

Core Humanitarian STANDARD

**Verification against the Core Humanitarian
Standard on Quality and Accountability**

Church of Sweden

Table of Contents

1. GENERAL INFORMATION	3
2. VERIFICATION SCOPE	3
3. SCHEDULE SUMMARY	4
3.2 VERIFICATION SCHEDULE	4
3.2 OPENING AND CLOSING MEETINGS:	4
4. RECOMMENDATION	4
5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE ORGANISATION	4
5.1 GENERAL:	5
5.2 ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:.....	5
5.3 CERTIFICATION OR VERIFICATION HISTORY:	6
6. SAMPLING.....	6
6.1 RATIONALE FOR SAMPLING.....	6
6.2 VISITED SITES:.....	7
6.3 INTERVIEWS.....	7
7. SUMMARY	8
7.1 SUMMARY BY CRITERION.....	8
7.2 SUMMARY OF NON CONFORMITIES	10
7.3 MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.....	10
8. DECISION.....	12
9. DETAILED FINDINGS	13
9.1 SCORING.....	13
9.2 CHECKLIST	15
<i>Commitment 1</i>	15
<i>Commitment 2</i>	17
<i>Commitment 3</i>	21
<i>Commitment 4</i>	25
<i>Commitment 5</i>	29
<i>Commitment 6</i>	33
<i>Commitment 7</i>	35
<i>Commitment 8</i>	38
<i>Commitment 9</i>	43
ANNEXES.....	46
A. DOCUMENT MAPPING	46
B. AUDIT SCHEDULE.....	53
C. ATTENDANCE SHEETS FOR OPENING AND CLOSING MEETINGS.....	58
D. LIST OF ACRONYMS	58

1. General information

Organisation Name:	Church of Sweden	Verification Ref / No:	
Type of organisation: <input type="checkbox"/> National <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> Federated <input type="checkbox"/> Membership/Network <input type="checkbox"/> Direct assistance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Through partners		Organisation Mandate: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy Verified Mandate(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	
Organisation size: <i>(Total number of programme sites/ members/partners)</i>		Legal Registration: <i>(NGO, Church, etc)</i>	2520026135, issued on 21.10.2009
Head Office Location:	Sysslomansgatan 4 75170 Uppsala Sweden	Field locations verified:	Palestine
Date of Head Office Verification:	February 25-27, 2015	Date of Field Verification:	March 6-11, 2015
Lead Verifier's Name:	Claire Boulanger	2nd Verifier's Name: <i>(indicate if Trainee)</i>	
		Observer's Name and Position	Elissa Goucem, HAP Verification Officer

2. Verification scope

2.1 Type of verification

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> External verification | <input type="checkbox"/> Mid term Audit |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certification audit | <input type="checkbox"/> Recertification audit |

3. Schedule summary

3.2 Verification Schedule

<i>Name of Programme sites/members/partners verified</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Mandate (Humanitarian, Development, Advocacy)</i>	<i>Number of projects visited</i>	<i>Type of projects</i>
LWF/WS Jerusalem	Ramallah	Development	1	Vocation Training Center
	Beit Hanina	Development	1	Vocation Training Center
Rabbis for Human Rights	Jahalin	Dev / advocacy	1	Beduin communities
	Anata	Dev / advocacy	1	Beduin communities
	Naif	Advocacy	1	Settlement issues
	Susya	Advocacy	1	Settlement issues
DSPR	Gaza	Hum / Dev	1	Primary health care center
	Gaza	Development	1	Vocation Training Center
Augusta Victoria Hospital			8	

3.2 Opening and closing meetings:

1) At HO

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting
Date	25/02/2015	27/02/2015
Location	Uppsala	Uppsala
Number of participants	About 40	About 20
Any substantive issue arising		

2) At PS

Due to schedule reasons, the opening and the closing meeting did not take place. Information on audit scope and conditions were given to CoS staff and partners on an individual basis, upon the start of each new meeting.

4. Recommendation

In our opinion, Church of Sweden conforms to the benchmarks of HAP 2010, and applies the Commitments and conforms to the Quality Criteria of the Core Humanitarian Standard. We recommend Certification.

Nevertheless, a plan for resolution of the minor CARs related to Commitment 4, 5 and 8 would need to be presented to the Secretariat of the Humanitarian Certification Initiative in 6 months and the CARs must be resolved in two years.

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

**Auditor's Name
and Signature**

**Date and
Place:**

5. Background information on the organisation

5.1 General:

Though the Church of Sweden is officially separated from the State since 2000, a vast majority of the Swedes are still *de facto* members: with 6.4 million people, it is a major national actor, with international outreach. Before 2002 when the Synod decided to merge both boards, Church of Sweden (CoS) was separated into CoS Mission (theology) and and CoS Aid diaconia and development).

As an Evangelical Lutheran church, Church of Sweden's vision is « *Life in the Realm of God, a healed Creation and Humanity in communion, justice, freedom and peace* », which translates into: sustainable and fair societies; freedom and dignity for all human beings ; a whole, healed and reconciled world.

In order to promote this vision, Church of Sweden sees itself as a challenger, an accompanier, a mobiliser and a facilitator, in Sweden and at global level.

CoS' activity in the field of international development is operated by the International Department, which work is outlined by the Strategic Plan for the Church of Sweden International Work 2014-2017.

This plan defines 5 strategic policy areas:

1. Pastoral development (Cooperation with churches and theological education institutions)
2. Health (Peoples right to sexual and reproductive health and rights)
3. Gender justice and equality (equal participation, voice and leadership for women and men in church and society, and people's rights to physical and sexual integrity).
4. Sustainable livelihood: (basic security and social and economic empowerment for people living in vulnerability)
5. Peace and reconciliation (People have increased security, possibilities and empowerment to handle conflict and participate in peace and reconciliation processes).

In addition to the strategic plan, Church of Sweden has designed a strategic map that evidences how these policy areas will be supported. The strategic map defines objectives concerning:

1. Partners and stakeholders
2. Effectiveness
3. Learning and improvement
4. Finance

The strategic map captures accountability commitments which were previously outlined in Church of Sweden's accountability framework.

Focus has come along with restructurizing, and as a result Church of Sweden has withdrawn from countries with a long history of presence and has downsized its programmes to 17 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East.

5.2 Organisational structure and management system:

Church of Sweden's Assembly (Synod) includes 251 elected members and 14 bishops. Members of the Assembly are elected for 5 years terms and may run for election either as the member of an official Swedish political party or as an individual candidate.

The Assembly appoints the Board (15 members), which overlooks the entire organisation. The Board meets 10 times / year for a 1 to 2 days session. The National Board appoints the 8 members of the International Council (formerly called NIMB), which acts as the board to the International Department and meets 4 times / year. The International Council works with International Department management teams in order to prepare strategic documents, position papers and budget information, which need to be formally accepted by the National Church Board. The National Board agrees annual budget of the International Department. International Committee Board meetings minutes are open to the public, as part of Swedish government' principle of openness.

The International Department is one of the 13 departments of the Church of Sweden, and is in charge of implementing humanitarian, development and advocacy programmes. Church of Sweden staff at the international department is around 80 people in Uppsala. Additionally, the International employs Liaison Officers in the Field (up to 25 to be deployed) and a global pool of 25 consultants to be mobilized on psychosocial issues upon request. CoS International Department budget is around 32Mns €/year (out of a total budget of about 349Mns€ for the whole of Church of Sweden).

International department includes 4 sections:

- Regional Unit
- Policy Unit
- Unit for Mobilisation, support and fundraising
- Support, which includes International Director's Team (PMER, coordination, administrative support) support to global ecumenical actors and the International Finance, which is formally part of the Finance Department.

The International Department has undergone a reorganisation effective January 2014, in line with the Strategic Plan for the Church of Sweden International Work 2014-2017. Drafting the new strategic plan coincided with the HAP certification process, and involved talks with stakeholders (8 regional consultations with more than 65 partners, together with consultations in Sweden) on why CoS should engage in international work. These consultations helped identify the 5 strategic areas, but also helped build trust and confidence in the work of the international department. The entire department was involved in this consultation : staff went to the field, got feed back from the partners and rights holders, which helped intensify partner dialogue. Though all 13 departments in CoS come from a tradition of working in silos, change is happening under General Secretary guidance and under the pressure of cross cutting issues (climate change, migrants) which make transversal approach necessary. However there is a challenge for CoS in facing the implications of being both a local and a global organisation; this challenge transpires through information and communication issues (on the website and on language).

5.3 Certification or verification history:

CoS was audited for HAP certification November 13-16 and 19-25, 2012 and was granted HAP certification in February 2013. Audited field programmes included South Africa and Bangladesh.

6. Sampling

6.1 Rationale for sampling

3 out of 17 countries were shortlisted for the audit at programme site:

- 1) Palestine
- 2) Ethiopia
- 3) Colombia

Criteria for choosing the countries were:

- level of security
- scope of programmes (humanitarian / development / advocacy)
- Number / volume of programmes
- Presence of a Liaison Officer
- Level of achievement in benchmarks
- Distance from Europe

Within Palestine, 3 out of 6 Church of Sweden's partners were chosen for interviews:

- Lutheran World Federation (LWF)
- Rabbis for Human Rights
- Department of Service to Palestine Refugees (DSPR)

Criteria for choosing partners

- Covering the entire scope of Church of Sweden's work
- Having a diversity of local / international partners
- Having a diversity of projects /partnerships (duration, volume, type...).

6.2 Visited sites:

Name of Programme sites/members/partners verified	Location	Mandate (Humanitarian, Development, Advocacy)	Number of projects visited	Type of projects
LWF/WS Jerusalem	Ramallah	Development	1	Vocation Training Center
	Beit Hanina	Development	1	Vocation Training Center
Rabbis for Human Rights	Jahalin	Dev / advocacy	1	Beduin communities
	Anata	Dev / advocacy	1	Beduin communities
	Naif	Advocacy	1	Settlement issues
	Susya	Advocacy	1	Settlement issues
DSPR	Gaza	Hum / Dev	1	Primary health care center
	Gaza	Development	1	Vocation Training Center
			8	

6.3 Interviews

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

Type of people interviewed	Number of people interviewed
Head Office	
Board members	1
Management	6
Staff	17
Other:	
Programme site	
Staff	2
LWF Management	2
LWF Staff	5
Rabbis for Human Rights	5
DPRS Management	3
DSPR Staff	6
Total number of interviews	24 at HO, 23 at PS

Focus Group Discussions (interviews with a group >6)

Type of Group	Number of participants	
	Female	Male
LWF / VTC Beit Hanina Trainees	4	4
LWF / VTC Ramallah Trainees and graduates	6	6
LWF / Augusta Victoria Hospital	3	
RHR / Beduin Community		1
RHR / Janata (South Hebron Hills)		2
RHR / Susya (South Hebron Hills)		2
DSPR / Health Center	6	5
DSPR		6
Total number of participants	19	26

7. Summary

7.1 Summary by criterion

1. Humanitarian assistance is appropriate and relevant

Church of Sweden's policies and practices ensure on-going analysis of stakeholders. Programmes are based on communities' needs and rights, taking into account the diversity of communities, and they are adjusted according to changes in needs, capacities and context.

2. Humanitarian response is effective and timely

In planning and assessing programmes, Church of Sweden makes very systematic use of relevant technical standards and good practices, and actively participates in elaborating these standards. Programmes are designed in a way that is realistic and safe for communities, with a concern for timeliness, and in line with CoS' organisational capacities. CoS has recently strengthened its PMER system, allowing more systematic monitoring and evaluation of activities. However, referral of unmet needs should be more systematically implemented and monitored.

3. Humanitarian response strengthens local capacities and avoids negative effects

As the leading agency on psychosocial projects within the ACT Alliance, CoS designs and implements programs that reinforce local capacities and communities resilience, enabling local organisations in their capacity as first responders, in order to promote early disaster recovery and sustainable development systems. Potential negative effects or programmes, risks and community hazards are taken into account, ensuring that marginalized groups are represented on the risk analysis and the capacity to respond. Transition or exit strategies are in place and have been implemented. However systems to safeguard personal and / or classified information about communities and people affected by crisis should be strengthened.

4. Humanitarian response is based on communication, participation and feedback

Church of Sweden's policies on community engagement and on information sharing show a dedication to rights based approach and to transparency. Policies and practices encourage communities' participation in identifying priorities and risk, and communities' feed back on their level of satisfaction. External

communications about programmes and about communities, including for fundraising purposes, are accurate and respectful of people.

Since CoS implements programmes through partners, dialogue with partners on communities participation and on the type of information that will be channelled to communities is essential. On both issues, dialogue and practices are not systematically taking place. As a result, CoS is not in a situation to ensure systematic inclusive community representation, nor to ensure that communities receive information about organization's principles, expected programme outcomes and expected staff behaviour, in languages, format and media that are appropriate to them. CoS has already identified this problem and discussions are taking place in order to solve it.

5. Complaints are welcomed and addressed

Church of Sweden has put in place a complaints response mechanism, including a referral system, after consulting with staff and partners about their preferences. However, communities have not taken part in this consultation. A number of complaints are coming through the system, and handled at top management level in a way that is appropriate and prioritizes safety of the complainant. Complaints are being included in annual activity reports and are taken seriously at all levels of the organisation.

However, the complaints system does not reach down to community level, though communities are theoretically able to lodge a complaint. Complaints mechanisms at partner level are not systematically in place and monitored. Communities and people affected by crisis are neither made aware of who Church of Sweden is and does, nor systematically made aware of expected behaviours of humanitarian staff and of organisation's commitments on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse. As a result, they cannot reach out to Church of Sweden, in case of abuse of power at partner level.

6. Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary

Church of Sweden policies and strategies demonstrate a strong culture of collaboration and a strong commitment to coordination with all relevant stakeholders, including national and local authorities. Church of Sweden actively participates in and contributes to coordination bodies at global and local level, and shares information through appropriate communication channels: publications, contributions to inter-agency groups, global and local coordination meetings, one to one meetings in the field, meetings with decision makers on advocacy issues, etc.

In designing programs, Church of Sweden makes sure to understand stakeholders' roles, responsibilities and interests, and to complement response of national and local authorities and other humanitarian organizations.

Work with implementing partners is framed by partnership agreements that are respectful of each other's mandates and recognize each partner's constraints and commitments.

7. Humanitarian actors continuously learn and improve

Church of Sweden is a learning organisation, which uses monitoring and learning from experience to the benefit of programming, shares learning with staff and partners, and contributes to learning and innovation in the sector.

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

CoS ensures having the management and staff capacity to deliver its programmes, with clearly set objectives in line with the organisation’s strategic plan, systematic appraisal, feed back mechanisms, and codes of conduct. Mechanisms are in place to improve staff skills and competencies and have competent and well-managed staff and volunteers.

However Church of Sweden should systematize accessibility to HR information for all staff, and in particular for non-Swedish speaking staff.

9. Resources are managed and used responsibly for their intended purpose

Church of Sweden has strong policies on responsible management of resources and strong financial and control systems to implement them.

