**DANISH REFUGEE COUNCIL
CHS CERTIFICATION REPORT**

DRC- CER - 2017 -008

Date: 2017-06-20

Table of Contents

1.   General information

Organisation Name:	Danish Refugee Council	Verification Ref / No:	DRC- CER - 2017 - 008
Type of organisation: ☐ National ☒ International ☐ Federated ☐ Membership/Network ☒ Direct assistance ☒ Through partners		**Organisation Mandate:** ☒ Humanitarian ☒ Development ☒ Advocacy **Verified Mandate(s)** ☒ Humanitarian ☐ Development ☒ Advocacy	
Organisation size: (Total number of programme sites/ members/partners – Number of staff at HO level)	Implementation through partners was 6.6% of international turnover (2016).	Programme Site sampled:	Uganda and Ukraine
Head Office Location:	Copenhagen, Denmark	Field locations verified:	Uganda and Ukraine
Date of Head Office visit:	03 – 05/05/2017	Date of Programme Site visit:	Uganda: 08-12/05/2017 Ukraine: 15-19/05/2017
Lead Auditor:	Claire Goudsmit	Second auditor:	Birgit Spiewok

2.   Scope

☒ Initial audit   ☐ Mid-term Audit

☐ Maintenance audit   ☐ Final/Recertification audit

3.   Schedule summary

3.2   Verification Schedule

Name of Programme sites/members/partners verified	Location	Mandate (Humanitarian, Development, Advocacy)	Number of projects visited	Type of projects
DRC Uganda Community Empowerment for Rural Development (CEFORD)	Kampala, Aura, Adjumani	Humanitarian	3	Emergency Assistance Protection Livelihoods
DRC Ukraine Mariopul Youth Union Kiev Ministry for Internally Displaced Persons Kiev Emergency State Services	Kiev, Mariopul	Humanitarian DDG Capacity Building	2	Legal Aid Livelihoods Shelter Youth Development

3.2   Opening and closing meetings

3.2.1   At Head Office:

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting
Date	03/05/2017	05/05/2017
Location	Copenhagen	Copenhagen
Number of participants	48	26
Any substantive issue arising	none	none

3.2.2   At Programme Sites:

	Opening meeting	Closing meeting	
Date	08/06/2017	13/06/2017	
Location	Kampala, Uganda	Skype	
Number of participants	12	2	
Any substantive issue arising	Situation in Arua area of large-scale influx of S. Sudanese refugees / DRC's Corproate Emergency response		
Date	14/05/2017	17/05/2017	19/05/2017
Location	Mariopul	Mariopul	Kiev
Number of participants	3	18	6
Any substantive issue arising	none	none	none

4.   Recommendation

In our opinion the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) conforms to the requirements of the Core Humanitarian Standard. We recommend certification.

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

Lead Auditor's Name and Signature	Claire Goudsmit	Date and UK, Place:	20 June 2017 UK

5.   Background information on the organisation

5.1   General

The Danish Refugee Council is a humanitarian, non-governmental, non-profit organisation founded in 1956 by Danish organisations in order to integrate Hungarian refugees in Denmark. In 1991, DRC started its first international programme assisting forcibly displaced persons in countries of the former Yugoslavia. DRC is now operational in 40 countries (with Liberia, Ivory Coast and Guinea operations closing down in 2017). Danish Demining Group (DDG) was established in 1997 to provide efficient and community-oriented solutions to human security problems cased by mines and other explosive remnants of war. DRC and DDG united as an organisation in 2007 and is a humanitarian mine action and armed violence reduction unit within DRC operating as an integrated programme in the areas of displacement and conflict with a holistic approach to servicing humanitarian needs. DRC's key intervention sectors are: Protection, legal assistance, shelter, livelihoods and capacity building. The DDG unit key intervention sectors are: mine risk education, Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) assessment, non-technical surveys, capacity building and clearance support activities.

