



VERIFICATION AGAINST THE CORE  
HUMANITARIAN STANDARD ON  
QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

**CHRISTIAN AID**

Date: 2016-02-08

## 1. General Information

<b>Organisation Name:</b>	Christian Aid	<b>Verification Ref / No:</b>	ChristianAid-2015-11-20
<b>Type of organisation:</b> <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		<b>Organisation Mandate:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy  <b>Verified Mandate(s)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	
<b>Organisation size:</b> <i>(Total number of programme sites/ members/partners)</i>	UK staff: 502 Overseas staff: 397 Programme Sites: 30 Countries CA work in: 44 Partners: 422	<b>Legal Registration:</b> <i>(NGO, Church, etc)</i>	NGO
<b>Head Office Location:</b>	London, UK	<b>Field locations verified:</b>	Malawi, Haiti
<b>Date of Head Office Verification:</b>	07 – 09.10.2015	<b>Date of Field Verification:</b>	Malawi: 12 - 15.10.2015 Haiti: 10 – 12.11.2015
<b>Lead auditor</b>	Claire Goudsmit	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Auditor</b> <i>(indicate if Trainee)</i>	Philip Miller <i>(trainee)</i>
		<b>Observer's Name and Position</b>	

## 2. Verification scope

 Third party verification

 Mid term Audit

 Certification audit

 Recertification audit

## 3. Schedule summary

### 3.1 Audit Schedule

<b>Name of Programme sites /partners verified</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Mandate</b>	<b>Number of projects visited</b>	<b>Type of projects</b>
Head Office	London, UK			
Emmanuel International (EI) – meeting with partner staff and community visit	Lake Chiuta, Malawi	Development	1	<b>Fisheries Integration of Society and Habitats (FISH)</b> Sustainable fisheries and livelihoods
EAGLES – meeting with partner staff and community visit	Chikwawa, Malawi	Humanitarian, Development	1	<b>ECRP</b> Strengthening the resilience and wealth of communities through improved food security, disaster preparedness and access to markets.
Groupe d'Appui aux Réfugiés et Rapatriés (GARR) – meeting with partner staff and community visit	Belladaire, Haiti	Humanitarian, Development	1	<b>Recovery and rehabilitation and livelihoods</b> Support to vulnerable IDPs and repatriated victims of violence and from earthquake

Mission Sociale Des Eglises Haitiennes (MISSEH) – meeting with partner staff and community visit	Ballan, Haiti	Humanitarian, Development	1	<b>Tree planting, access to resources</b> Land and shelter rights advocacy linked to environmental protection (Plants nursery), house construction, disaster risk reduction and emergency response, cash for work reforestation and terracing.
--	---------------	---------------------------	---	--

### 3.2 Opening and closing meetings:

#### 1) At HO

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting
<b>Location</b>	London, UK	London
<b>Date</b>	07.09.2015	15.12.2015
<b>Number of participants</b>	3	5
<b>Any substantive issue arising</b>		limited PSEA, Code of Conduct (and in partnership), risks highlighted and acknowledged.

#### 2) At PS

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting
<b>Location</b>	Lilongwe, Malawi	Lilongwe, Malawi
<b>Date</b>	13.10.2015	15.10.2015
<b>Number of participants</b>	8	4
<b>Any substantive issue arising</b>	Regional management meeting taking place so a number of managers absent for the audit	
<b>Location</b>	Port Au Prince, Haiti	Port Au Prince
<b>Date</b>	10.11.2015	12.11.2015
<b>Number of participants</b>	1	3
<b>Any substantive issue arising</b>	Post-election protests/random violence potential to disrupt field visits	

## 4. Recommendation

In our opinion, *Christian Aid* conforms to the commitments of the Core Humanitarian Standard. We recommend certification.