7.2 Summary of non conformities

Non compliance	MAJOR	MINOR
Commitment 1		
Commitment 2		2.3.1
Commitment 3		3.8.1
Commitment 4		4.1.1 ; 4.2.1
Commitment 5		5.1.1 ; 5.2.1 ; 5.6.1
Commitment 6		
Commitment 7		
Commitment 8		8.5.1
Commitment 9		
TOTAL Number	0	8

7.3 Major strengths and weaknesses

Major Strengths:

- Culture of working in partnership through the ACT Alliance, through a strong historical network of local partners and with a strong commitment to transparency and openness, wich reflects in dialogue with partners.
- Commitment of management and staff to quality and accountability, which translates in organisational changes, development of new tools, and change in practices (including changing staff profiles).
- Underlying principles for action (rights based approach, do no harm, quality standards) are owned by all stakeholders.

Major Weaknesses:

- The global and local identities of Church of Sweden are sometimes antagonized, with consequences on issues like recruitment or information.

- Implementing through partners induces potential limitations on the application of the CHS, in particular for commitments involving accountability to the communities (information, participation, complaints mechanism)

A series of Minor CARs related to the commitments 4 and 5 indicate a potential systemic failure related to the way CoS reaches out to communities and people affected by crisis in terms of its own accountability and quality. While not leading to a Major CAR, this has the potential to threaten the overall organisation's accountability and quality system and must be considered as an urgent issue to resolve.

- Church of Sweden has recently changed its quality and accountability policies and procedures: they still need to be implemented on a systematic basis, and fully owned by staff and partners.

8. Decision

Quality Control by: Pierre Hauselmann	Quality Control finalised on: First Draft: 2015-04-18 Final: 2015-05-29
Certification Decision At the time this report is finalised, the Humanitarian Certification Initiative that will make the decision on CHS certification is not operational. The decision will be made as soon as this happens and will be signed by the ED of the new organisation. As an interim measure, the Head of Verification of HAP has signed this report and will make sure it is transferred for decision asap to the Humanitarian Certification Initiative.	Date: 29 May, 2015 

Certification Decision:	
Certification	Re-certification
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified <input type="checkbox"/> Certified with corrective actions <input type="checkbox"/> Preconditioned (Major CARs) <input type="checkbox"/> Not certified	<input type="checkbox"/> Certified <input type="checkbox"/> Certified with corrective actions <input type="checkbox"/> Suspension of Certificate (Major CARs)
Deadlines: Fulfilment of corrective actions: Plan: 30 Nov. 2015. Resolution: 1st June 2017	

Appeal

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

The Secretariat 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, Church of Sweden can inform in writing the Secretariat within 15 days after being informed of the proposed solution of their intention to maintain the appeal.

The secretariat will transmit immediately the information to the Appeal Board of the Humanitarian Certification Initiative who will have 30 day to address the appeal.

If, in turn the solution proposed by the Appeal Board is deemed not satisfactory, Church of Sweden will have another 15 days after being informed of the outcomes of the process to appeal to the CHS Alliance Board, whose decision will be final.

The details of the Appeal Procedure can be found in document PRO050 – Appeal and Complaints Procedure.

9. Detailed findings

9.1 Scoring

The following is an explanation of the general meaning of the scores, within the framework of both third party verification and certification. The score provide an indication of priority improvement areas for developing a continuous improvement plan (in the case of third party verification) or a basis to make a decision on certification.

Score 0

- Operational activities systematically **contradict** the intent behind the CHS Commitment and requirement (Key Actions and Organisational Responsibilities).
- Policies or procedures (formal or informal) do not respond to the intent behind the CHS requirement Policies and procedures **directly contradict** the intent behind the CHS Commitment and requirement (Key Action or Organisational Responsibility).

Indicates:

- a systemic issue that threatens the integrity of the relevant CHS Commitment;
- the complete absence of a process or policy; or
- a systemic failure to implement the necessary actions at operational level.

Equivalence for certification

Major Non Conformity. Excludes the organisation from certification until the Major Corrective Action Request (CAR) is corrected.

Score 1

Policies and procedures respond broadly to the intent behind the CHS requirement. However:

- A significant number of relevant staff are NOT familiar with the policies and procedures and/or
- There are instances where policies and procedures are NOT reflected in the design of programmes and activities.

Indicates:

- that the organisation has implicit or informal approaches that are consistent with the relevant CHS requirement but not necessarily systematised or formalised; or
- that key documentation is incomplete or missing, or that policies are in place, but not consistently implemented, without compromising the integrity of the relevant CHS commitment; or
- a lack of knowledge by the relevant staff about the requirement or relevant procedure, but that common practice mostly compensate for the gap.

Equivalence for certification

Minor Non Conformity. Allows certification of the organisation, but needs to be corrected within a certain timeframe (normally 2 years, although a shorter deadline can be identified if the CAR threatens to become systemic)

A Minor CAR that is not addressed within the specified timeframe becomes a Major CAR.

Score 2

Policies and procedures respond to the intent behind the Organisational Responsibility. However:

- Some operational staff are NOT familiar with the policies and procedures
- There are instances of actions that are in contradiction with the relevant CHS requirement

Indicates that:

- policies and procedures meet the intent behind the Organisational Responsibility, but that there are some instances where they are not correctly applied at operational level, without compromising the integrity of the requirement

Equivalence for certification

Conformity with observation. Denotes a small issue that, if not addressed may become more serious and become a Minor CAR

Score 3

- Policies and procedures respond to the intent of the CHS requirement.
- Relevant staff are familiar with the policies and procedures
- Policies and procedures are applied in the design of programmes and in the activities

Indicates that:

- the CHS requirement is met.; and
- the organisation's system ensures that the requirement is met throughout the organisation and over time.

Equivalence for certification

Conformity.

Score 4

Like 3, but in addition:

- Policies and procedures go beyond the intent of the CHS requirement.
- Relevant staff can explain how they apply the policies and procedures in their work and provide examples of implementation. They can relate the example to the relevant CHS requirement.
- Field and programme staff act frequently in a way that goes beyond the procedure's and CHS relevant requirements.

Indicates that

- the Organisational Responsibility is met in an exemplary way, across the organisation.

Equivalence for certification

Above average conformity.

Score 5

Like 4, but in addition:

- Policies, procedures, programmes and 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.

Indicates:

- Excellency. A score of 5 should only be attributed on exceptional circumstances.

Equivalence for certification

Exceptional conformity.

9.2 Checklist

Note: In the findings section, the text in blue indicates weaknesses in the application of the CHS

1. Communities and people affected by crisis receive assistance appropriate to their needs

1.1 Conduct a systematic, objective and ongoing analysis of the context and stakeholders

Ind. 1.1: The context and stakeholders are systematically, objectively and continuously analysed

Score: 3

At HO, reports on monitoring and partners' visits provide regular information on context and stakeholders as part of the dialogue between Church of Sweden and its partners. Programme and project officers travel to the field on a regular basis (staff travels up to 5 times / year). When in the field, monitoring staff is encouraged to meet other stakeholders than CoS partners (e.g. other NGOs, UN agencies, embassies...) in order to do cross reference data.

At PS, monitoring and situation reports are sent by partners to HO on a quarterly or yearly basis. When in place, Liaison Officers provide monthly reports, including information on meetings attended and partners met, and participate on a regular basis (twice a month over Skype) in HO programme team meeting.

Evidences: Documents 12, 47, 119, 165, 179, 192, 194, 203 and interviews with staff

1.2 Design and implement appropriate programmes based on an impartial assessment of needs¹ and risks, and an understanding of the vulnerabilities and capacities of different groups.

Ind. 1.2: Programmes are appropriately designed and implemented based on an impartial assessment of needs and risks and an understanding of vulnerabilities and capacities of different groups

Score: 3

As Church of Sweden doesn't do any direct implementation, projects are designed and implemented only by partners. Impartial assessment of needs is outlined through partnership agreements, project documents and partners work plans. Rights, needs, and vulnerabilities are entry points for dialogue with partners, which consists in working on how to mitigate those vulnerabilities. Some Church of Sweden staff feel impartiality may be challenged by some CoS members (individual donors) who insist that Christian groups should be given a priority. There is however enough evidence that impartiality is respected so far.

Projects are assessed with guidelines and check lists for risk and needs assessments (including participatory needs assessments). Country programmes, partners' and projects' assessments include sections on vulnerable situations and on specific target groups.

At field level, impartiality in implementing projects was never questioned by partners, partner staff or beneficiaries.

¹ "Needs" includes assistance and protection.

Evidences: Documents 10, 16, 44, 119, 120, 185, 186, 189, 195, 198, 201 and interviews with staff, partners and communities

1.3 Adapt programmes to changing needs, capacities and context.

Ind. 1.3: Programmes are adapted to changing needs, capacities and context

Score: 3

The Strategic Plan for the Church of Sweden International Work 2014-2017 promotes results oriented approach, which management intends to use as a basis for discussion on future programming. Church of Sweden and its partners conduct ongoing monitoring through activity reports, partner dialogue, travel reports, and interviews with beneficiaries.

Both HO staff and partners at PS provided several examples of programming adjustment based on changes in context, needs and organizational capacities.

Evidences: Documents 12, 47, 64, 103, 165, 188, 199, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220 and interviews with staff and partners

1.4 Policies commit to providing impartial assistance based on the needs and capacities of communities and people affected by crisis

Ind. 1.4a: Policies commit to impartial assistance

Ind. 1.4b: Assistance is based on the needs and capacities of communities and people affected by crisis

Score: 4

AT HO, The Strategic Plan for the Church of Sweden International Work 2014-2017 outlines International Department's commitments and guiding principles, which include impartiality, and providing assistance based on people's short and long term needs, as part of a rights based approach. Impartiality is an overarching principle of ACT Alliance Code of Good Practice, which applies to CoS staff. Principles of impartiality and principles of basing action on peoples needs and rights are reconfirmed in the Guidelines for Humanitarian Action and in Church of Sweden application to SIDA 2014-2016, which represents a binding framework for the International Department. CoS new PMER system has put in place tools that systematically investigate and monitor communities' needs and capacities in designing and implementing programmes.

Some staff prefers referring to rights rather than needs, particularly in development programmes (e.g.: right to health, to non discrimination, and to your own self-expression). They also expressed concern that impartiality might jeopardize CoS's capacity to take stands against the roots of vulnerability.

At PS, partners' strategic plans, workplans or core funding proposals demonstrate commitment to impartiality and to providing assistance based on people's needs.

Evidences: Documents 2, 3, 44, 50, 109, 135, 152, 185, 188, 195 and interview with staff

1.5 Policies set out commitments which take into account the diversity of communities, including disadvantaged or marginalised people, and to collect disaggregated data

Ind. 1.5a: The diversity of communities, including disadvantaged or marginalised people is taken into account in policies

Ind. 1.5b: Policies commit to collect disaggregated data to include the diversity of communities

Score: 3

At HO, Church of Sweden's strategic plan points out vulnerable or marginalised groups requiring specific attention in designing programmes: women and children will be priority targets for health programmes; children and young people, refugees, internal refugees and others who migrate for various reasons are seen as rights holders in the most vulnerable situations. COS application to SIDA indicates that disaggregated data concerning age and gender should be systemically collected and used to inform humanitarian programming, and that gender analysis should always be reflected in at least one of partner's activities or outcomes. Gender equality is analysed in relation to human rights and to HIV/AIDS prevention in a position paper issued by Church of Sweden. Staff feel that most of CoS's partners' target groups are people placed in the most vulnerable positions, based on age, gender, and ethnicity. People with disabilities are an upcoming agenda, particularly in Asia.

At PS, some, but not all partners have gender policies, or strategic plans targeting marginalised groups such as women, children and the poor.

Evidences: Documents 2, 3, 142, 183, 185 and interview with staff

1.6 Processes are in place to ensure an appropriate ongoing analysis of the context

Ind. 1.6: The analysis of the context is on-going and appropriate

Score: 3

At HO, guidelines and templates are provided to programme staff in order to support systematic analysis of context and stakeholders, from initial assessment to final evaluation through project implementation. Partner and project monitoring visits cover updates on context, on partner quality and capacity, and on programme / project monitoring.

At PS, partners' agreements include sections on frequency and scope, ensuring on-going analysis of reporting, monitoring and evaluation.

Evidences: Docs 4 and 6, 7, 12, 16, 17, 18, 44, 47, 106, 119, 165, 166, 171, 172, 175

2. Communities and people affected by crisis have access to the humanitarian assistance they need at the right time.

2.1 Design programmes that address constraints so that the proposed action is realistic and safe for communities

Ind. 2.1: Programmes are designed taking into account communities' safety and capacity constraints

Score: 3

Assessment of constraints includes conflict situations, environment, risks (including corruption), partners' capacity and vulnerable situations (age, gender, status). It is required in project proposals and applications to partnership with Church of Sweden, and screened through partners assessments.

Realism and safety are assessed through Church of Sweden's dialogue with partners, in order to contextualize projects and responses in order to take into account communities' safety and capacity constraints.

Evidences: Documents 4, 5, 6, 7, 19, 44, 108, 120, 121, 195 and interviews with staff and partners

2.2 Deliver humanitarian response in a timely manner, making decisions and acting without unnecessary delay

Ind. 2.2a: When delivering assistance, decisions are taken without unnecessary delay

Ind. 2.2b: Decisions are acted upon without unnecessary delay

Score: 2

The recent reorganisation of CoS' international department has provided an opportunity to review decision-making processes, contingency plans and organizational capacities. The humanitarian team routine describes steps for action and people in charge in the event of an alert. COS has increased its HR capacity for timely response, with a new fast deployment staff. As a leading agency in the field of psychosocial work within the ACT Alliance, CoS has put in place a roster of 20 psychosocial experts that can be deployed in any emergency. COS has developed rapid response mechanisms (RCA, Syria, Sudan) that are operated mostly through ACT Appeals, and it is currently developing projects linking relief, recovery and development, in order to ensure continuity and timeliness in response. Department, staff and partners work plans at HO and PS reflect commitment to deliver response according to agreed timelines and without delay.

Nevertheless, staff indicate that operating through partners and through ACT appeals may challenge CoS capacity to deliver timely response. Some examples were provided of delays in implementation when many units involved in decision-making process.

Evidences: Documents 102, 103, 106, 185, 186, 189, 196, 210, 215 and interviews with staff and partners

Observation: CoS has improved its processes in order to improve timeliness in response, however the organization could work on decision making processes involving multiple departments in the organization, or involving coordination with partners, which can be a cause for delay.

2.3 Refer any unmet needs to those organisations with the relevant technical expertise and mandate, or advocate for those needs to be addressed.

Ind. 2.3: Unmet needs are referred to an organisation with relevant technical expertise and mandate or there is advocacy to address these needs

Score: 1

At HO and PS, examples were provided to evidence that Church of Sweden has referred unmet needs (e.g.: in ACT appeals, ACT forums or clusters) or advocated for these needs to be addressed (e.g.: at partner, network or government level). However, Church of Sweden has not developed a systematic approach to referral, which is not included in the checklist of questions for partners and is not part of partner dialogue. Referring unmet needs is also not systematically done in coordination bodies, such as the ACT Alliance.

Evidences: Documents 12, 15, 25 and interviews with staff and partners

Minor CAR 2.3-1: Church of Sweden has not developed a systematic approach to referral and advocacy on unmet needs – Time for resolution: 2 years

2.4 Use relevant technical standards and good practice employed across the humanitarian sector to plan and assess programmes.