5.2   Organisational structure and management system

DRC is an umbrella organisation consisting of almost thirty member organisations working within the refugee context in Denmark, and some but not all members are operational in international emergency and development work. The supreme authority of DRC is the Council, which approves DRC's annual report and accounts, meets annually and elects a Chair and an Executive Committee. The Executive Committee comprises of the Chair and six members, it meets at least five times per year, appoints the Secretary General and is responsible for the management of DRC in between Council meetings. The Secretary General leads the organisational and strategic development of DRC, represents the organisation and ensures that the organisation is accountable to its stakeholders. DRC consists of four departments of which the International Department is the one where emergency and development programmes are managed. Country programmes are either part of one of four regions, which are supported by regional offices or stand alone country programmes supported directly by Head Office. The organisation has a decentralised management structure with countries being directly responsible for finance, HR, management and programme/country strategy.

5.3   Work with Partners

DRC is largely a self-implementing organisation, with approx. 6.6% (2016) of its international turnover generated through partner implementation. DRC's "seeks implementing partnerships which foster local capacity and commitment to deliver on and safeguard the rights aims to engage with local actors, including local NGOs, CBOs and public institutions as well as INGOs operating in the local context as implementing partners to provide efficient and effective delivery of humanitarian assistance.

In Implementing Partnerships, with a view to provide the organisation has recently developed a Partner Policy, which came into effect in January 2017 aiming to increase efficient and effective delivery of humanitarian assistance, while promoting local capacities. Local partners include local NGOs, INGOs, CBOs and public institutions. Partners are selected after an assessment of capacities and risks and DRC monitors the results of the interventions.

5.4   Certification or verification history

DRC's International Department and programmes' certification history is as follows:

April 2007	HAP 2007 Certification (HO Copenhagen and North Caucus Programme)
November 2008	HAP Mid-Term Progress Audit (HO Copenhagen)
May 2009	HAP Mid-Term Programme Audit (Sri Lanka Programme)
March 2010	HAP 2007 Re-Certification Audit (HO Copenhagen and Kosovo Programme)
March 2012	HAP Mid-Term Progress Audit (HO Copenhagen and Cote D'Ivoire)
June 2013	HAP 2010 Re-Certification Audit (HO Copenhagen and Lebanon Programme)

6.   Sampling

6.1   Rationale for sampling:

Staff selected for interview at the Head Office and both Country Offices were selected to represent a range of DRC/DDG staff roles and responsibilities e.g. senior management, programme management, programme support, project officers, operational and support staff.

From the information provided by DRC in the Programme Site Selection Form and by its website a number of Country Offices were shortlisted based on factors that would make them relevant and suitable to visit, including Kenya, Turkey, Uganda and Ukraine. Kenya and Turkey both presented complications in terms of access to projects in country and newness of operation. Therefore the following Country Offices were selected, which represent different operational contexts and focus areas for DRC/DDG:

Uganda – established in 1997, $10 million annual budget, 321 staff in-country, 3 implementing partners, security level 2, accessible project locations, large-scale multi-sector refugee response projects including: WASH, livelihoods, protection.

Ukraine – established in 2007, $9 million annual budget, 140 staff in-country, 6 implementing partners, security level 3, accessible project locations, range of projects including; protection, shelter, livelihoods, capacity development, DDG operations.

Projects included in the programme site audits were selected in dialogue with the DRC focal point persons at Head Office and Country Offices. Itineraries were developed to ensure that: the project locations were accessible within the set timeframe of the audit; that the different mandates and project types that the office implements were represented and that partners were available.

Disclaimer:

It is important to note that the audit findings are based on the results of a sample of the DRC's documentation and systems as well as interviews and focus groups with a sample of staff, partners, communities and other relevant stakeholders. Findings are analysed to determine the organisation's systematic approach and application of all aspects of the CHS across its organisation and to its different contexts and ways of working.