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

**Auditor's  
Name and  
Signature**

Claire Goudsmit



**Date and  
Place:**

19 December 2015,  
UK

## 5. Background information on the organisation

### 5.1 General:

Christian Aid, established shortly after World War II in response to the needs of European refugees who'd lost everything, believes that poverty was created by human systems and can be ended by human action through partnerships bringing together a global movement of individuals and organisations. CA's work is founded on Christian Faith and hope and through a practical love and care for its neighbours, acts to change an unjust world through charity. CA is mandated by 41 sponsoring churches in England and Ireland to work on relief, development and advocacy for poverty eradication. CA's essential purpose is to expose the scandal of poverty, to help in practical ways to root it out from the world and to challenge and change structures and systems that favour the rich and powerful over the poor and marginalised. While helping vulnerable groups to meet their immediate needs through relief and build long-term security through development, Christian Aid supports communities in claiming their rights to end poverty and bring about changes into the systems, through advocacy actions.

CA works with local partner organisations across Latin America and the Caribbean (10 countries), Africa (15 countries), the Middle East (5 countries) and Asia (7 countries). Christian Aid is a key member of the ACT Alliance, a coalition of 100 churches and church-related organisations. It is one of the largest international networks channelling food aid, shelter, water, sanitation and poverty reduction programmes in the world's poorest countries.

CA follows its values of: love and solidarity; dignity and respect; justice and equality; cooperation and partnership and accountability and stewardship. Christian Aid's 2012-2018 strategic plan: 'Partnership for Change: the power to end poverty', defines global level challenges and outlines the need for a shift in power to end poverty, with 3 goals for empowerment: resilient and thriving societies, equity and sustainability, and just power relationships. In order to achieve these goals, CA's strategic change objectives are: power to change institutions, the right to essential services, fair shares in a constraint world, equality for all, tackling violence and building peace.

Christian Aid has been working in Malawi for almost 20 years focusing on resilience, disaster risk response and health, including maternal and child health and HIV treatment and prevention. With its partners, CA supports vulnerable communities to improve health and build resilience by participating in and influencing development. The programme's current strategy focuses on scaling up proven effective approaches to improving food security and resilience - promoting climate resilient farming technologies and better, more competitive market systems for smallholder farmers; health to remote areas and supporting communities advocating for improved access to services delivery. CA currently works with 18 programme partners with a 2015 annual country budget of approximately £4,297,000.

CA has supported partners on the island of Hispaniola since the 1980s, working with Haitians, Dominicans and Haitian migrants and their descendants who were often – and continue to be – excluded from state support in both countries. CA established its office in 1997 and one in Santo Domingo in 2007 working on agriculture, human rights and health, including HIV, climate change, human rights in prisons, tax and budget monitoring and

corruption with the most poor and marginalised, regardless of race, nationality or gender. CA and its partners responded widely to the earthquake in 2010 supporting the country to rebuild and move on after the disaster. CA currently works in Haiti with 17 programme partners with a 2015 annual country budget of approximately £1,440,000.

## 5.2 Organisational structure and management system:

The board of trustees of Christian Aid meets six times a year and consists of a Chair; a nominee from each of the national committees for Wales and Scotland; the Chair of Christian Aid Ireland; a nominee of Churches Together in Britain and Ireland (CTBI); and up to 15 other trustees appointed by the members (the sponsoring churches in Britain and Ireland). The board delegates certain functions to committees of trustees, including a nominations and procedures committee; an audit and risk committee; a finance, fundraising and investment committee, a human resources and strategy committee; and a remuneration committee.

Reporting to the Board of Trustees, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) leads the Directorate made up of 5 directors: Policy and Public Affairs, Finance and Operations, Strategy and People Management, Supporter and Community Partnerships and International Country Managers and Representatives have responsibility for staff in country, annual country budgets, financial control, programme and partnership development and local coordination. Country Representatives report to the Regional Representative and attend quarterly management meetings. The Head of the Humanitarian Division has ultimate decision-making authority in regards to how and when CA responds to emergencies, but local level responses using CA funding are managed by the Country Teams, DEC Appeals are directed by the Director of CA as trustee of the DEC with the Head of Humanitarian Division, and ACT appeals are managed by country and regional emergency managers, with the Head of Humanitarian Division.