Ind. 2.4a: Programmes are planned using relevant sector technical standards

Ind. 2.4b: Programmes are assessed using relevant sector technical standards

Score: 4

Church of Sweden uses standards and good practices employed across the humanitarian and development sector in order to plan and assess its programme. Rights based approach and “do no harm” are two practices that are frequently referred to by staff and by key policy documents (Strategic Plan, guidelines for Cos humanitarian assistance, position papers...). Other commonly accepted standards include HAP, Sphere, IASC Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial support in Emergency settings the Red Cross’s and Red Crescent’s Code of Conduct for Disaster Relief, Istanbul Principles for CSO (Civil Society Organisation) Development Effectiveness and the Geneva conventions. As an ACT member, Church of Sweden subscribes to codes of conduct and gender policies developed within ACT Alliance.

Conformity with relevant standards is requested in partnership agreements and in programme documents. Guidelines for partner collaboration within the international work of CoS outline expectations vis a vis partners, which include “Work with a rights-based approach using principles of participation, non-discrimination, empowerment, and accountability». Relevant standards are checked through Humanitarian Project Monitoring Checklist, Partner assessment, project / programme assessment and monitoring visit reports.

Evidences: Doc 5, 16, 109, 115, 119, 136 and interviews with staff and partners

2.5 Monitor the activities, outputs and outcomes of humanitarian responses in order to adapt programmes and address poor performance.

Ind. 2.5a: Activities, outputs and outcomes are monitored

Ind. 2.5b: Programmes are adapted based on monitoring results

Ind. 2.5c: Poor performances are acted upon as a result of monitoring results

Score: 2

CoS new PMER is being put in place and made available for staff on VIPS. Implementation is on-going: objectives for evaluation (2014-2017) have been outlined, and humanitarian teams have drafted an evaluation plan. Monitoring reports evidence on-going monitoring of activities, and CoS has conducted 10 projects / programme evaluation in 2013. **However these systematic approach and tools are still new to Church of Sweden and still need to be owned by staff**, which refers mostly to partners’ assessments, project assessment tool, and partner visit check list.

At HO and PS, staff and partners provided a number of examples evidencing that programmes are adapted based on monitoring results, and that poor performances are acted upon as a result of

monitoring results.

Evidences: Documents 2, 3, 13, 16, 17, 18, 47, 48, 49, 109, 135, 167, 168, 169, 173, 174 and 175, and interviews with staff and partners

Observation: CoS' new PMER system is in place but still needs to be fully owned and implemented throughout the organisation.

2.6 Programme commitments are in line with organisational capacities

Ind. 2.6: Programme commitments are in line with organisational capacities

Score: 3

The 2014-2017 Strategic Plan was translated into the Strategic map, which replaced CoS accountability framework. The Strategic map intends to be a quality management tool, ensuring that CoS has de resources to achieve its goals. It translates into department and into individual work plans, with objectives and timelines. It is revised by the International management team on a quarterly basis, together with a priority list of programmes to be funded.

The new Strategic Plan has led to refocusing on 5 areas of activities, and on 28 instead of 35 countries. Those were divided into different types of partner collaborations for different purposes: Programme countries, Resource countries, Relational countries and Exit countries. Reorganizing the International Department, putting in place the humanitarian and psychosocial roster, and deploying Liaison Officers in the field participate in making CoS programmes commitments in line with organisational capacities.

Evidences: Documents 2, 14, 26, 97, 149, 219 and interviews with staff

2.7 Policy commitments ensure:

- a. systematic, objective and ongoing monitoring and evaluation of activities and their effects;**
- b. evidence from monitoring and evaluations is used to adapt and improve programmes; and**
- c. timely decision-making with resources allocated accordingly.**

Ind. 2.7a: A systematic, objective and on-going monitoring and evaluation of activities and their effect is ensured and taken into account in programming

Ind. 2.7b: Policy commitments ensure timely decision-making with resources allocated accordingly

Score: 3

Church of Sweden's commitments on quality of programmes (based on monitoring, evaluation and learning) are captured in several key policy documents, including:

- 1) Strategic plan for the Church of Sweden's international work 2014– 2017
- 2) Application to Sida HUM 2014-2016 (Strategic Humanitarian Partnership) which translates the Strategic plan into a framework contract with key back donor, and indicates:
 - commitments to results based management (base new programming on results evidenced trough monitoring) and to aid effectiveness.

- details on CoS internal system for planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting, including scope and frequency of monitoring (follow up), documentation (VIPS = information planning system), scope and frequency of risks analysis.
- how CoS will implement timely response : through ACT Appeals, by avoiding earmarking funds, by putting in place the psychosocial desk which includes capacity building and psychosocial programs in emergencies for quicker recovery, by reorganizing the international department, and having teams working together (ex : psychosocial with humanitarian...).

3) Church of Sweden Monitoring Levels and PMERL model in Country Programmes (including narrative description) describes Church of Sweden's new M&E system, and related tools, throughout all the project cycle (assessment, implementation, reporting). Monitoring processes are reflected in partnership agreements.

4) Guidelines for CoS humanitarian assistance include sections on implementation of aid (emergency preparedness, emergency response, and early recovery) and on monitoring, evaluation and learning.

5) Timely decision-making with resources allocated accordingly is facilitated by reorganization of the International Development and procedures such as appeal management routines developed by the Humanitarian team.

Evidences: Documents 2, 3, 26, 48, 49, 97, 104, 113, 135, 177, 193 and 215

3. Communities and people affected by crisis are not negatively affected and are more prepared, resilient and less at-risk as a result of humanitarian action

3.1 Ensure programmes build on local capacities and work towards improving the resilience of communities and people affected by crisis.

Ind. 3.1a: Programmes are built upon local capacities

Ind. 3.1b: Programmes work towards community resilience

Score: 4

Within the ACT Alliance, Church of Sweden has become the lead on psychosocial projects, and as such, provides in kind support (through a global roster of 20 of psychosocial specialists), support through desk support to psychosocial workers, and through strategic partnerships (DCA, FCA and LWF). Capacity building on psycho social activities is integrated into CoS humanitarian responses, in order to improve community resilience.

Partners' assessments include supporting questions in order to capture whether partners have capacities and tools, and to identify capacity building needs. Capacity building for partners, including on accountability issues, is taking place on a regular basis, is part of partner dialogue, and is planned over the 2014-2017 strategic period.

Interviews with partners at PS evidence strong support and successes in capacity building and in supporting key actors for community resilience.

Evidences: Documents 7, 8, 17, 18, 25, 109, 112, 119, 133, 188, 195, 209, 210, 212 and interviews with staff and partners

3.2 Use the results of any existing community hazard and risk assessments and preparedness plans to guide activities.

Ind 3.2: The organisation uses the results of any existing community hazard and risk assessments and preparedness plans to guide activities.

Score: 3

CoS has guidelines and processes to analyse risks, conflict impact and environmental and community hazards (e.g. in guidelines for Community Based Psycho Social Support). Risks analysis is included in country programmes and in project documents (check list for ACT appeals, partners proposals, partner/project assessments). Risk assessment and community hazard are discussed in meetings in the field as part of dialogue with partners.

Evidences: Documents 6, 7, 10, 44, 119, 133, 195, 198, 201 and interviews with staff and partners

3.3 Enable the development of local leadership and organisations in their capacity as first-responders in the event of future crises, taking steps to ensure that marginalised and disadvantaged groups are appropriately represented.

Ind. 3.3a: Programmes enable the development of local leadership and organisations in their capacity as first responders.

Ind. 3.3b: Programmes promote an appropriate representation of marginalised and disadvantaged groups in local leaderships and organisations

Score: 3

As outlined in CoS Capacity Building framework, capacity building is a crosscutting goal of CoS activities, either through projects (e.g. vocational training centres for disadvantaged youth / women, or psychosocial support projects) or as a result of the rights based approach as an underlying principle of the organisation's activities.

Capacity building needs are tracked through partners' assessment (negative responses to questions become an area of focus and potential capacity building). CoS partnership guidelines

and practices focus on capacity building as a key issue in working with partners, as evidenced in the Guidelines for partner collaborations within the international work of the Church of Sweden and in the Plan för kapacitetsbyggande, Asien 2014 – 2017 / Capacity Building Plan, Asia 2014 – 2017. Focus on marginalized groups is outlined in CoS strategic documents and checked through project documents.

Evidences: Documents 8, 22, 23, 25, 107, 109, 133, 207 and interviews with staff and partners

3.4 Plan a transition or exit strategy in the early stages of the humanitarian programme that ensures longer-term positive effects and reduces the risk of dependency.

Ind. 3.4: Exit strategy is planned in the early stages of the humanitarian programme that ensure longer-term positive effects and reduce the risk of dependency

Score: 3

Goals and methods for phasing out of programmes have been outlined in several documents describing phasing out processes, and in the Guidelines for partner collaboration within the international work of the CoS. Exit strategy is included on the checklist of questions relevant to project/programme assessment, as

part of assessing the potential sustainability of the project.

Staff provided several examples of recent exist strategies, indicating criteria and timeline for phasing out. As a result of the reorganization and pressure for more focus, CoS has exited 7 countries since 2014, including countries with a history of long lasting CoS presence.

Evidences: Documents 11, 109, 110, 115, 117, 118, 124, 219 and interviews with staff

3.5 Design and implement programmes that promote early disaster recovery and benefit the local economy.

Ind. 3.5a: Programmes are designed and implemented in order to benefit the local economy

Ind. 3.5b: Programmes are designed and implemented in order to promote recovery

Score: 3

CoS designs and implements programmes that promote early disaster recovery and benefit the local economy through:

- **Guidelines and processes**, such as the guidelines on humanitarian response which mention disaster risk reduction, and linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD), the guidelines for community based psycho social support, or the guiding principles for conflict impact assessment. However the check-list for screening humanitarian appeals does not include a question about benefiting the local economy.
- **Organizational capacities:** staff acknowledges that the new organisation of CoS international development is creating links between development and humanitarian teams (who work with the same partners), and that at field level, LRRD is easier when partners involved in humanitarian assistance also work on development issues (e.g.: Colombia, Pakistan, South Sudan, Uganda). Liaison Officers are seen as an opportunity to develop it.
- **Specific projects:** disaster risk reduction in relation with community resilience and CBPS, livelihood projects, micro credit and fair trade projects, vocational training programmes...
- **Corporate practices:** CoS procurement policy and manual encouraging procurement of resources (including consultants and evaluators) at local level. Partners' procurement policies and practices are checked through partners' assessment.

Evidences: Documents 7, 44, 133, 135, 204, 148 and interviews with staff and partners

3.6 Identify and act upon potential or actual unintended negative effects in a timely and systematic manner, including in the areas of:

- a. people's safety, security, dignity and rights;**
- b. sexual exploitation and abuse by staff;**
- c. culture, gender, and social and political relationships;**
- d. livelihoods;**
- e. the local economy; and**
- f. the environment**

Ind. 3.6a: Programmes identify potential or actual unintended negative effects in a timely and systematic manner, including in the areas of people's safety, security, dignity and rights, sexual exploitation and abuse by staff, culture, gender, social and political relationships, livelihoods, the local economy, and the environment.

Ind. 3.6b: When potential and actual un-intended negative effects are identified, programmes act upon them in a timely and systematic manner

Score: 2

Potential or actual unintended negative effects can be tracked through project/programme assessments, problem analysis, partners' assessments, monitoring and partner visit reports, and CoS complaints mechanism. Screening covers people's safety and rights, sexual exploitation and abuse by staff, culture, gender and social and political relationships. [Effects on livelihoods, local economy and the environment are not systematically covered.](#)

Staff and partners and HO and PS could point out a number a significant situation evidencing that CoS has identified and acted upon unintended effect. These examples were mostly focused on issues related to culture, gender and social/political relationships.

Evidences: Documents 17, 18, 19, 47, 109, 167, 223, 224 and interviews with staff and partners

Observation. [Potential effects on livelihoods, local economy and the environment are not systematically covered in context analysis and programme monitoring.](#)

3.7 Policies, strategies and guidance are designed to: prevent programmes having any negative effects, such as, for example, exploitation, abuse or discrimination by staff against communities and people affected by crisis; and strengthen local capacities.

Ind. 3.7: Policies, strategies and guidance are designed to prevent programmes having any negative effects such as, for example, exploitation, abuse or discriminating by staff against communities and people affected by crisis, and strengthening local capacities.

Score: 4

Prevention of potential negative effects in programmes is outlined in strategy documents such as the Strategic plan for the Church of Sweden's international work 2014– 2017, the Guidelines for the Church of Sweden humanitarian assistance, or thematic position papers (e.g. Position papers on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR)). It reflects in work plans and in project / programme documents (e.g. check lists for humanitarian programmes, risk analysis)

Staff is sensitized to and has been trained on the Do no Harm approach. The ACT Alliance Code of good practice is applicable to CoS programming.

Code of conduct (CoS and ACT's) cover preventing exploitation, abuse and discrimination by staff against communities.

Strengthening local capacities is a core principle of the 2014-2017 Strategic plan, of the Guidelines for partner collaborations within the international work of the Church of Sweden and of the Guiding Principles for community based support. It translates into CoS Capacity building framework.

Evidences: Documents 2, 25, 44, 102, 103, 109, 120, 121, 133, 135, 151, 152, 207, 221

3.8 Systems are in place to safeguard any personal information collected from communities and people affected by crisis that could put them at risk.

Ind. 3.8: Personal information collected from communities and people affected by crisis that could put people at risk are systematically safeguarded

Score: 1

At HO and PS, sensitive information collected from communities and people affected by crisis is [handled ad hoc](#). Some instructions such as codification have been given around classified programmes but [there are no clear and systematic guidelines and systems to handle and safeguard sensitive, personal or classified information](#). Staff note that this is a weakness they often find in partners.

Evidences: Interviews with staff and partners

MINOR CAR 3.8-1: CoS has not developed a systematic approach to safeguarding sensitive information –
Time for resolution: 2 years

4. Communities and people affected by crisis know their rights and entitlements have access to information and participate in decisions that affect them

4.1 Provide information to communities and people affected by crisis about the organisation, the principles it adheres to, how it expects its staff to behave, the programmes it is implementing and what they intend to deliver.

Ind. 4.1: Information is provided to communities and people affected by crisis about the organization, the principles it adheres to, the expected behaviours of staff, its programmes and deliverables.

Score: 1

The English version of CoS website includes a section called “for our partners” which covers:

1. Basic information about CoS (strategic plan, annual report, contacts, membership affiliations), governance and management information (including organogram), and organisational policies (guidelines for partnership collaboration, guide to partnership, information policy, fundraising policy)
2. Policies, guidelines and position papers (including procurement manual, anti corruption guidelines and ACT code of conduct).
3. Strategies and plans (programmes are only available upon request and a number of evaluations are published on the website), information on finance and performance.
4. Complaints mechanism.

CoS Plan / Strategy for information sharing outlines Cos and partners’ roles and responsibilities in sharing information with people they aim to assist. According to this strategy, partners only are in charge of disclosing info about the projects / programmes. Information sharing is part of project documents, including partnership agreements ([though not systematically](#)), and check lists to screen ACT appeals.

Position papers provide information on CoS stand and views on issues such as regional conflicts, sexual and reproductive health, impact of programmes on the environment. [However, a number of these position papers are only in Swedish.](#)

Together with HAP certified ACT Alliance members, CoS has organized and/or supported capacity building workshops on HAP benchmarks for partners, which has given opportunities to discuss information sharing with communities.