6.2   Interviews:

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

Type of people interviewed	Number of people interviewed
Head Office	26
Senior Management Group	4
Management	8
Officers	14
Programme site Uganda	24
Management	8
Staff	12
Partner organisation	4
Programme site Ukraine	32
Management	11
Staff	9
Partner organisations	7
Community members – livelihoods programme	5
Total number of interviews	82

6.2.2 Focus Group Discussions (interviews with a group >6

Type of Group	Number of participants	
	Female	Male
Uganda		
Community Group (men) - camp	-	12
Community Group (women) - camp	15	-
Community Group (leaders) - camp	4	14
Community Group (women) - camp	12	-
Community Group (youth) - camp	1	10
Community Group (farmers) - camp	11	9
Community Group (farmers) - camp	7	11
Ukraine		
Community Group - legal aid	6	1
Community Group - shelter	5	2
Youth Group	7	7
Total number of participants	68	75

7.   Report

7.1   Overall organisational performance

DRC performs well against the CHS and shows a high level of commitment to delivering on its commitments to communities and to establish strong internal quality management and control systems across its operations. DRC has been actively involved in the development of the CHS and was a previous Board member of HAP, certified against People in Aid and is partnered with ALNAP. DRC has provided training to its staff and partners on the CHS and has integrated, to some extent, the standard's commitments into its programme and operational policies and handbooks. DRC works closely with other actors at the global, country and project level and developed a strong framework for Partnership, coordination and collaboration. DRC's commitments to: decentralised management; protection and resilience; transparency; research, innovation and continual improvement; systematic financial governance and resource management; investment in staff; and establishing strong policy and quality management systems for its operations are DRC's key strengths in delivering the CHS.   However, DRC is experiencing growth and is undergoing much change and development. DRC is reviewing and updating a significant number of its policies, guidelines and systems, and introducing these to its staff across all its Country Offices, all of which present challenges in mainstreaming and resourcing systematic change. In this context, staff ability to absorb and adhere to changes can be challenged at times. Effectively sharing learning from the outcomes of DRC's project work between Country Offices is also a challenge at the organisation level. Weaknesses in DRC's support to Country Offices in some key areas of community engagement and representation, community complaints mechanisms and monitoring and evaluating community accountability systems i.e. information provision, participation and complaints handling, were also found during the audit.

7.2   Summary of non-conformities

Non-compliance	Type	Time for resolution
5.1 DRC does not consult communities and other stakeholders on the design, implementation and monitoring of its complaint handling processes.	MINOR	2 Years
5.2: DRC does not ensure that information on how to access its complaint mechanisms and their scope is consistently available to its stakeholders.	MINOR	2 Years
5.6: DRC does not ensure that communities are aware of the expected behaviours of staff, including commitments on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.	MINOR	2 Years
TOTAL Number: 3		

7.3   Strong points and areas for improvement

Commitment 1: Humanitarian assistance is appropriate and relevant

Score: 3

DRC states its commitment to humanitarian principles, including impartiality and neutrality and to assistance based on needs in its vision, values and organisational standards and ensures that adherence to these principles is considered in the selection process of implementing partners and partner collaboration.   DRC analyses current and potential future global trends and developments as a basis for its organisational strategy, develops 3-year Strategic Responses for each Country Programme and has processes in place to develop Emergency Preparedness and Risk Plans (EPRPs), although these are not implemented in all countries. DRC undertakes systematic context and stakeholders analyses to ensure programming is based on a thorough understanding of the situation in each operational area. Analyses are based on multiple sources of information and programme planning and project planning is based on impartial assessments of needs using a variety of tools. DRC has policies and procedures in place to respond to changing needs, capacities and context. The organisation follows a rights-based approach and is committed to incorporate age, gender and diversity concerns and aspects in its operations. Implementing partners adapt their programmes to changing needs, capacities and context through regular monitoring and reporting done by the partners and analysed by DRC staff.

