commitment 8:</b> Staff are supported to do their job effectively, and are treated fairly and equitably	2.6
<b>Commitment 9:</b> Resources are managed and used responsibly for their intended purpose	2.5

\*Note: scores are culminative and updated at this audit stage based on the results from previous audits


## 5. Summary of non-conformities

Corrective Action Requests (CAR) / Weaknesses (YYYY – indicator)	Type (minor / major)	Close-out due date (YYYY/MM/DD)	Date closed out (YYYY/MM/DD)
2019-3.8: FCA does not ensure that systems are in place at field level to safeguard personal information from affected communities	Minor	2020/06/26	2020/05/25
2019-5.6: People affected by crisis are not fully aware of the expected behaviour of FCA staff, and organisational commitments made on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse	Minor	2021/06/26	


## 6. Sampling recommendation for next audit

<b>Sampling rate</b>	As outlined for re-certification. Based on FCA with between 10-16 country programmes operational, 3 sites should be sampled – 1 onsite visit and 2 assessed remotely.
<b>Specific recommendation for selection of sites</b>	

## 7. Lead auditor recommendation


In our opinion, Finn Church Aid (FCA) is implementing the necessary actions to close the minor CARs identified in the previous audit and continues to conform with the requirements of the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability. We recommend maintenance of certification.	
<b>Name and signature of lead auditor:</b>  Claire Goudsmit	<b>Date and place:</b>  2020/05/25 Falmouth, UK

## 8. HQAI decision

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certificate maintained	<input type="checkbox"/> Certificate reinstated
<input type="checkbox"/> Certificate suspended	<input type="checkbox"/> Certificate withdrawn
<b>Next audits</b> Recertification before 2021/06/25	
<b>Name and signature of HQAI Executive Director:</b>  Pierre Hauselmann	<b>Date and place:</b>  2020-06-04

## 9. Acknowledgement of the report by the organisation

<b>Space reserved for the organisation</b>	
Reservations regarding the findings / remarks regarding the behaviour of the audit team:  <i>If yes, please give details:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no
<b>Acknowledgement and Acceptance of Findings:</b> I acknowledge and understand the findings of the audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

I accept the findings of the audit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
<b>Name and signature of FCA representative:</b>  Jouni Hemberg	<b>Date and place:</b> 9 June 2020 Helsinki, Finland

## 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

<b>0</b>	<b>Major non-conformity or Major weakness</b>
	Your organisation currently does not work towards applying this requirement, either formally or informally. It's a major weakness that prevents your organisation from meeting the overall commitment.
<b>1</b>	<b>Minor non-conformity or Minor weakness</b>
	Your organisation has made some efforts towards applying this requirement, but these efforts have not been systematic.
<b>2</b>	<b>Observation</b>
	Your organisation is making systematic efforts towards applying this requirement, but certain key points are still not addressed.
<b>3</b>	<b>Conformity</b>
	Your organisation conforms to this requirement, and organisational systems ensure that it is met throughout the organisation and over time – the requirement is fulfilled
<b>4</b>	<b>Exceptional conformity</b>
	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.