At PS, communities had a good understanding of what partners are doing, who they are, what programmes they implement, and what they intend to deliver. However there is no systematic information about the principles against which partners operate, and the expected behaviour of staff, and there is no evidence that information sharing with communities is systematically discussed with partners. Information about CoS does not reach out beyond top management level among partners, and does not reach out to communities. None of the communities interviewed at PS knew who CoS is and what it does.

Evidences: Documents 28, 44, 106, 112, 113, 137-147, observation and interviews with staff, partners and communities

MINOR CAR 4.1-1: CoS has not developed a systematic approach to information sharing with communities at field level about the organisation, the principles it adheres to, how it expects its staff to behave – Time for resolution: propose a plan for resolution to the HAP secretariat = 6 months, Implementation = 2 years

4.2 Communicate in languages, formats and media that are easily understood, respectful and culturally appropriate for different members of the community, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups.

Ind. 4.2: Communication with communities uses languages, formats and media that are easily understood and respectful and culturally appropriate for different parts of the community, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups.

Score: 1

CoS has made a number of core documents such as strategy and policy documents, position papers, annual report and evaluation reports available in English and in Spanish, and a number of these documents can be found on the website.

However many documents, including programme and partnership documents (project description, monitoring reports) are in Swedish only. In the annual report, the International Department is treated as one part of CoS activity, making it difficult to access comprehensive information about CoS international work. The only available version of International Department comprehensive activity report used to be in Swedish only (report to SIDA). As of 2015 it is in English.

Staff acknowledges that CoS website is not easily navigable for non-Swedish speakers and international stakeholders. Partners confirm they find it difficult to find specific information, and partner consultations point information sharing as an issue.

At PS, there were no information documents made by or about Church of Sweden. Communities receive information from partners about partners work through group or individual discussion, or through official documents translated into the local language.

Evidences: Documents 98, 122, 123, 125, 139-147, 150, 157, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 175, 203, 218, observation and interviews with staff, partners and communities

MINOR CAR 4.2-1: CoS does not systematically communicate in languages, formats and media that are easily understood, and are respectful and culturally appropriate to all its stakeholders - Time for resolution: propose a plan for resolution to the HAP secretariat = 6 months, Implementation = 2 years

4.3 Ensure representation is inclusive, involving the participation and engagement of communities and people affected by crisis at all stages of the work.

Ind. 4.3: Inclusive representation, participation and engagement of people and communities are ensured at all stages of the work.

Score: 2

Participation and engagement of communities at all stages of the work is included in the list of questions to be covered in partners and project assessments, in monitoring visits and evaluations. It is also included in the HAP workshops CoS has organized for its partners over the last two years, together with other ACT Alliance members.

However, some staff feel that in partner dialogue, participation and engagement of communities is often considered as a given, and as part of partner's strength and legitimacy, and it is therefore not systematically discussed. It is also felt that lack of field presence does not allow being very systematic about community participation. There was no evidence at PS that participation and engagement of communities is systematically discussed with partners.

Evidences: Documents 12, 16, 18, 47, 109, 119, and interviews with staff and partners

Observation: In dialogue with partners, CoS could address the topic of participation and engagement and assess whether it is inclusive and takes place at all stages of the work.

4.4 Encourage and facilitate communities and people affected by crisis to provide feedback on their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of the assistance received, paying particular attention to the gender, age and diversity of those giving feedback.

Ind. 4.4a: Communities and people affected by crisis are encouraged to provide feedback on their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of assistance.

Ind. 4.4b: Programmes pay particular attention to the gender, age and diversity of those giving feedback.

Score: 2

Monitoring and partner visit check list includes a question about real life examples of community participation in planning, implementing, monitoring and reporting of the project. CoS seeks feedback from communities in its evaluation processes and includes this requirement in terms of reference for external evaluators. At PS, partners collect beneficiaries' feed back through satisfaction surveys, focus group discussions and face-to-face conversations. . According to staff at HO and PS, **feed back from beneficiaries should be, but is not systematically part of partner dialogue.**

Evidences: Documents 12, 47, 166, 171, 172, 212 and interviews with staff, partners and communities

Observation: CoS should systematise that feedback from beneficiaries is part of dialogue with partners, and that gender, age and diversity of those providing feed back is taken into account.

4.5 Policies for information-sharing are in place, and promote a culture of open communication.

Ind. 4.5a: Policies are in place for information sharing.

Ind. 4.5b: Policies promote a culture of open communication.

Score: 3

Policies for information sharing are in place and promote a culture of open communication. Guidelines for sharing information are available in English and Spanish, indicate a clear commitment to transparency and cover:

- what information CoS will make publicly available in Swedish, English, and Spanish
- what information CoS will encourage their partners to make available for the people they aim to assist.
- Information that will not be made available, or circumstances that might lead CoS to not disclose information (Doc 27)

Guidelines for anti corruption, fundraising policy and information sharing practices on International Committee minutes and decisions are part of CoS open communication culture. The International Committee has to publish on the Diary (open electronic system making official documents available) all decisions made, and all letter coming in and out, as part of Swedish public transparency policy.

Evidences: Documents 27, 92, 127 and interviews with staff

4.6 Policies are in place for engaging communities and people affected by crisis, reflecting the priorities and risks they identify in all stages of the work.

Ind. 4.6a: Policies are in place for engaging communities and people affected by crisis.

Ind. 4.6b: Policies commit to taking into account the priorities and risks communities identify in all stages of the work.

Score: 3

Policies covering participation of communities in projects include the Strategic plan for the Church of Sweden's international work 2014–2017, guidelines for partner collaboration and COS' plan/strategy for participation (flowchart describing participation mechanism in relation with partners). Psychosocial components of projects are based on community participation.

Partners' assessments check whether community participation is taking place throughout the project cycle and whether programmes reflect the priorities and needs communities have expressed.

Risk analysis feeds into programming, and is based on dialogue with partners and their understanding of communities.

Evidences: Documents 2, 10, 15, 16, 18, 25, 29, 120, 133, 201

4.7 External communications, including those used for fundraising purposes, are accurate, ethical and respectful, presenting communities and people affected by crisis as dignified human beings.

Ind. 4.7: External communications, including those used for fundraising, are accurate, ethical and respectful, presenting communities and people affected by crisis as dignified human beings.

Score: 2

CoS has a fundraising policy, however it is [directed to donors, and does not cover guidelines on how communities and people affected by crisis should be presented.](#)

Processes are in place to align external communications with CoS principles and rights based approach :

- fundraising team (Unit for mobilisation, support and fundraising) is the responsibility of the Director of CoS International Department, which allows coherence between programmes and communication for fundraising purposes.
- CoS programme staff and CoS partners are invited to provide briefing and recommendation on communication material (films, pictures...) involving programmes and communities.
- Communication and fundraising staff and consultants have been taken to field trips to understand how CoS runs programmes. When making pictures, people's consent is sought.

Evidences: Document 92 and interviews with staff

Observation: [CoS should address the representation of communities and people affected by crisis in fundraising in its policies and procedures.](#)

5. Communities and people affected by crisis have access to safe and responsive mechanisms to handle complaints

5.1 Consult with communities and people affected by crisis on the design, implementation and monitoring of complaints-handling processes.

Ind.5.1: Communities and people affected by crisis are consulted on:

- the design
- the implementation
- the monitoring of complaints handling processes.

Score: 1

According to staff, CoS conducted a partner survey with 126 partners in 2011 and organised HAP trainings with partners about CRM in 3 pilot countries (Liberia, Colombia and India), and included questions on CRM in partner consultation about the new strategic plan. Staff in Uppsala was consulted about the CRM.

Communities and people affected by crisis were consulted in one occasion in each Pilot country over 2011. However CoS has not yet checked with its partners whether communities have been consulted about the CRM system and its functioning after that, and has not consulted communities and people affected by crisis outside pilot countries. This issue is part of the Capacity Building B-plan for the partner dialogue during the programme period 2014-2017.

Evidences: Documents 200 and 218 and interviews with staff and partners

MINOR CAR 5.1-1: Communities and people affected by crisis were/are not consulted on the design, implementation and monitoring of the CRM - Time for resolution: propose a plan for resolution to the HAP secretariat = 6 months, Implementation = 2 years

5.2 Welcome and accept complaints, and communicate how the mechanism can be accessed and the scope of issues it can address.

Ind. 5.2a: Complaints are welcomed and accepted

Ind. 5.2b: The complaint handling process is clearly communicated

Score: 1

Access to and functioning of CRM is part of the introduction package to new staff. CoS receives 10/15 complaints per year on its CRM, and complaints are documented in an annual report indicating how they have been addressed. Staff have a good understanding on how to operate the CRM system, and trust in its outcome.

At PS, communities indicate ways to complain if necessary, but there is no clear and systematic systems in place, and no evidence that CoS has worked with its partners on CRM, aside from workshops on HAP benchmarks. Staff at HO and PS is unsure how communities could reach out to CoS, should they need to complain about partners, specially if they are in a position of power or influence. CoS mentioned that there are examples from other partners / countries demonstrating clear communication on the CHM.

Evidences: Documents 37, 38 and interviews with staff, partners and communities

MINOR CAR 5.2-1: Affected communities are not provided a clear and systematic access to CoS' CRM at field level - Time for resolution: propose a plan for resolution to the HAP secretariat = 6 months, Implementation = 2 years

5.3 Manage complaints in a timely, fair and appropriate manner that prioritises the safety of the complainant and those affected at all stages.

Ind. 5.3a: Complaints are managed timely, fairly and appropriately

Ind. 5.3b: The complaints handling mechanism prioritises the safety of the complainant and those affected at all stages.

Score: 3

The complaints handling mechanism prioritises the safety of the complainant and those affected at all stages.

The complaints committee consists of 3 members: Director of International Department, Director

International Finance, and the focal person for CRM. It was put in place two and half years ago, and meets on a monthly basis. It has dealt with a few cases of corruption which were raised through project officers, sample test in the field, or Church of Sweden's own auditors as part of the whistle blowing policy – none of those cases were raised through the online CRM.

Annual reports provides details on how complaints were managed. Staff in charge of CRM provided further examples. Staff and partners feel safe to complain. The issue could not be brought up with communities since they do not know about CoS complaints mechanism.

Evidences: Documents 32, 36, 37, 38, 223 and interviews with staff and partners

5.4 The complaints-handling process for communities and people affected by crisis is documented and in place. The process should cover programming, sexual exploitation and abuse, and other abuses of power.

Ind. 5.4: The complaints handling process is documented and in place for communities affected by crisis and covers to programming, sexual exploitation and abuse of people, or other abuses of power

Score: 3

Guidelines for handling complaints, international mission and diaconia and format for making complaints describe and operationalize CoS' complaints mechanism. They are available on CoS website under the HAP / quality and accountability section. Complaints handling mechanism is described in details, and provide information on :

- scope and limitation (what complaints will be accepted/not accepted, who can complain, how complaint handling will be secured). Scope covers programming, sexual exploitation and abuse and abuses of power.
- how to make a complaint,
- the process for handling the complaint (including investigation, appeal, reference to a third party and support to complainant or witness)
- Follow up, lessons learnt, consequences and internal action plan.

COS plan / strategy for handling complaints outlines the primary responsibility of partners as operational focal points for communities. It is consistent with the recommendations of the plan for information sharing. However sets limits to communities access to CoS' complaints mechanism. Guidelines for partner collaboration within the international work of the CoS indicate that CoS expects partners to have integrity-based routines for processing feedback and complaints.

Evidences: Documents 32, 35, 115, 223, 224, observation and interviews with staff

5.5 An organisational culture in which complaints are taken seriously and acted upon according to defined policies and processes has been established.

Ind. 5.5: Complaints are promoted at the highest level of the organization, seen as positive and as a means for learning

Score: 3

Complaints are handled at top management level are reported annually and are included in report to back donor. At HO, staff provided several examples of complaints that have been logged and taken care of. Staff feels that the systems is reliable, used as a source of information, and protective of people. CoS co-organized with other HAP certified members of the ACT Alliance a number of capacity building workshops

for local partners about HAP commitments, including complaints mechanism.

Guidelines for handling complaints include a section on lessons learnt, and there were some examples of changes that were made in project, based on complaints.

Evidences: Document 199, 200, 223 and interviews with staff

5.6 Communities and people affected by crisis are fully aware of the expected behaviour of humanitarian staff, including organisational commitments made on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.

Ind. 5.6: Communities and people affected by crisis are aware of the expected behaviour of staff, including commitments on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.

Score: 1

Partners are made aware of behaviour expected from CoS staff through agreements and partner dialogue (including trainings and conferences about HAP commitments), *however this awareness does not reach further than partner top management level.*

CoS expect partners to have a code of conduct, as outlined in the guidelines for working in partnership, and code of conduct is seen as the first step towards a complaints mechanism. It is also a formal requirement under the partner agreement. *However the communities' awareness of the partner's code of conduct is not systematically discussed with partners nor checked systematically in the field.*

Communication to communities about the code of conduct is part of the partner assessment and it is expected that this will thus be systematically covered as this is rolled out.

At PS, communities and people affected by crisis were neither aware of CoS and partners commitments on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, nor aware of expected behaviours.

Evidences: Doc 112, 218, 222 and interviews with staff, partners and communities.

MINOR CAR 5.6-1: *Communities and people affected by crisis are not fully aware of the expected behaviour of the staff, and of the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse - Time for resolution: propose a plan for resolution to the HAP secretariat = 6 months, Implementation = 2 years*

5.7 Complaints that do not fall within the scope of the organisation are referred to a relevant party in a manner consistent with good practice.

Ind. 5.7: Complaints that do not fall within the scope of the organisation are referred to a relevant party in a manner consistent with best practice.

Score: 3

Guidelines for handling complaints describe the referral system. In practice, CoS might handle a complaint with the legal department, or might refer complaints to other stakeholders (partners, HAP certified members, local police). There were no concrete examples of referral, but staff feels referral can be operated in manner consistent with good practice if need be.

Evidences: Document 223 and interviews with staff.

6. Communities and people affected by crisis receive coordinated, complementary assistance

6.1 Identify the roles, responsibilities, capacities and interests of different stakeholders

Ind. 6.1: Role, responsibilities, capacities and interests of different stakeholders are identified

Score: 3

Projects and programmes assessments, partners' assessments and monitoring visits are opportunities to define the roles, capacities and interests of different stakeholders. Coordination bodies such as the ACT Alliance and the ACT Fora provide a source of information and exchange of experience.

At PS, identifying and linking with the various stakeholders of CoS projects is the role of the recently deployed Liaison officers.

Evidences: Documents 12, 16, 18, 47, 109, 167, 201 and interviews with staff

6.2 Ensure humanitarian response complements that of national and local authorities and other humanitarian organisations.

Ind. 6.2: The response complements the action of national and local authorities and other actors

Score: 3

Complementing response of national and international stakeholders is a requirement from SIDA. In many countries, partners are not allowed to start a new programme without government authorization, which CoS sees it as part of its rights based approach.

CoS explores actions of national and local authorities and other humanitarian organisations through initial assessments and through consultations with partners. For instance, before engaging in its new strategic period, CoS sought feed back from partners on where its action would make most sense with regard to existing organisations.