Feedback from people affected by crisis and communities on Commitment 1:

Communities confirm impartiality of needs assessments and communities were consulted on their different vulnerabilities and capacities in most assessment processes.

Commitment 2: Humanitarian response is effective and timely

Score: 2.5

DRC mainstreams protection in its operations to ensure that relief and rehabilitation activities are safe for communities to access. The organisation has a decentralised organisational structure with clear lines of authority as well as a corporate emergency procedure in place allowing for timely decision-making. DRC takes an active role in promoting needs through established global, country and local level coordination mechanisms and refers specific and unmet needs to other stakeholders. Programmes are planned and assessed using up to date sector technical standards. Activities, outputs and outcomes are systematically monitored and results are used to adapt programmes. DRC works closely with partners to monitor activities.

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

Most communities stated that they felt safe and not further exposed to harm as result of DRC`s programmes, however, some communities highlighted that specific vulnerabilities of some members of the communities were not taken into consideration sufficiently. Although some community members stated that assistance was delivered very timely with no delays, a number of communities experienced significant delays between the point of contact with DRC staff and the assistance received. Some communities described the interaction between DRC staff and community-based workers as insufficient to ensure that their activities are monitored and evaluated adequately.

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

Score: 2.7

DRC systematically works to address root causes of displacement and find durable solutions for protracted displacement. Policies and procedures are designed to prevent programmes having negative effects, to protect people and 'Do no Harm'. Programmes include livelihood and Cash Assistance, which strengthen local capacities and the local economy and promote resilience. The organisation systematically plans transitions or exits along a set of criteria. However, results of community hazard and risk assessments and preparedness plans are not used to guide activities in all country programmes and environmental risks are not systematically assessed and acted upon. Partner organisations stated that they have support to build their capacity from DRC and ongoing discussions regarding longer-term strategic cooperation with the organisation.

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

In general communities stated that they felt stronger and resilient as a result of the work of DRC in their communities. Some communities however, have not received support to fulfil the expected leadership roles and communities expressed their dissatisfaction with some community representatives, citing issues of poor representation and lack of trust.

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

Score: 2.2

Policies and procedures for information sharing and engagement of communities and stakeholders of DRC's work are in place. A Communication Manual is in place, guiding external communications, but assurance systems to assure communications are accurate, ethical and respectful are no systematically in place. DRC's Accountability Framework provides a tool for information sharing of DRC's commitments and its operations, however these are not contextualised and updated for each Country Office and they are not systematically used at the operational level. Some information about DRC, its principles, programmes, deliverables and expected behaviours is available but this is not systematically shared with communities. DRC mostly works through community representatives, leaders and groups to communicate and engage with communities throughout a project. However, the effectiveness and appropriateness of the channels used by DRC to communicate and disseminate information with communities, especially to vulnerable and marginalised groups, are not systematically monitored or assured in all operations and projects. Partners are informed about DRC and have close collaboration and communication with DRC staff throughout project implementation. Commitments to information sharing and community engagement with communities is discussed between DRC and partners and expected to be included in projects.

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

Communities confirmed that they receive some information regarding DRC and its work, but they did not always feedback that they understand DRC's principles and commitments, project deliverables and plans. Most communities were unaware of expected behaviours of staff. Communities were dissatisfied with the opportunities to feedback and engage with DRC, especially vulnerable and marginalised community members who do not feel adequately represented.

Commitment 5: Complaints are welcomed and addressed

Score: 2

DRC is committed to receiving and responding to complaints throughout the organisation and has a clear complaint handling policy in place. Procedures for reporting sensitive issues related to DRC's Code of Conduct are in place and DRC has invested in establishing systems in its Country Offices. However, procedures and guidance for handling operational complaints are less clear and not consistently implemented at Country Office and programme levels. Procedures for establishing and implementing community complaint mechanisms at the project level are not in place, are unclear to staff and partners, and therefore are not implemented in all projects. Compliance is difficult to achieve due to the lack of clear expectations of staff and of systems for both Code of Conduct and operational complaints.