CA's information and project management system consists of MIS and PROMISE, CA's intranet portal comprising thematic areas, partner information, financial and project reporting and monitoring information.

## 5.3 Certification or verification history:

<p>June 2009 - HAP 2007 Certification Audit: Head Office, London and Dublin Programme sites: Burkina Faso and India</p>	<p>June 2011 HAP Mid-Term Progress Audit (MTPA): Head Office, London Programme Site: Tajikistan</p>
<p>March 2012 - HAP 2010 Re-Certification Audit: Head Office, London Programme Sites: Bangladesh and Ghana</p>	<p>2013: People in Aid kite mark (certification)</p>

## 6. Sampling

### 6.1 Rationale for sampling:

A number of countries and country programmes were shortlisted based on factors that would make them relevant to visit, including level of security, scope of programming (development and humanitarian), volume of partners and projects, size of country budget and the accessibility to project sites within audit timescale. The programme sites initially selected were Brazil, Malawi and Sierra Leone. Malawi was approved with CA but Brazil could not accommodate the audit at this time (the whole team were engaged in the coordination of a large-scale regional partner meeting). Therefore, Myanmar and Haiti were selected as similar size programmes and in a different geographical area to Malawi. Myanmar was experiencing insecurity due to local unrest and it was not advisable for the audit to take place at this time, therefore the Haiti programme would offer a reasonable comparison and sample of CA's work in terms of its: overall country office size; number of partners; types and variety of programming; and geographical, social and political context within which CA operate.

The two programmes thus selected to be visited as part of the audit were:

- **Malawi:** established office, considered to be a large programme with £4,297,000 annual budget, 19 staff, 18 partners and wide ranging portfolio of 23 projects covering development, humanitarian and advocacy work. In terms of access, CA rated Malawi as 2 in terms of UN/HAP security, indicating very low probability of restricted access to the country office and field level due to insecurity. The country programme was not previously audited by HAP.
- **Haiti:** well-established office, 17 staff, 17 partners, a range of projects with an annual budget of £1,442,000. Security was rated 3, and post-election disruptions prevented some restrictions on movement during the audit. The country programme has not previously been audited by HAP.

It is important to note that the audit findings are based on the results of a sample of CA's documentation and systems and interviews with a sample of CA staff, partners and communities. Findings are drawn from information gained from conversations with a sample of staff at Head Office London and the two selected Country Programmes, a sample of the partners and of their staff involved in the two selected Country Programmes, and a sample of the communities involved in the selected partners' projects. Findings are analysed to determine CA's systematic approach and application of all aspects of the CHS across its organisation and to its different ways of working.

In the case of this audit, it is recognised that one partner is not a direct partner of CA and the project is implemented through a consortium of agencies, which creates a dissonance between CA, the implementing partner and the community, and might affect the overall findings. However, it remains valid and important for CA to make decisions as to how it will apply the CHS in contexts similar to this.

## 6.2 Visited sites:

<b>Name of Programme sites /partners verified</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Mandate</b>	<b>Number of projects visited</b>	<b>Type of projects</b>
<b>Malawi</b>				
Emmanuel International (EI) (Consortium partner)	Lake Chiuta	Development	1	<b>Fisheries Integration of Society and Habitats (FISH)</b> Sustainable fisheries and livelihoods and co-management best practices, strengthening the resilience and wealth of communities through improved food security, disaster preparedness and access to markets.
EAGLES	Chikwawa	Humanitarian, Development	1	<b>ECRP</b> Strengthening the resilience and wealth of communities through improved food security, disaster preparedness and access to markets.
<b>Haiti</b>				
Groupe d'Appui aux Réfugiés et Rapatriés (GARR)	Belladaire	Humanitarian, Development	1	<b>Recovery and rehabilitation and livelihoods</b> Support to vulnerable IDPs and repatriated victims of violence and from earthquake with house construction, livelihoods support, training and access to resources.
Mission Sociale Des Eglises Haitiennes (MISSEH)	Ballan	Humanitarian, Development	1	<b>Tree planting, access to resources</b> Land and shelter rights advocacy linked to environmental protection (Plants nursery), house construction, disaster risk reduction and emergency response, cash for work reforestation and terracing. Alternative livelihoods i.e. tools for sustainable farming instead of charcoal production.