In humanitarian emergencies, CoS will intervene as part of the ACT Alliance and through ACT appeals, and will systematically participate in the OCHA cluster system.

At PS, there were many evidences of participation of CoS and partners in local and international networks and coordinating bodies.

Evidences: Documents 3, 44, 109, 112, 202 and interviews with staff and partners

6.3 Participate in relevant coordination bodies and collaborate with others in order to minimise demands on communities and maximise the coverage and service provision of the wider humanitarian effort.

Ind. 6.3: The organisation collaborates with others in order to minimise demands on communities and maximise the coverage and service provision of the wider humanitarian effort.

Score: 4

CoS has a very strong culture and practice of coordinating and collaborating with others. The ACT Alliance is one the main coordination bodies, and CS will participate through

- ACT fora in the field (national and regional meeting)

- participation in ACT appeals,
- leading the group on psychosocial support.
- Common projects such as organizing jointly with HAP certified members of the ACT Alliance capacity building workshops on quality, accountability and HAP for local partners.

CoS participates in the Nordic Director meetings involving managements teams of NCA, DCA, FCA, Diaconia Sweden and other Nordic faith based INGOs around issues such as harmonizing PMER systems or undertaking key advocacies.

Coordination in the field will take place through ACT fora and through UNOCHA clusters when CoS is registered. In the Middle East however, CoS is not registered as an implementing agency. Minutes from UNOCHA meetings are sent through fellow organizations (LWF and NCA).

CoS has developed stronger collaborations with Christian Aid and ICCO, which translates globally into meeting twice a year in the E-Aid meetings and discussing advocacy issues, harmonization on HAP/ Western European Christian Group and good donorship (harmonize fundraising) and translates locally into sharing office space and joint programming.

Evidences: Documents 40, 41, 42 and interviews with staff at HO and PS

6.4 Share necessary information with partners, coordination groups and other relevant actors through appropriate communication channels.

Ind. 6.4: The information is shared with partners, coordination groups and other relevant actors through appropriate communication channels

Score: 4

Information sharing with partners is outlined in partnership agreements and is channelled through reports, visits in the field, capacity building workshops and capacity building initiatives (which may include partners' visit in CoS head office in Sweden).

At global level, information is shared with partners within the ACT Alliance, within groups supported by the same back donor (SIDA, EU), or within thematic groups (eg: interagency work on psychosocial support).

At PS, Liaison Officers have a key role in sharing information with partners, coordination groups and relevant actors, which may include ACT fora and thematic coordination groups (eg : vocational training, health).

Evidences: Documents 109, 111, 113, 119, 177, 179, 191, 192, 194, 199, 202, 203 and interviews with staff and partners

6.5 Policies and strategies include a clear commitment to coordination and collaboration with others, including national and local authorities, without compromising humanitarian principles.

Ind. 6.5: Policies and strategies include a clear commitment to coordination and collaboration with others, including national and local authorities without compromising humanitarian principles.

Score: 4

Commitment to coordination and collaboration with others is clearly stated in CoS key strategy documents.

The Strategic plan for Church of Sweden's international work 2014– 2017 includes a section on cooperation with partners and global ecumenical network and alliances. Alliances, coordination and clusters are also indicated in the application to a pluri-annual funding from SIDA. Guidelines for the Church of Sweden's humanitarian response, Guidelines for development cooperation, Guidelines for policy dialogue and Guidelines for partner collaboration, which frame CoS work in the 2014-2017 strategic period also outline commitments to coordination and collaboration with other stakeholders, including national and local authorities.

Evidences: Documents 2, 3, 115, 125, 135 and 138

6.6 Work with partners is governed by clear and consistent agreements that respect each partner's mandate, obligations and independence, and recognises their respective constraints and commitments.

Ind. 6.6a: Clear and consistent agreements govern the work with partners

Ind. 6.6b: Agreements respect each partner's mandate, obligation and independence and recognises their respective constraints and commitments

Score: 3

Partnership agreements and dialogue are framed in a way that is respectful of CoS and partners' mandate, obligations and independence.

Partner agreements cover:

- CoS undertakings, including fundraising and financial support, information sharing available, complaints mechanism, coordination with other agencies.
- Partner undertakings, including selection criteria for target groups (taking into account gender and age in particular), participation of target groups throughout the project, use of resources, goals and objectives, PMER processes and good governance (accounting and bookkeeping).
- Code of conduct, procurement, fraud and corruption
- Secure that all partner staff (project, finance and external auditors) are informed about the content of agreement.

Partners meetings are taking place regularly to discuss partnership issues. However some reports on partners visit / dialogue are in Swedish, which raises the issue of how these are shared with partners.

Evidences: Documents 161, 163, 164, 165, 193 and interviews with staff and partners

7. Communities and people affected by crisis can expect delivery of improved assistance as organisations learn from experience and reflection

7.1 Draw on lessons learnt and prior experience when designing programmes.

Ind. 7.1: Programmes are designed based on prior lessons and experience.

Score: 3

Putting lessons learnt into practice is an expectation that is clearly outlined in the guidelines for partner collaboration within the international work of the CoS. Supporting tools and methods linking experience and change have been developed, in line with CoS Strategic plan (e.g: results framework, CBPS logframe).

Complications in programming are discussed within the International Department in learning conferences,

involving regional unit and policy advisors, and conclusions of the learning conference are reintegrated into the programmes.

At PS, there were a number of examples of reusing lessons learnt into new programming, or into adjustments to on-going programmes.

Among staff at HO and PS, there is a strong sense that CoS builds programmes on lessons learnt from experience, although processes are not very systematic. As a result, drawing from lessons learnt may still differ according to situations.

Evidences: Documents 21, 63, 115, 119, 129, 173, 175 and interviews with staff and partners

7.2 Learn, innovate and implement changes on the basis of monitoring and evaluation, and feedback and complaints.

Ind. 7.2: The organisation uses learning from M&E, feedbacks and complaints to implement change.

Score: 3

CoS new 2014-2017 Strategic Plan is being implemented through programme results frameworks which set goals for changes that CoS and its partners want to see. These programme results frameworks translate into individual workplans. The new PMER system and tools are designed to feed monitoring, evaluation, feedback and complaints into programming in order to bring about change and innovation.

Learning opportunities are scheduled throughout the year for CoS staff (learning “heats” twice or 3 times a year, learning conferences during the “stay at home weeks”) and for CoS partners (capacity building workshops, ACT fora, partner dialogue which may include travel of partners to Sweden).

At HO and PS, a number of examples were provided of innovation and change based on monitoring, feedback and complaints. These examples involved bringing additional components to programmes, enlarging pilot projects, changing HR profiles, involving new partners, reaching out to new target groups, or adjusting programme implementation.

Evidences: Documents 5, 12, 21, 169, 170, 188, 217 and interviews with staff and partners.

7.3 Share learning and innovation internally, with communities and people affected by crisis, and with other stakeholders.

Ind. 7.3: Learning and innovation are shared with internal and external stakeholders including communities and partners.

Score: 2

At HO, learning is shared through project documents (including monitoring reports) made available to all International Department staff on VIPS, and through learning events.

When needed, CoS calls for outside expertise on thematic and regional issues, to either upgrade staff knowledge or support framing of position papers.

Global or thematic coordination bodies, such as the ACT Alliance, or the IASC working group on psychosocial issues are privileged channels for sharing learning and innovation.

At PS, learning and innovation are shared with partners through capacity building plans and through partner dialogue. There were examples that partners are encouraged to participate and are involved in networks where learning from programmes can be shared with relevant professional stakeholders. [However, sharing innovation and learning seems not to reach down to communities and people affected by crisis.](#)

Evidences: Documents 43, 47, 101, 108, 112, 119, 133, 136, 199, 202 and interviews with staff and

partners

Observation: CoS needs to find ways to ensure that learning and innovation reaches out to communities and people affected by crisis, beyond partners level.

7.4 Evaluation and learning policies are in place, and means are available to learn from experiences and improve practices.

Ind. 7.4: Policies and procedures describe how the organization evaluates and learns from its practice and experience.

Score: 3

Cos is currently redesigning its PMER system with an intent to systematize evaluation processes and disseminate their conclusions, together with a flow chart indicating the process by which CoS will follow up on results and will implement evaluation. M&E tools covering all the project cycle are made available to project staff on VIPS, and include:

- Partner assessment,
- Project assessment tool
- Monitoring and partner visits check list
- Annual programme report
- Evaluations
- End of project report
- Final programme report.

These documents reflect the priorities of the new 2014-2017 strategic period through the results matrix and integrate accountability in PMER tools through additional questions.

The reorganization of CoS International Department has placed PMER in the International Director's team, making it a crosscutting support system to all other units (Regional unit, including development and humanitarian programs and Policy Unit).

Evidences: Documents 2, 47, 48, 63, 166, 172 and interviews with staff

7.5 Mechanisms exist to record knowledge and experience, and make it accessible throughout the organisation.

Ind. 7.5: There are processes to document and make accessible knowledge and experience throughout the organisation.

Score: 3

All project documents, including partners / projects assessments and documents related to monitoring and evaluation, are made available on VIPS. New formats have been designed by PMER teams to disseminate information about meetings with external stakeholders. Reporting is done to the International Committee about activities and results of the International Department

Learning events are taking place regularly, either during the 2 weeks (spring and autumn) during which all International Department staff is asked to stay at HO, through learning conferences or through "learning heats" in which specific topics related to programme / project experience are presented and discussed.

Evaluation reports and planning for future evaluations have been made available, however several staff points out that CoS approach to evaluation should become more systematic, and that the new PMER

system still needs to be owned within the organization.

Evidences: Documents 16, 46, 47, 74, 119, 159, 160, 162, 165, 171, 173, 175, 212 and interviews with staff

7.6 The organisation contributes to learning and innovation in humanitarian response amongst peers and within the sector.

Ind. 7.6: The organisation contributes to learning and innovation in humanitarian response amongst peers and within the sector.

Score: 4

CoS contributes to learning and innovation within the sector as part of dialogue with partners and coordination with other stakeholders. These contributions include:

- capacity building and training workshops with partners, either directly organized by CoS or implemented with other ACT / HAP certified members.
- Joint evaluations, together with other INGOs involved in the similar project/programme.
- CoS contributions to guidelines, methods and developments on psychosocial support, through interagency work or through communities of practice within the ACT Alliance.
- Publications on CoS Website of over 10 CoS position papers on issues related to field work and over 20 reports co-produced by CoS and other agencies on issues related to humanitarian, development and advocacy work.

Evidences: Documents 43, 112, 133, 136, 142-147, 199, 207, 212, 216 and interviews with staff

8. Communities and people affected by crisis receive the assistance they require from competent and well-managed staff and volunteers

8.1 Staff work according to the mandate and values of the organisation and to agreed objectives and performance standards.

Ind. 8.1a: Staff works according to the mandate and values of the organisation

Ind. 8.1b: Staff works according to the agreed objectives and performance standards

Score: 3

Staff and partners are made aware of mandates and values of the organization, objectives and performance standards through CoS 2014-2017 strategic plan and strategic map, guidelines, position papers, country and programme planning, partnership agreements, and individual workplans. Project documents and monitoring guidelines frame objectives and performance standards.

Interviews with staff and partners at HO and PS evidenced ownership of CoS values and a good understanding of objectives and of expected performance standards. However, staff points out the need for a greater sense of priority in key policy documents and in key procedures / tools.

Evidences: Documents 2, 5, 12, 14, 25, 29, 63, 99, 113, 125, 126, 135, 136, 138, 167, 142-147, 177, 169, 182-186, 189, 190, 193, 195, 196, 198, 222, and interviews with staff and partners

8.2 Staff adhere to the policies that are relevant to them and understand the consequences of not adhering to them.

Ind. 8.2a: Staff adheres to the policies that are relevant to them

Ind. 8.2b: Staff understands the consequences of not adhering to them

Score: 3

At HO and PS, staff are aware of CoS and ACT Alliance Code of Conduct, as well as of policies related to corruption and gender and of CoS positions on thematic and regional issues.

At PS, partners demonstrate awareness and implications about Code of Conduct or relevant standards (rights based approach, corruption policies, policies related to gender and sexual harassment), but at staff level, awareness of core policies is not systematic.

Evidences: Documents 31, 35, 127, 131, 137, 142-147, 151, 152, 176, 183, 205, 206, 221 and interviews with staff and partners

8.3 Staff develop and use the necessary personal, technical and management competencies to fulfil their role and understand how the organisation can support them to do this.

Ind. 8.3a: Staff develop and use the necessary personal, technical and management competencies to fulfil their role

Ind. 8.3b: Staff understand how the organisation can support them to develop and use the necessary personal, technical and management competencies to fulfil their role

Score: 2

The induction package provides guidance into CoS and is systematically provided to new staff. **However all HR and internal documents are in Swedish, which is a challenge for non-Swedish speakers.** Conversations on professional development and on salary revision take place twice a year with line managers and are seen by staff as a good opportunity to raise capacity building issues.

Staff is not aware of a specific procedure on training and capacity building, however staff say they receive regularly e-mails informing about seminars or learning sessions taking place internally, and feel encouraged to look at training opportunities outside CoS (i.e.: Swedish Mission Council, Swedish Christian council, Foreign Policy Institute...). Several staff mentioned an annual budget allocated for staff development (10.000 SEK/year/person). Team meetings take place on a regular basis at staff and management level, and staff feel they have easy access to and are supported by their line manager.

At PS, **HR issues do not seem to be presently part of partner dialogue,** however it is now included through the partner assessment in the new PMER package and this situation may be corrected. HR practices (induction procedures, line management, team meetings, annual appraisal) range from very systematic to not very formal, depending on partners 'culture and understanding of HR implications of accountability.

Evidences: Documents 46, 68-73, 79, 80, 82, 84, 87, 89 and interviews with staff and partners

Observation: CoS needs to have a better communication of the support it can bring to its staff and engage partners in discussion re the relation between HR issues and accountability. See 8.5

8.4 The organisation has the management and staff capacity and capability to deliver its programmes.

Ind. 8.4a: The organisation has the means to deliver its programmes

Ind. 8.4b: The management and staff has the capacity to deliver the organisation's programmes

Score: 3

Reorganisation of CoS International Department took effect in January 2014, as a result of the new 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and as a result of back donor (SIDA) requirement. Management published in December 2014 the results of a staff survey on psychosocial environment and job satisfaction.

Adjusting capacities to programmes has meant on one hand quantitatively and qualitatively increasing HR capacities: Liaison Officers, Psychosocial pool, hiring new and more international profiles, fast deployment staff... And on the other hand decrease international presence in order to refocus according to new strategic Plan.

Performance appraisals take place 6 months after induction for or new staff, then twice a year (one interview on professional development and one on salary revision). They are conducted systematically. Team meetings take place either every week or every other week. Training happens through events based on in-house expertise, or by calling competencies outside CoS and staff feel very supported in capacity building.

At PS level, partners' management and staff capacity and capability to implement programmes is explored through partners assessments and check lists to screen project applications. CoS undertakes capacity building and training sessions with partners on a regular basis. Partners provided a number of examples of recruitments or reorganization processes to put management and staff capacity in line with programmes, however this question does not seem to be on the agenda of partner dialogue.