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

Although some communities made complaints to DRC staff and partners and some had direct one-to-one communication with DRC staff where they could speak freely on issues of concern, general feedback was dissatisfaction with the process and opportunities available regarding complaints. In general communities are not aware of DRC's complaints mechanisms, are not consulted on the process and are not given the means to give and receive a response to complaints in a systematic and appropriate manner in all projects.

Commitment 6: Humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary

Score: 3

DRC has clear commitment and strategic priority to build partnership, collaborate with others and advocate for coordinated approaches. DRC coordinates with a range of other actors, institutions, organisations and authorities at global, country and local levels to ensure that its actions, and the actions of others, are complementary, avoid duplication and cover the needs of affected populations and communities. A comprehensive Partnership Policy and associated tools to support partners to deliver activities are in place and partners are supported in their work and work closely with DRC staff at the country level.

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

Communities were satisfied and complimentary with how activities were coordinated between agencies and with local authorities, and commented that there was no duplication of activities.

Commitment 7: Humanitarian actors continuously learn and improve

Score: 2.7

DRC actively contributes to learning and innovation amongst its peers and within the sector at global, national and local levels. The organisation is a member of several networks to exchange good practice and actively contributes toward humanitarian learning, policy development, research and innovation. Processes are in place to ensure that knowledge and experience are accessible throughout the organisation, however, sharing of project learning and innovation between programme staff of different Country Offices is limited. Evaluation is ensured through policy and practice and the organisation promotes learning with procedures and guidance notes, however there is no learning policy or dedicated learning budget. Nevertheless, DRC does not ensure systematic learning from feedback and complaints.

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

Communities had little awareness of learning from project activities or as a result of monitoring processes.

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

Score: 2.9

DRC has human resources and personal development policies in place that are in line with legal requirements, are fair, transparent and non-discriminatory, cover staff safety, security and wellbeing, and are understood by staff. Staff systematically receive induction on relevant organisational policy and procedures. Feedback mechanisms are in place for staff and performance appraisal processes take place in a regular manner and staff make use of these to set work objectives and plan personal development goals on an annual basis. Training opportunities are available to staff. They have access to means to improve their skills and knowledge to fulfill their roles. DRC's has a Code of Conduct (CoC) in place for all staff based in its international Country Offices and programmes, it includes specific reference to PSEA obligations and all staff receive an induction on the CoC, sign it as part of their contracts and programme staff clearly understand their obligations to adhere to the CoC. Although a Code of Behaviour for staff based at HO is under development, it does not include all key commitments of DRC's CoC e.g. Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) articles, and staff based at HO or external visitor to Country Offices and projects are not currently required to sign adherence to a code of conduct/behaviour.

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

Communities were satisfied and complimentary of DRC staff behaviour and attitudes.

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

Score: 2.5

DRC has robust and comprehensive financial, procurement and resource management policies and procedures in place to ensure efficient and ethical use of resources, which are systematically applied in Country Offices. Risks are identified and managed, although DRC's new Risk Management Framework is not fully in place at this time. DRC has a Fraud and Corruption Policy and CoC reporting mechanism in place and staff and partners have received training on these processes, however not all communities are made aware of project budgets, reporting mechanism and of DRC's fraud and corruption policy. Environmental considerations are not systematically analysed and addressed in all operations.

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

Some communities are aware of DRC's commitment to anti-fraud and corruption and how this is applied in projects, especially those involving savings schemes or cash distributions, however, this was not known by most community members and most did not know what they should do if they identify any misappropriation of resources.