### 6.3 Interviews:

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

Type of people interviewed	Number of people interviewed		
	Head Office	Programme site (Malawi)	Programme site (Haiti)
CA Management	18	2	3
CA Staff	14	5	2
Partners		4 (EI = 2 + EAGLES = 2)	10
Community members			4 (GARR)
	32	11	28
Total number of interviews	71		

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

Type of Group	Number of participants	
	Female	Male
<b>Malawi</b>		
<i>Community members (inc. Community leaders and mobilisers)</i>	8 (EI) + 10 (EAGLES)	24 (EI) + 12 (EAGLES)
<b>Haiti</b>		
<i>Community members (inc. Community leaders and mobilisers)</i>	10 (MISSEH)	12 (MISSEH)
Total number of participants	76	

## 7. Summary

### 7.2 Summary by criterion:

#### 1. Humanitarian assistance is appropriate and relevant

The assistance provided by CA is appropriate and relevant. This is ensured through systematic contextual analysis, which leads to appropriate design and subsequent review of programmes. Whilst policies ensure impartial assistance based on needs, impartiality is not systematically assured in the design process.

#### 2. Humanitarian response is effective and timely

CA's humanitarian responses are effective and timely. Programme designs are realistic, decisions are made so as to not cause delays, unmet needs are mostly referred to other organisations, programme monitoring is leading to adaptation and poor performances being addressed, and there is a degree of consistency between programme commitments and CA's capacities. CA has evaluation policies for its international and humanitarian programming. However, HAP and CHS standards are not being fully integrated across CA programming notably in regards to the protection of communities, especially marginalised groups, and the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA)

#### 3. Humanitarian response strengthens local capacities and avoids negative effects

CA undertakes humanitarian responses, which strengthen local capacities but does not do enough to ensure negative effects are avoided. Generally CA builds programmes upon local capacities and an understanding of risks and hazards, longer term positive effects are planned for, early recovery and the local economy is promoted, and systems are in place to protect personal information collected from communities. However, CA does not have thorough systems in place to manage and reduce the risks of sexual exploitation and abuse.

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

Participation of, and feedback from, people affected by crisis is well promoted by CA although there are gaps in Christian Aid's communication systems. CA uses languages that are widely understood and formats to promote broad understanding amongst communities, has policies for sharing information and engaging communities, and encourages feedback from people affected by crisis about their satisfaction. However CA does not ensure that information about CA or its partners is systematically provided to communities.

#### 5. Complaints are welcomed and addressed

Whilst Christian Aid is open to complaints in principle, Christian Aid does not methodically provide opportunities for communities to lodge complaints, especially complaints in regards to sexual exploitation and abuse, and ensure these are addressed

#### 6. Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary

Christian Aid has firm commitments and processes in place to ensure communities receive coordinated and complimentary assistance. CA methodically identifies different stakeholders, shares information and coordinates with them, engages with local and national authorities, and its relationships with partners are governed by consistent agreements.

#### 7. Humanitarian actors continuously learn and improve

Christian Aid has policy commitments to undertake regular reviews and evaluations of all its programmes. It has processes in place, which encourage and facilitate learning, leading in turn to improved assistance for people affected by crisis. CA has systems in place to share knowledge throughout the organisation, draws on experiences in the design of programming, draws learning through its M&E systems, and shares this to strengthen the humanitarian sector more broadly. However, CA does not always share learning with the communities it works with.