Evidences: Documents 2, 22, 46, 64, 68, 73, 74, 75, 76, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 97, 106, 112, 116, 149, 162, 180, 199, 201, 207, 209, 210, 215, 219 and interviews with staff and partners

8.5 Staff policies and procedures are fair, transparent, non-discriminatory and compliant with local employment law.

Ind. 8.5: Staff policies and procedures are fair, transparent, non-discriminatory and compliant with local employment law.

Score: 1

CoS Internal Web system provides a section called « For you as employed » which embraces all relevant policies, procedures and tools relevant to employees.

Staff policies and procedures provided to staff during induction are listed on a presentation named « staff capacity and support » and include:

Order of delegation, which describes levels for decision

Role description (Job Description) + activity plan related to JD

Contract. There are policies at international department level (including CoC) and there are other policies applicable to all CoS staff (travel policy, instructions on how to represent CoS)

Performance and salary appraisal (both topics are discussed in separate meeting take take place 6 months apart from each other).

Complaints response mechanism

Survey on employee satisfaction, which is followed up at team, unit and department level.

However all of these documents are only in Swedish. The same applies to HR related documents provided during the audit. Language format is an issue for non-Swedish employees and co-workers: this may concern Liaison Officers, members of the Psychosocial pool, and international employees.

It is unclear whether HR policies and procedures applicable to International Department are encompassed in a single HR Manual.

Interviews with staff give a sense of insufficient HR support to the International Department, although staff feel treated fairly by their line management.

Evidences: Documents 69-73, 76, 77, 78, 84-87, 89 and interviews with staff

MINOR CAR 8.5-1: CoS procedures do not ensure transparency, fairness and non-discrimination - Time for resolution: propose a plan for resolution to the HAP secretariat = 6 months, Implementation = 2 years

8.6 Job descriptions, work objectives and feedback processes are in place so that staff have a clear understanding of what is required of them.

Ind. 8.6a: Job descriptions, work objectives and feedback processes are in place and clearly state what is required from them

Ind. 8.6b: Staff have a clear understanding of what is required of them

Score: 3

CoS 2014-2017 Strategic Plan has set goals which translate into:

- Country, programme, department and individual work objectives. Individual work objectives were not provided, however they are outlined in job descriptions and in annual appraisal reports.
- Most, though not all job descriptions were redrafted after the launch of the Jan. 2014 reorganisation, in order to reflect the new strategic plan. They provide information on the scope of the work, on reporting (line management), power and responsibilities, and required qualifications.
- Feed back processes are in place, with the 6 months interview for new staff, annual appraisals (twice a year) and weekly discussions with line management.

All HR and project information relevant to the International Department is available on VIPS, to which all staff have been introduced. However, some staff see VIPS as a complex, not user-friendly system. Documents are not systematically dated, which makes it difficult to identify the latest version. Staff demonstrates a clear understanding of what is required of them, and express confidence in the feed back system with their line manager.

At PS, partners provided job descriptions and workplans at project or organisation level. There was no evidence that individual work plans and feed back processes are in place and no evidence that the issue is on the agenda of partner dialogue. However, partner staff demonstrated a clear understanding of what is required of them.

Evidences: Documents 64, 66, 67, 68, 73, 79, 82, 153-156, 180, 182, 184, 186-190, 196, 210, 213, 220 and interviews with staff and partners

8.7 A code of conduct is in place that establishes, at a minimum, the obligation of staff not to exploit, abuse or otherwise discriminate against people.

Ind.8.7a: A code of conduct is in place

Ind. 8.7b: The code of conduct establishes, at a minimum, the obligation not to exploit or abuse or otherwise discriminate against people

Score: 3

CoS's code of conduct is included in employees' contracts in a paragraph establishing the obligation for staff to not use position of power to behave improperly. Bribes, benefits and the purchase of sexual services are not allowed. The ACT Alliance Code of Conduct, which applies to CoS staff, mentions the obligation on non discrimination against people.

Guidelines for humanitarian assistance point that CoS humanitarian teams obey by the rules of the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief.

Codes of conducts are requested from partners in cooperation agreements, and existence of a code of conduct is checked through partners assessments and through project check lists on humanitarian appeals.

At PS, some partners have a code of conduct, others have guidelines on corruption, fraud and/or on gender. Codes of conduct are discussed in HAP capacity building workshop. CoS and other HAP certified members of the ACT Alliance who put these workshops in place view discussion about Code of Conduct as a first step towards complaints mechanism.

Evidences: Documents 16, 44, 106, 112, 113, 135, 151, 176, 183, 201, 205, 206, 213, 221 and interviews with staff and partners

8.8 Policies are in place to support staff to improve their skills and competencies.

Ind. 8.8: Policies are in place to support staff to improve their skills and competencies.

Score: 3

Section 6.4 of CoS 2014-2017 Strategic Plan makes commitments on human resources and on improving skills and competences. A capacity building plan has been drafted in January 2015, but staff does not seem to be aware of it yet.

Processes to strengthen staff skills and competencies are not very clear and systematic. They include in-house learning events, and support staff in their initiatives to participate in outside training, learning or capacity building events. However staff describes CoS as a learning organization and feels supported in initiatives to improve their skills and competencies.

Guidelines for partner collaboration within the international work of the COS indicate that COS expect partners to continuously work on the staff's development, rights and working conditions.

Evidences: Documents 2, 89, 115 and interviews with staff

8.9 Policies are in place for the security and the wellbeing of staff.

Ind. 8.9: Policies are in place for the security and wellbeing of staff

Score: 2

Security trainings (one week long) are organized once a year for international staff. CoS has safety routines for travelling abroad, and staff receives a briefing about these routines before travelling aboard. However it is not clear whether security instructions are given in writing to staff, and how regularly security information in the field is updated and contextualized.

CoS undertakes psychosocial surveys of staff on work conditions. The results of the latest survey were published in January 2015.

Evidences: Documents 75, 76, 86, observation and interviews with staff

Observation: CoS should ensure that security guidelines, instructions and briefings are provided orally and in writing to staff travelling abroad, and that they updated according to the latest available information.

9. Communities and people affected by crisis can expect that the organisations assisting them are managing resources effectively, efficiently and ethically.

9.1 Design programmes and implement processes to ensure the efficient use of resources, balancing quality, cost and timeliness at each phase of the response.

Ind. 9.1: Programmes are designed and implemented to ensure the efficient use of resources, balancing quality, cost and timeliness at each phase of the response

Score: 3

Efficient use of resources in projects and programmes is a strategic commitment of CoS. It is screened through partners assessments and through programme / project assessments, and it is included in partnership agreements as an expectation from CoS towards partners.

At HO, commitments to projects without a back donor and / or outside the estimated budget are discussed between finances, fundraising and programmes. Priorities are discussed on the basis of a list which is updated quarterly at management level.

At HO and PS, procurement manuals provide guidelines to mitigate quality, cost and timeliness.

Evidences: Documents 16, 44, 90, 106, 109, 113, 148, 205, 206 and interviews with staff and partners

9.2 Manage and use resources to achieve their intended purpose, so minimising waste.

Ind. 9.2a: The organisation manages and use resources to achieve their intended purpose

Ind. 9.2b: The organisation minimise waste of resources

Score: 3

CoS does not have specific guidelines about prevention or minimization of waste. However management of resources is framed in project documents (proposal screening and project monitoring) and on partnership / funding agreements. Most CoS funding's are earmarked.

CoS' finance department has developed an investment strategy based on sustainable investment opportunities and there is a sense that the organization is conscious and concerned about minimizing waste of resources.

Evidences: Documents 5, 12, 104, 106, 113, 208, observation and interviews with staff

9.3 Monitor and report expenditure against budget.

Ind. 9.3: Expenditure is monitored and reported against budget

Score: 4

At HO, expenses are monitored against budget as part of the financial management and internal control system. Balance is allowed, but needs to be formally authorized by Church of Sweden and justified by partners. Auditors are usually Finance department staff and conduct ad hoc audits, based on partners assessments which are also used as a baseline for sampling.

Church of Sweden intends to create a map of partners in order to define a two years internal auditing plan.

Church of Sweden's accounts (including International Department) are audited annually by Grant

Thornton. Management letter is provided to and discussed at global CoS level. Annual accounts are published on Church of Sweden's website, however there is no distinguished narrative and financial report of the International department.

At PS, changes in budget are possible as part of partnership dialogue, but budgets have to be discussed and approved by CoS before any change takes place.

Evidences: Document 5, 16, 93, 94, 104, 105, 106, 113, 214 and interviews with staff

9.4 When using local and natural resources, consider their impact on the environment.

Ind. 9.4: Local and natural resources are used taking their actual and potential impact on the environment into account

Score: 3

Although it does not have an environmental policy, CoS' commitment to protecting the environment includes:

- Bishop's letter on climate (to be sent to all congregations) and position paper on agriculture (agrolgy).
- Instructions in procurement policy (includes a section on environment) and code of conduct on environment for suppliers (currently being drafted),
- Finance and investment policy (involves not buying bonds from non green companies) - CoS won a prize in January 2015. CoS is a stakeholder (owner) of the Swedish Fair Trade.
- Travelling policy, recommending making moderate use of transportation with a strong impact on environment.
- Environmental criteria on project assessments (e.g.: farming activities, activities related to water, use of space), and assessment of partners' competences to run "big" projects (building infrastructures) while taking into account environmental impact.

Evidences: Documents 5, 16, 93, 94, 104, 105, 106, 113, 214, 225, 226 and interviews with staff

9.5 Manage the risk of corruption and take appropriate action if it is identified.

Ind. 9.5a: The risk of corruption is managed

Ind. 9.5b: The organisation takes appropriate action when corruption is identified

Score: 4

CoS anti corruption policy is in place but has not been updated since 2008. The organisation has faced a few cases of corruption in 2014. These cases were channelled through project officers, sample test in the field, or through CoS' own auditors. All cases have been logged, discussed within the complaints committee, and shared with SIDA as CoS back donor. One case has been on-going for half a year but the 3 other cases are now clear.

At PS, not all partners provided an anti corruption policy, however anti corruption practices are requested and checked in partnership agreements and in project documents. When needed, capacity building activities are put in place to help partners strengthen their financial management system.

Evidences: Documents 16, 31, 96, 106, 205, 206 and interviews with staff and partners

9.6 Policies and processes governing the use and management of resources are in place, including how the organisation:

- a. accepts and allocates funds and gifts-in-kind ethically and legally;**
- b. uses its resources in an environmentally responsible way;**
- c. prevents and addresses corruption, fraud, conflicts of interest and misuse of resources;**
- d. conducts audits, verifies compliance and reports transparently;**
- e. assesses, manages and mitigates risk on an ongoing basis; and**
- f. ensures that the acceptance of resources does not compromise its independence.**

Ind.9.6: Policies and processes governing the use and management of resources are in place, including how the organisation:

- a. Accepts and allocates funds and gifts-in-kind ethically and legally;
- b. Uses its resources in an environmentally responsible way;
- c. Prevents and addresses corruption, fraud, conflict of interests and misuse of resources;
- d. Conducts audits and verifies compliance and reports transparently;
- e. Assesses, managed and mitigates risk on an on-going basis; and,
- f. Ensure that the acceptance of resources does not compromise its independence.

Score: 3

A number of policies, guidelines and position papers are in place in order to frame CoS practices on management of resources:

- a) CoS Fundraising policy provides a definition of fundraising and funds, methods, relationship to donors and conditions for earmarking funding.
- b) Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment, travel policy and instructions to General Services provide guidance on how to use resources in environmentally responsible way. CoS is involved in the post 2015 agenda, and works on fair trade issues related to CSR issues. COS is one of the founding members of the fair trade movement in Sweden.
- c) Guidelines for anti-corruption, finance policy and guidelines on delegation of authority outline CoS position on corruption, fraud and conflicts of interests.
- d) CoS finance policy frames auditing and financial reporting. Guidelines for partner collaboration within the international work of the CoS outline CoS expectations on plan, follow up, evaluation and reporting on how resources are used and what results are achieved – and put lessons learned from this into practice. Partners are expected to have sound financial and administrative routines, undergo an annual audit and conduct continuous anti-corruption work.
- e) Risk is screened through a variety of documents, including partner, country and programme assessment. However, CoS does not have a comprehensive risk management policy covering all risks potentially faces by International Department.
- f) CoS does not have a clear process to ensure that acceptance of resources does not compromise its independence. However fundraising policy includes a section on declining donations (when conflicting with CoS' values), on partner dialogue about other donors to that partner, and on funding diversification.

Evidences: Documents 16, 17, 18, 50, 92, 109, 114, 115, 127, 128 134, 167, 201, 210, 211 and interviews with staff

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:**

Annexes

A. Document mapping

	Title	Date	CHS link
1	Accountability Framework 2012-2013	24/04/2012	
2	Strategic plan for the Church of Sweden's international work 2014– 2017		
3	Strategic Humanitarian Partnership Application to Sida 2014-2016	1.4, 1.5, 2.7	
4	Submitting a Project Concept Note	05/06/2014	1.1, 1.6
5	Humanitarian Project Monitoring Checklist / HUM Programme 2014/2016 (Draft) HUM Programme 2014-2016		8, 4, 5, 2.4, 2.5, 3, 9.2., 9.3.
6	Guiding questions for Environment Impact Assessment – EIA	15/04/2013	9.4.
7	Guiding questions for Conflict Impact Assessment – CIA	15/04/2013	1.1, 1.4., 1.6., 3.1., 3.2., 3.3., 3.5,
8	Working with partners - The Church of Sweden Guide to Partnership	11/06/2013	
9	Granskning av ekonomisk rapportering från partner - instruktion	2013-07-03	
10	INSTRUKTION FÖR RISKANALYS (inklusive konfliktkonsekvensbedömning)	19/08/2013	1.2, 1.6, 3.2
11	Manual för utfasning inom den internationella verksamheten	2013-05-30	3.4.
12	Church of Sweden Monitoring and Partner Visit Checklist (Draft)		1.1, 2.5, 7.2
13	Monitoring levels and PMERL model		2.7, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4
14	Övergripande styrkarta int verksamheten.pdf	21/11/2013	
15	COS' plan/strategy for participation – i e implementation of Guidelines for Partnercollaboration		
16	Partner Assessment		8.2, 8.5, 8.7, 5, 9.1, 9.3, 9.5, 4.3, 6, 1.2, 2.4, 2.7, 7.4, 7.5,
17	Church of Sweden Partner Assessment _ A tool for dialogue with partner churches and organisations		
18	APPENDIX: PARTNER ASSESSMENT - SUPPORTING QUESTIONS		

19	LATHUND Problemanalys		1.3, 3.6
20	Example template for a Project Application	15/04/2013	1, 2, 3, 9
21	Results Framework Church of Sweden Country Programmes		7.1, 7.2
22	Plan för kapacitetsbyggande, Asien 2014 – 2017 / Capacity Building Plan, Asia 2014 - 2017	06/02/2015	3.3, 7.3
23	Plan för arbetet med att bygga partners kapacitet i Asien 2014 – 2017	06/02/2015	3.3, 7.3
24	Welcome to the Church of Sweden Partner Survey, on the quality and accountability status of the Church of Sweden 2015		
25	Guidelines for partner collaborations within the international work of the Church of Sweden	11/02/2015	3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7
26	Re-organisation of the International Department 2014	28/01/2014	2.6, 4.1,
27	Guidelines for sharing information	02/04/2012 Rev. 10/02/2014	4.5
28	COSs plan/strategy for information sharing		4.5
29	Together for a Just World – The Church of Sweden’s International Work		1.4, 1.5, 3.7, 4.6
30	Juntos pour un mundo justo – la cooperacion internacional de la iglesia sueca.		4.2
31	CORRUPTION & FRAUD - A practical guide for staff at Church of Sweden International department to prevent, resist, detect and act against corruption and fraud.	21/04/2008	9.5, 5.4
32	COSs plan/strategy for handling of complaints (CRM)		5.4
33	Annex 1: Format för att lämna klagomål		5.4
34	Intern hantering av klagomål		5.4
35	Policy och handlingsplan mot trakasserier på grund av kön, sexuella trakasserier och repressalier	23/01/2012	5.4
36	Hantering/arbetsgång vid misstanke om oegentligheter.	01/03/2012	5.4
37	Årsrapport 2014 Svenska kyrkans Internationella Verksamhets klagomålshantering CRM		5.3, 5.5.
38	Årsrapport 2013 för Svenska kyrkans internationella verksamhets klagomålshantering		5.3, 5.5
39	Incident Report Form		
40	Core support to WCC from Church of Sweden (Draft for discussion)	June 24, 2014	6.3
41	Report CoS and LWF/WS meeting in Uppsala, Sweden	Feb. 2-3, 2015	6.3
42	WCC Working Together 2014	17/05/2014	6.3
43	A Brief Report on Participatory Proposal Development and Budgeting for Project Proposal Training program held in Bangkok, Thailand 18-22 November 2013		7.3, 7.6
44	Bedömningsunderlag HUM 2014-2016	10/11/2014	1.2, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 6.2, 8.7, 9.1
45	Church of Sweden 2014 Annual Progress Report for HAP		
46	Interna utbildningar våren 2015 (Utdrag ur chefsbrev) Internal trainings spring 2015 (taken from International Directors letter)	28/01/2015	8.3, 7.5
47	Monitoring and Partner Visit Report Template		2.5, 7.2, 7.4,
48	Monitoring levels and PMERL model		7.4
49	Narrative description of Church of Sweden Monitoring Levels and PMERL model in Country Programmes		2.5, 7.4
50	Church of Sweden Partner Assessment		
60	THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION – Program Report 2012		
61	Reserapport (India, Bangladesh)	31/05/2013	2.5, 7.5
62	Reserapport (Uganda)	18/06/2014	2.5, 7.5
63	Resultatuppföljning HUM programme 2014		2.5, 7.4
64	6 månaders-intervjumall	31/10/2013	8.1, 8.4, 8.6
65	Saker från HR som visar vad vi lär oss:		
66	Kyrkokansliet i Uppsala, internationella avdelningen söker		8.6

	Policyhandläggare med ansvar för Afrika		
67	Rollbeskrivning handläggare	15/01/2014	8.6
68	Arbetsmiljöutbildning, för kyrkokansliets chefer och skyddsombud Work environment training for managers and "protectionombudsmen" at the Central Church office	30/12/2013	8.4, 8.6
69	Avgångsintervju mall Template for interview upon staff end of employment		
70	Checklista inför introduktion av nyanställd – stöd för anställande chef och administratör Checklist before introduction of new employment – support for the manager that undertakes the employment and administrator	15/08/2014	8.3
71	Checklista arbetsplats Checklist work place (office)		8.3
72	Information till nyanställd Information to newly employed	15/08/2014	8.3
73	Chefsbrevpersonal Directors letter to staff	11/11/2014	8.3, 8.6
74	HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT AWARENESS TRAINING (HEAT)	September 21-26, 2014	8.4
75	Arbetsguide, Ett stödmaterial för att arbeta med resultatet av kyrkokansliets medarbetarundersökning 2014/2015 Working guide, A supporting material to work with the results from the Central Church Office staff questionnaire 2014/2015		8.8
76	Medarbetarundersökning 2014 Genomförd av CMA Research AB Central Church Office Staff questionnaire 2014/2015. Made by CMA Research Ltd	December 2014	8.4
77	Likabehandlingspolicy och jämställdhetsplan Policy for Equal treatment and equality	22/01/2015	8.5
78	Lönepolicy Policy on salaries	30/10/2014	8.5
79	PU-samtal (sammanställs på separat dokument) Annual staff meeting with closest manager (summary is made in a separate document)		8.6
80	Program introduktionsutbildning Stefan	13/01/2015	8.2, 8.3
81	Psykosocial skyddsround vt 2014, Standardrapport Psychosocial protection round spring 2014, standard report		
82	PU- samtal – STÖDDOKUMENT Annual staff meeting with closest manager – supporting document	10/10/2014	8.6
83	ARBETSMATERIAL, Rapport lönekartläggning, Svenska kyrkans kansli Working material, report mapping of salaries at the Central Church Office	2014	8.6, 8.4
84	Rekryteringsprocess HR version 1The recruitment process HR V1		8.4, 8.5
85	Rehabiliteringsrutin Routins for rehabilitation	23/01/2012	8.4, 8.5
86	Säkerhetsrutiner vid tjänsteresa utomlands Safety routines for travelling abroad		8.9
87	Interna utbildningar våren 2015 (Utdrag ur chefsbrev) Internal trainings spring 2015 (extract from the directors letter)	28/01/2015	8.3, 8.4,
88	Stödmaterial vid upprättande av risk- och möjlighetsbedömning Supporting material for risk and possibilities assessment	02/04/2012	
89	Utbildningspaket för internationella avdelningen och Intek Education package for international department and international finances	16/01/2015	8.4, 8.8
90	Svenska kyrkans årsrapport till Sida för år 2013 Church of Sweden annual report to Sida 2013	8/05/2014	9.1, 9.3
91	Finanspolicy för Svenska kyrkans nationella nivå Finance Policy for the Church of Sweden National level	21/04/2010	9.6
92	Fundraising policy for the Church of Sweden	26/10/2011	9.6.a, 9.6.f
93	Mall - Checklista vid granskning av ekonomisk rapport Format – Checklist for financial report from partner	03/06/2013	9.3
94	AVPRICKNINGSLISTA SIDA-FINANSIERAD VERKSAMHET Checklist for final report to Sida- when financed through Sida		9.3
95	Uppföljningsinstruktion med stödfrågor för anslagsinsatser Monitoring instruction with supporting questions for projects that we finance	04/05/2010	
96	Annex to the Accountability Framework	01/08/2013	9.5
97	The International Department from 2014	28/01/2014	8.4
98	Review and financial summary 2013 – The National Level of the Church of		

	Sweden		
99	Our theology: A life-empowering faith as our driving force	August 30, 2013	
100	Organisationer/organ/styrelser där Svenska kyrkan är representerad/medlem och/eller betalar anslag/medlemsavgift genom den internationella verksamheten Organisations/steeringcommittees etc where the Church of Sweden is represented /member and/or pay a members fee through the International department	04/06/2013	6.3
101	Ansökan till Sida 2013 Bilaga 9 Illustration KV/LVF/ACT 2013		6.3
102	Målöversikt HUM program 131024	24/10/2013	2.1, 2.2, 2.7, 3.7
103	Colombia målöversikt - revision 140213	25/02/2014	2.1, 2.2, 2.7, 3.7
104	Funding Agreement 2013-2014 between the Church of Sweden and the Lutheran World Federation	02/03/2013	9.2, 9.3
105	Checklista vid granskning av ekonomisk rapport utifrån avtalsvillkor Checklist for assessment of financial report based on requirements in the agreements	27/05/2014	9.3
106	LWF CoS Funding Agreement 2013-2014 Annex 2 DMD	02/03/2013	1.3, 1.6, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 8.4, 8.5, 8.7, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 9.6.c, 9.6.d, 9.6.e
107	LWF CoS Funding Agreement 2013-2014 Annex 3 LWF policies		
108	Membership agreement between ACT Alliance member and ACT Alliance	14/12/2011	
109	Project/Programme Assessment - INSTRUCTIONS	Pilot 2014	1.1, 1.6, 1.3, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 6.2, 6.3, 3.7, 9.1, 9.4, 9.6.b, 9.6.d,
110	Instruktioner för avslut av finansiellt stöd till projekt eller partner (bilaga till Manual för utfasning) Instructions for exit of financial support to projects or partners (annex to Manual for Exit)	30/05/2013	3.4
111	Ansökan till Sida 2013 Bilaga 11 Svenska kyrkans samarbetspartner med sidafinansiering		
112	Coordination of CB plans for the Church of Sweden support to partners through the partner dialogue 2014-2017	03/12/2014	4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4, 7.3, 7.6, 8.4, 8.7,
113	COOPERATION AGREEMENT [yyyy-yyyy] between Church of Sweden and <u>Partner-name</u>		1.2, 1.5, 2.5, 2.7, 4.1, 5.4, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 8.7, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.6
114	Guiding questions for Environment Impact Assessment – EIA	15/04/2013	9.4, 9.6.b
115	Guidelines for partner collaborations within the international work of the Church of Sweden	11/02/2015	
116	Re-organisation of the International Department 2014	28/01/2014	
117	Mål för Utfasning 2014-2017		3.4
118	Manual för utfasning inom den internationella verksamheten	30/05/2013	3.4
119	Meetings with partners in the Child Rights Project (NCA, DSPR, ELCHLJ, LWF/WS- Vocational Training Centre)	25-30/11/12	1.1, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4, 5.5, 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 8.7
120	RISKANALYS Israel och Palestina	19/08/2013	1.1, 1.2, 9.6.e
121	INSTRUKTION FÖR RISKANALYS (inklusive konfliktkonsekvensbedömning)	19/08/2013	1.1, 1.2, 9.6.e
122	Together for a just world – a brief presentation of the Church of Sweden's international work		4.1
123	Juntos por un mundo justo – una breve presentación del trabajo de		4.1

	Cooperación Internacional de la Iglesia Sueca		
124	Utfasningsstrategi – plan för avslut (Exit strategy)	30/05/2013	3.4
125	Policyutvecklingsplan för programperioden 2014-2017	30/09/2014	3.7
126	Policyutvecklingsplan HF Bilaga 5 aktiviteter	30/09/2014	3.7
127	Guidelines for Anti-Corruption	13/03/2013	9.6.c
128	Beslut i enlighet med delegationsordning	27/02/2014	9.6.c
129	CBPS logframe 2014-16		7.1, 7.2, 7.6
130	Diskrimineringslagen	20/03/2012	8.5
131	Position on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR)	Validity : 2014-2017	3.7, 4.1, 4.2
132	Posicionamiento sobre la justicia de género y la equidad de género en el ámbito de la cooperación internacional de la Iglesia Sueca	Valid until 31/12/2015	3.7, 4.1, 4.2
133	Community Based Psychosocial Support for ACT Alliance programmes - Guiding Principles	04/12/2011	3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.4, 7.6
134	Finanspolicy för Svenska kyrkans nationella nivå	21/04/2010	9.6
135	Guidelines for the Church of Sweden humanitarian assistance	19/03/2013	6.5, 2.4, 3.5, 3.7,
136	IASC Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial support in Emergency settings	2007	2.4, 7.6
137	Position for sustainable peace between Israel and Palestine in the Church of Sweden's international work	22/11/2012	4.1, 4.2
138	Policyutvecklingsplan för programperioden 2014-2017, möjliggörande miljö – demokratiskt utrymme och ansvarsutkrävande Policy Development for the programming period 2014-2017 , the enabling environment - democratic space and accountability	23/09/2014	4.1
139	Övergripande Policyutvecklingsplan 2014-2017	07/10/2014	4.1
140	Översikt Policyutveckling 2014-10-08		4.1
141	Policy utvecklingsplan för programperioden 2014-2017 - Fred och försoning	29/09/2014	4.1
142	Human Rights, HIV/AIDS prevention and Gender Equality		4.1, 7.6
143	The Church of Sweden's position on peace and human rights in Colombia	31/05/2012	4.1, 7.6
144	Posicionamiento para la cooperación internacional de la Iglesia Sueca orientado a fomentar una paz sostenible y duradera en Colombia	31/05/2012	4.1, 7.6
145	Social protection as a means of combating poverty and hunger in developing countries	11 april 2012	4.1, 7.6
146	The Church of Sweden's Position on Sustainable and Just Peace in and between Sudan and South Sudan	23/10/2013	4.1, 7.6
147	The Church of Sweden's position on sustainable and just peace in Zimbabwe	3/12/2013	4.1, 7.6
148	Procurement manual	20/01/2014	9.6, 9.2, 9.1
149	Strategy for the Church of Sweden's liaison officers	23 Oct. 2014	
150	Global policydialog – ett sätt att bidra till visionen om ett "liv i Guds rike, en helad skapelse och mänsklighet i samhörighet, rättvisa, frihet & fred"		4.1
151	ACT Alliance CODE OF CONDUCT For the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, fraud and corruption and abuse of power For all staff of ACT members and the ACT Secretariat	Feb.5, 2011	8.7
152	Code of Good Practice For the ACT Alliance	Feb.5, 2011	1.4, 3.7,
153	Rollbeskrivning handläggare humanitärt bistånd	15/01/2014	8.6
154	Rollbeskrivning handläggare policydialog	15/01/2014	8.6
155	Rollbeskrivning psykosociala tematikern	15/01/2014	8.6
156	Rollbeskrivning handläggare policyutveckling	15/01/2014	8.6
157	Svenska kyrkans årsrapport till Sida för år 2013	8/05/2014	
158	Året som gick 2012 int arb	2013	
159	International manager's activity report to the Council	20/11/2014	7.5
160	Rapport från konferenser/seminarier, nätverksmöten, uppvaktningar	15/12/2014	7.5