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

Christian Aid support staff to do their job effectively and they are treated fairly and equitably. The values of CA are made known to its staff through human resources and performance management systems are in place across the organisation. Staff development processes are in place to ensure staff have the capacities to fulfil their roles, and there are clear organisational commitments to the well-being of the CA staff. Although a code of conduct is in place for staff, CA does not have processes in place to ensure all staff are aware of it and understand how it applies to them. CA does not work with partners on establishing that staff codes of conduct are in place.

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

Christian Aid has systems in place to ensure its resources are managed and used responsibly for their intended purpose. CA designs and implements programmes to promote efficiency, has systems in place to check that resources are used for their intended purpose, monitor their expenditure, and manage the risk of corruption. CA takes its environmental policy seriously and considers its impact on the environment not only in its programming but throughout the organisation.

## 7.2 Summary of non conformities

Non compliance	MINOR	Time for resolution
Commitment 1	<b>1.2:</b> CA does not assure that programmes are based on impartial assessment of the needs and risks of the community involved in all projects.	<b>18 months</b>
	<b>1.5:</b> CA does not routinely and systematically collect disaggregated data, taking into account the diversity of communities, including disadvantaged or marginalised people	<b>18 months</b>
Commitment 2	<b>2.4:</b> CHS (HAP) protection and PSEA standards are not used in the planning and assessment of all programmes, especially for non-humanitarian programmes	<b>1 year</b>
Commitment 3	<b>3.3a:</b> CA does not fully enable first responders to perform their role	<b>2 years</b>
	<b>3.3b:</b> Programmes do not systematically promote an appropriate representation of marginalised and disadvantaged groups	<b>18 months</b>
	<b>3.6a:</b> CA does not systematically identify the potential or actual unintended negative effects on people's safety and of sexual exploitation and abuse by CA or partners staff.	<b>1 year</b>
	<b>3.7:</b> CA does not routinely assure robust protection and PSEA mechanisms are in place at the partner level	<b>2 years</b>

Commitment 4	<b>4.1:</b> Information is not systematically provided to communities and people affected by crisis about the organisation, the principles it adheres to, the expected behaviours of staff, its programmes and deliverables	<b>2 years</b>
	<b>4.3:</b> Inclusive representation is not ensured at all stages of the work	<b>18 months</b>
Commitment 5	<b>5.1:</b> Communities and people affected by crisis are not systematically consulted on the design, implementation and monitoring of complaint-handling processes.	<b>2 years</b>
	<b>5.2a:</b> CA does not clearly communicate or ensure that communities are informed of how relevant stakeholders can access its complaint mechanism and the scope of issues it can address.	<b>2 years</b>
	<b>5.3b:</b> CA does not ensure complaint-handling mechanisms routinely prioritise the safety of stakeholders.	<b>2 years</b>
	<b>5.4:</b> Complaint handling processes are not in place for communities in all country programmes.	<b>1 year</b>
	<b>5.6:</b> CA does not systematically ensure that communities are aware of the expected behaviour of its staff or commitments to PSEA.	<b>1 year</b>
Commitment 6		
Commitment 7	<b>7.3:</b> CA does not systematically share learning emanating from the programme with communities, government and other external stakeholders	<b>18 months</b>
Commitment 8	<b>8.1a:</b> The Code of Conduct and Child Protection and Vulnerable Adults Policy are not thoroughly covered in induction processes, some staff are not fully aware of these or their implications.	<b>1 year</b>
	<b>8.1b:</b> Not all components of the CHS are fully integrated into staff induction and performance management processes.	<b>1 year</b>
	<b>8.7a:</b> CA does not systematically assure that partners have a code of conduct in place for its staff.	<b>2 years</b>
	<b>8.7b:</b> CA does not systematically assure that staff fully understand its code of conduct and Child Protection and Vulnerable Adults policy and how they apply to them.	<b>1 year</b>
Commitment 9		
<b>TOTAL Number</b>	<b>19</b>	

### 7.3 Major strengths and weaknesses

Christian Aid's vision is to build a global community in order to effect sustainable change, which is underpinned by its strategic focus on shifting power and its commitments to working in partnership. Christian Aid's (CA) working approaches stem from these and promote the development of strong partnerships with all its stakeholders: with individuals (i.e. its staff, partner staff); and with other entities and organisations (i.e. national governments and institutions, programme partners, peer organisations, ACT Alliance members). Corporately, CA has a strong engagement with the development of international quality and accountability standards and initiatives (i.e. BOND, SCHR, DEC, HAP, CHS, DFID PPA), which facilitates how CA interprets and understands its obligations to transparency and accountability to all its stakeholders. CA has gone a long way to integrate these into its programme approaches, and its resource and project management tools.