161	Partner Meetings in Pretoria and Cape Town South Africa	June 9-19, 2013	6.6
162	HAP Accountability Peer Learning Group	23/01/2013	7.5
163	Partnerbesök i Indien med fokus på planering av samarbete under Svenska kyrkans programperiod 2014-2017	Oct. 15-13, 2013	6.6
164	Uppföljning Guatemala och Honduras 27/10 – 10/11	25/11/2013	6.6
165	Diaconia Peru and IBC - Field visit and phase-out meetings 8-12 December 2013	08/01/2014	6.6
166	Routines for establishing Terms of Reference for evaluation		2.5, 2.7, 7.4
167	Bedömningsunderlag HUM 2014-2016	16/05/2014	2.6, 2.7
168	The Lutheran World Federation – Program Report 2012. Accountability Project		2.5
169	Draft Monitoring Plan – Humanitarian Programme 2014-2017	03/12/2013	2.5, 2.7
170	“The Bible does not want to see Children Dying.” A Baseline and Monitoring Study of the Pilot Programme on Health, Gender and Theology	August 2013	2.5
171	Academia, local leaders and communities interacting to promote SRHR and maternal and child health Evaluation of the Pilot Programme on Health, Gender and Theology	07/09/2014	2.5
172	Reference Guide for Evaluation / Manual for evaluation within the international mission and diaconia	12/06/2012	2.7, 7.4
173	PMER flow 20141117		2.7, 7.1, 7.5
174	Lista på utvärderingar 2013, Svenska kyrkan		2.5
175	Mål för Utvärdering 2014-2017		2.7, 7.1
176	Code of Conduct Arabic		8.7
177	Cooperation Agreement 2014-2016 between the Church of Sweden and Department of Service to Palestine Refugees.	10/03/ 2014	6.6, 1.4, 1.5
178	Economic Empowerment – 2014 consolidated logframe		1.4, 3.7
179	DSPR Gaza – Second quarterly report	30/06/2014	2.5
180	DSPR organizational Chart		8.4
181	DSPR Area Committees Interim Reports January –May 2014		2.5
182	Health Programme – 2014 consolidated logframe		1.4, 3.7
183	NECC Gender Equality Policy		8.7, 3.7s
184	Social and Economic Justice – 2014 consolidated logframe		1.4
185	Augusta Victoria Hospital - Midterm Development Plan 2012-2014		1.2, 2.2, 2.6, 9.6.e
186	Augusta Victoria Hospital - Work Plan for 2015		1.2, 2.2, 2.6,
187	Job Description - Director, LWF Vocational Training Program (VTP)	Sept. 2014	8.6
188	LWF VTP Strategic Plan 2013-2018 Results Monitoring Matrix 2015-2016		2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3
189	LWF – Vocation Training Programme – Strategic Plan 2013-2018		1.2, 2.2, 2.6, 9.6.eS
190	The LWF - Program Plan 2015		2.6
191	AVH – 6 months report		1.5, 2.5
192	The Lutheran World Federation Vocational Training Program LWF-VTP 2014 Semi-Annual Narrative report		2.5
193	Cooperation agreement 2014-2016 between Church of Sweden and Rabbis for Human Rights.	17/03/2014	6.6
194	Report to the Church of Sweden on RHR activities 2014		2.5
195	Proposal to the Church of Sweden for Core Funding Peace and Reconciliation 2014-2017		1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 3.7.b, 2.6
196	RHR Project Work Plan 2014 and Beyond		1.6., 2.2. 2.5. 2.6
198	Landprogram Israel och Palestina	10/04/2014	1.1, 1.2, 2.6, 2.7, 3.2
199	ACT Palestine Forum (APF) Capacity Building Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) 3rd phase workshop		6.6.
200	NCA Report from partner survey on HAP (including CoS partner DSPR, LWF and ELCJHL)	December 9th, 2014	6.6.
201	Bedömningsunderlag HUM 2014-2016 / DSPR partner / project assessment	7/07/2014	1.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 3.2, 4.3, 4.6, 6.5,

			8.4, 8.7,
202	ACT Palestine Forum Annual Meeting, Gaza (28/09 to 01/10, 2014)	29/10/2014	6.2, 6.3, 6.4
203	Månadsrapport november 2014 (monthly report from Palestine Liaison Officer).		1.1, 2.5
204	Church of Sweden's Procurement regulation for partners		9.6
205	Middle East Council of Churches DSPR Financial Management and procedure manual.		9.1, 9.5; 9.6
206	Ministry of Interior Procedures for NGOs located in Gaza Strip		9.1, 9.6
207	Church of Sweden partner capacity building framework (draft)		3.3, 3.7.b
208	Swedish church fund handpicks sustainable investment opportunities		9.2
209	Psychosocial Roster: Purpose and Management	06/02/2015	2.2., 8.4,
210	Resepolicy för Svenska kyrkan på nationell nivå Beslutad av kyrkostyrelsen	10/12/2008	9.6
210	Deployments from CoS Psychosocial Roster Roles and responsibilities International HR coordinator/PAL, HUM team Programme Officers and HUM team Psychosocial Advisers		2.6, 8.4, 8.6
211	Servicecenters arbete med miljö och hållbarhet	03/03/2015	9.6.b
212	From Praying for Peace to Making Peace. A real time Evaluation of the impact of Church of Sweden's community based psychosocial capacity building contribution to the project Continuation of Assistance to Ivorian Refugees in Liberia, March 2012 to February 2013.		2.5, 7.4, 7.5
213	Temporary employment based on collective agreement, Psychosocial Specialist (Malawi)	17/02/2015	8.6, 8.7
214	Grant Thornton Audit	2012	9.3
215	Appeal Management Routines – Humanitarian Team	16/10/2014	2.2, 2.6, 8.4
216	Measuring advocacy impact: Case study of a capacity building programme (INTRAC – International NGO Training and Research Center).		7.6
217	Field program monitoring report / LWF Mauritania	Jan 13-21, 2012	2.5, 6.6, 7.2
218	Partnerkonsultation för Östra Afrika 2 (13-14 nov. 2012)	20/11/2012	6.6
219	Rev landlista Fokuseringen: 2014 – framåt / Phase-out process list of countries	27/08/2013	3.4, 2.6
220	Role description for Church of Sweden Liaison Officers	23/10/2014	2.6, 8.4, 8.6,
221	Uppförandekod		
222	Guide to Partnership - How the Church of Sweden works with partner and project support in order to be a change agent	14/04/2013	
223	Guidelines for handling complaints, international mission and diaconia	10/02/2012	
224	Annex 1: Format for making complaints		
225	Agricultural Development for Poverty reduction and Sustainable Development.	03/12/2013	9.4
226	Church of Sweden's position on Climate change and development	13/01/2011	9.4
227	Policy paper on goals and targets in the Swedish National climate policy.	05/01/2011	9.4

B. Audit Schedule

Agency	Church of Sweden (Svenska Kyrkan)
Location	CENTRAL OFFICE Postal address: 751 70 Uppsala Visiting address: Syslomansgatan 4 phone: +46 18-16 95 00 www.svenskakyrkan.se
Dates	Feb. 25-27, 2015
Auditors	Claire Boulanger, Lead Auditor Telephone : + 33 59 67 84 10 Skype : claire-boulanger
Contact details	Maria Möller Policy Advisor Organisational Development, HAP focal point International Department e-mail: maria.moller@svenskakyrkan.se telephone: +46-18-169560 mobilephone: +46-703484150 fax : +46-18-169799 skype: cosmariamoller

Day One: Wednesday, February 25, 2015			
Time	Interviewees	Location	Auditor Notes
8:15 – 9:00	Meeting with Maria Möller		Checking last details for audit
9:00 – 9:30	Opening meeting	Matsalen	
9:45 – 10:30	Erik Lysén, Director of International Affairs	Sparven Plan 4	
10:30 - 11:15	Per Lindmark HR	Sparven Plan 4	
11:15 – 12:00	Gunnar Sjöberg Director of Communication, Department of Communication	Sparven Plan 4	
12:15 – 12:45	Lunch		
13:00 – 13:45	Carolina Grelsson Coordinator, Organisational Development	Sparven Plan 4	
13:45 – 14:30	Malin Canslätt Programme Officer	Sparven Plan 4	
14:30 – 15:15	Maria Möller Policy Adviser, Quality Assurance	Sparven Plan 4	
15:15 – 16:00	Anette Nilsson Director, International Finance	Sparven Plan 4	
16:00 – 16:45	Annika Davidsson Controller, Internal Audit	Sparven Plan 4	
17:00	Day 1 ends		
Day Two: Thursday, February 26, 2015			
9:00 – 9:45	Margarete Carlineus Chairperson of the international committee and ice chair for the Church of Sweden Board.	Sparven Plan 4	
9:45 – 10:30	Urban Jorméus Director Fundraising & Mobilization	Sparven Plan 4	
10:30 – 11:15	Eva Olsson Coordinator, International Human Resources	Sparven Plan 4	
11:15 – 12:00	Marina Kalisky Psychosocial Adviser	Sparven Plan 4	

12:00 – 12:45	Eva Ekelund Team leader Africa	Sparven Plan 4	
13:00 - 13:30	Lunch		
13:45 – 14:30	Carina Björnlund Policy Adviser	Sparven Plan 4	
14:30 – 15:15	Anna Garvander Team Leader Humanitarian Response	Sparven Plan 4	
15:15 – 16:00	Johan Hasselgren Programme Officer	Sparven Plan 4	
16:00 – 16:45	Gunilla Hallonsten Policy Director	Sparven Plan 4	
17:00	Day 2 ends		
Day three : Friday, February 27, 2015			
8.15 – 9.00	Per Söderberg Policy Adviser	Svalan Plan 4	
9:00 – 9:45	Maria Lundberg International Programme Director	Svalan Plan 4	
9:45 – 10:30	Erik Apelgårdh Team Leader Middle East	Svalan Plan 4.	
10:30 – 11:15	Tina Sandkvist Programme Officer, Humanitarian Response	Svalan Plan 4	
11:15 – 12:00	Sofia Nordenmark Policy Adviser	Svalan Plan 4	
12:00 – 12:45	JP Mogheti Heath Policy Adviser	Svalan Plan 4	
12:45 – 13:15	Lunch		
13:15 – 14:00	Nicklas Fahlgren Team leader Latin America	Utbildningsins titutet Room 106	
14:00 – 14:15	Auditor's work	Utbildningsins titutet Room 106	
14:15 – 15:00	Closing meeting	Utbildningsins titutet Room 108	
15:15 – 16:15	Security brief	Utbildningsins titutet Room 106	
16:15 – 16:45	Auditor's work	Utbildningsins titutet Room 106	
17:00	Day 3 ends		

Verification Schedule in Israel / Palestine

Agency	Church of Sweden (Svenska Kyrkan)		
Location	Jerusalem		
Dates	March 4 – 11, 2015		
Auditors	Claire Boulanger Lead Auditor Telephone : + 33 59 67 84 10 Skype : claire-boulanger		
Contact details	Ulrika Persson LIAISON OFFICER MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL DEPARTMENT E-MAIL: ulrika.persson@svenskakyrkan.se SKYPE: ulrikapersa MOBILE PHONE SWEDEN: +46-768-00 01 70 MOBILE PHONE JORDAN: +962-798-72 38 16		
Accommodation March 4-11	Notre Dame Guest House, Jerusalem Paratroopers Road #3, P.O.Box 20531, Jerusalem 91204, Israel T: +972 (0)2 627 9130, F: +972 (0)2 627 1995 Jamal Kafiety, Reservations Manager Email: jkafiety@notredamecenter.org		
Questions before March 7th	If there should be any questions or concerns before Ulrika arrive Jerusalem, please contact : Carin Gardbring the Swedish Theological Institute Prophet Street 58, Jerusalem carin.gardbring@svenskakyrkan.se , tel +972-2-625 38 22 mob +972-52-528 5313.		
Day One: Wednesday, March 4, 2015 – Arrival			
Time	Interviewees	Location	Auditor Notes
18:00	Claire Arrives Jerusalem	Notre Dame	
Day Two: Thursday, March 5, 2015			
Time	Interviewees	Location	Auditor Notes
Day Three: Friday, March 6, 2015 – Security Briefing and talk to Church of Sweden Representative			
Time	Interviewees	Location	Auditor Notes
10:00-11:00	Security briefing by Yara Atallah +972-54-873 63 69	JIC-office Old City (just a ten minutes walk from the hotel, a map will be available for you in the Notre Dame reception)	
11:00-14:00	Optional Tour and lunch with Ms. Anna Hjälms in the Old City. Anna is seconded by the CoS to the World Council of Churches	Anna has her office in the JIC-office Old City anna.hjalm@svenskakyrkan.se +972-54-7715881	
16 :00 – 18 :00	Meeting with Ulrika Persson (Liaison officer)	Notre Dame	
19-00 – 21 :00	Dinner with Ulrika Persson		
Day Four: Saturday, March 7, 2015 – Lutheran World Federation/World Service, Vocational Training Program			
Time	Interviewees	Location	Auditor Notes

8:30-9:00	Quick tour in the center and introduction	VTC Beit Hanina	
9:00-10:00	Management team and some staff (VTP Director, VTC Deputy Director and VTC admin and HR assistant)	VTC Beit Hanina	
10:00-11:00	VTC Beit Hanina trainees	VTC Beit Hanina	
11:00-12:00	Break and departure to Ramallah Center		
12:00-12:30	Tour in the VTCR	VTC Ramallah	
12:30-13:30	VTC Ramallah trainees and graduates	VTC Ramallah	
13:30-15:30	Lunch and summarizing of the day with the VTP director		
15 :30 – 16 :30	Travel back to Jerusalem		
16:30 – 19:00	Auditor's work	RHR HO Jerusalem	
Day Five: Sunday, February March 8, 2015 – Rabbis for Human Rights			
9:00-10:00	Meeting with RHR Administrative and management staff	RHR HO Jerusalem	
10:00-10:30	Travel with Rabbi Yehiel Grenimann and translator Nasser Elkadi to the Jahalin Beduin Community		
10:30-11:00	Meet with Ibtisam Hirsch, coordinator of the arts and crafts center and community library	Jahalin Beduin Community	
11:00-11:15	Travel to Anata		
11:15-11:45	Meet with Abu Suleiman – representative of the Jahalin community	Anata	
11:45-12:15	Travel back to RHR HO		
12:15-13:15	Lunch		
13:15-13:45	Travel to Naif (near the settlement of Nokdim) with Rabbi Arik Ascherman and translator Nasser Elkadi.		
13:45-14:30	Meet with Naif community	Naif	
14:30-15:15	Travel to Susya		
15:15-16:00	Meet with Susya residents	Susya	
16:00-17:15	Travel back to RHR office		
18:30	Meeting with Carin Gardbring over dinner	Place to be decided	
Day Six: Monday, March 9, 2015 - Lutheran World Federation/World Service, Augusta Victoria Hospital			
9:00-10:30	Tour of the Hospital, meeting with cancer and dialyses patients.	AVH	
10:30-11:30	Discussion with CEO on Hospital compliance and accreditation	AVH	
11:30-13:30	Disussion and record review with senior management, finance and staff	AVH	
14:00 – 15:00	Lunch		
15:00 – 16:30	Auditor's work		
16:30 – 18:30	Work with Liaison Officer	Hotel Notre Dame	
19:00 – 21:30	Meet with DSPR Executive Director and Finance Manager	Hotel Notre Dame	
Day Seven: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 – DSPR Gaza			
7:30-09:00	Travel from Jerusalem to Erez	Gaza	
9:30-11 :00	Meet with focus groups at Family Health care Center DSPR Gaza will arrange with translator.	Gaza	

11 :00 – 11 :30	Interview with chief nurse	Gaza	
11 :45 - 12 :15	Interview with psychosocial coordinator	Gaza	
12:30-13:30	Meet with Executive Director / Finance / and Health Coordinator	Head Office Gaza	
14:00 - 15:30	Lunch with ED / finance and health coordinator		
15:30 – 19:30	Auditor’s work		
20 :00 – 22 :00	Dinner with ED + DSPR partner		
Day Eight: Wednesday, March 11,			
Time	Interviewees	Location	Auditor Notes
7 :30	Interview with DSPR finance manager	DSPR HO	
8 :15	Interview with DSPR Health coordinator		
9 :00	Meet with focus groups VTC Sheja’a DSPR Gaza will arrange with translator.		
11 :30	Cross point Erez		
13:00	Claire leaves for the Air Port		

C. Attendance sheets for opening and closing meetings

To be inserted

D. List of Acronyms

ACT – Action of Churches Together

CBPS – Community Based Psychosocial support

CoS – Church of Sweden

CRM – Complaints response mechanism

IASC – Inter-Agency Standing Committee

LRR – Linking Relief and Rehabilitation

PMER – Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

RBA - Rights Based Approach