In having established partnerships with local partners and effective networks (i.e. ACT Alliance, START Network) CA is in a strong position in relation to the CHS whereby it can: build on and develop local capacities; have on-going well-informed analyses of the contexts where it works; provide interventions that are appropriate to and address local needs and vulnerabilities; mobilise local resources for front-line responders in humanitarian emergencies in a timely way; and learn from and with peer organisations and partners in order to improve practice.

However, CA's relationship with communities and people affected by injustice and disaster is reliant on its partners' ways of working, the context where they work and their capacity to engage with communities. Although CA does ensure partnerships are based on an understanding of shared values and CA supports partners to strengthen their capacity, some components of good accountability are not assured unless there has been a specific focus on accountability or HAP, either by the partner or by CA directly. This is generally the case where CA has a humanitarian programme focus or has responded to a large-scale emergency, for example in Haiti, and CA has provided HAP training. Where programmes focus more on development, for example the Malawi Country Programme, HAP training has not been routinely delivered to all staff and partners or integrated fully into all programmes. Where CA works in a consortium, its ability to influence and assure accountability (to the partners and to communities) is a challenge, which was noticeable during the audit visit to FISH project partner and communities in Malawi. Not all the CHS sub-commitments are integrated into CA project management and monitoring tools and capacity strengthening assessments. The core weaknesses identified are in regards to how CA works with its partners to systematically assure that: the vulnerabilities, risks and capacities are identified for all community members involved in programme activities; marginalised groups are included at all stages of a project; the protection of communities and individuals is prioritised and that all programmes are designed to ensure that its actions do no harm to people.

## 7.4 Partners

CA has worked with a number of partners on the HAP standard and on power and gender analysis in its programming, which provides a strong basis from which CA can integrate the CHS commitments into its work. Given how recently CHS was launched, in general partners had limited knowledge of the standards. However, CA has already introduced the CHS to its partners in Haiti and training is planned for 2016. CA criteria for selecting its partners is based on their approach to community-based and community-led programming, which provides CA with access to and the knowledge of communities that would otherwise be difficult to achieve.

CA is committed to strengthening the capacity of its partners to support them to achieve their organisational goals and objectives, to uphold agreed shared values and principles and operate effectively, and provide good support through its country teams. Partner capacity assessments are conducted with all partners and plans to address gaps are put in place. These cover: governance, leadership and organisational management; project planning and management; financial management and reporting; personnel management; procurement and asset management, and risk management. How support is provided is partner-led, and CA facilitates their needs as appropriate, either from within the organisation or by funding third party services. Capacity development plans are integrated into Country Programme budgets and partner programme proposals. CA's capacity to systematically monitor the delivery of each partners' work and to measure this at the community level is limited due to partner autonomy and the large number of communities CA reach through its projects. Therefore, how CA integrates components of the CHS into its programme proposal development and monitoring processes with partners, its programming guidance and training tools, and how it identifies and measures risks to communities of its and its partners' actions, are key to moving forward.

## 8. Decision

Quality Control by: Elissa Goucem	Quality Control finalised on: First Draft: PH 2015-12-24 Final: EG 2015-09-15
<b>Certification Decision</b>	<b>Date: 21 March, 2016</b>

<b>Certification Decision</b>	
Certification	Intermediate audit
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified <input type="checkbox"/> Not certified (Major CARs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance of certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Suspension of Certificate (Major CARs)

Pierre Hauselmann  
Executive Director