8. Organisation's signature

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:

Date of the report: 2017-20-06

9. Decision

Quality Control by: Elissa Goucem, QA Officer, HQAI	Quality Control finalised on:
	First Draft: 2017-06-29
	Final: 2017-07-03

Certification Decision:	
Certification	Intermediate audit
☒ Certified ☐ Preconditioned (Major CARs)	☐ Maintenance of certificate ☐ Suspension of Certificate (Major CARs)
Deadlines: Fulfilment of corrective actions: 3 Minor CARs: JULY 23th 2019	

Certification Decision	Date:
Pierre Hauselmann	2017.07.24
Executive Director	
Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative	

Appeal:

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

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

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

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

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

Annex 1: Explanation of the scoring scale

In line with the CHS's emphasis on continuous learning and improvement, rather than assessing a pass/fail compliance with the CHS requirements, the CHS Verification Scheme uses a scoring system. It is graduated from 0 to 5 to determine the degree to which organisations apply the CHS and to measure progress in this application.

Be it in the framework of a self-assessment or in a third-party assessment process, it is key to have detailed criteria to evaluate (score) the degree of application of each requirement and commitment of the CHS. A coherent, systematic approach is important to ensure:

• Transparency and objectivity in the scoring criteria;

• Consistency and reliability between one verification cycle and another, or between the different verification options;

• Comparability of data generated by different organisations.

This document outlines a set of criteria to orient the assessment process and help communicate how the respective scores have been attributed and what they mean.

While verification needs to be rigorous, it needs also to be flexible in its interpretation of the CHS requirements to be applicable fairly to a wide range of organisations working in very different contexts. For example, smaller organisations may not have formal management systems in place, but show that an Organisational Responsibility is constantly reflected in practices. In a similar situation, the person undertaking the assessment needs to understand and document why the application is adequate in the apparent absence of supporting process. It is frequent that the procedures actually exist informally, but are" hidden" in other documents. Similarly, it is not the text of a requirement that is important, but whether its intent is delivered and that there are processes that ensure this will continue to be delivered under normal circumstances. The driving principle behind the scoring is that the scores should reflect the normal ("systematic") working practices of the participating organisation.

What do the scores stand for?

Score	Key actions	Organisation responsibilities
0	• Operational activities and actions systematically contradict the intent of a CHS requirement. • Recurrent failure to implement the necessary actions at operational level. • A systemic issue threatens the integrity of a CHS Commitment (i.e. makes it unlikely that the organisation is able to deliver the commitment).	• Policies and procedures directly contradict the intent of the CHS requirement. • Complete absence of formal or informal processes (organisational culture) or policies necessary for ensuring compliance at the level of the requirement and commitment.
	Score 0 means: The organisation does not work currently towards the systematic application of this requirement/commitment, neither formally nor informally. This is a major weakness to be corrected as soon as possible.	
1	Some actions respond to the intent behind the CHS requirement. However: • There are a significant number of cases where the design and management of programmes and activities do not reflect the CHS requirement. • Actions at the operational level are not systematically implemented in accordance with relevant policies and procedures.	Some policies and procedures respond to the intent behind the CHS requirement. However: • Relevant policies exist but are incomplete or do not cover all areas of the CHS. • Existing policies are not accompanied with sufficient guidance to support a systematic and robust implementation by staff. • A significant number of relevant staff at Head Office and/or field levels are not familiar with the policies and procedures. • Absence of mechanisms to ensure the monitoring and systematic delivery of actions, policies and procedures at the level of the commitment.
	Score 1 means: The organisation has made some efforts towards application of this requirement/commitment, but these efforts have not been systematic. This is a weakness to be corrected.	

Score	Key actions	Organisation responsibilities
2	Actions broadly respond to the intent behind the CHS requirement: Actions at operational level are broadly in line with the intent behind a requirement or commitment. However: • Implementation of the requirement varies from programme to programme and is driven by people rather than organisational culture. • There are instances of actions at operational level where the design or management of programmes does not fully reflect relevant policies.	Some policies and procedures respond to the intent behind the CHS requirement. However: • Relevant policies exist but are incomplete or do not cover all areas of the CHS. • Existing policies are not accompanied with sufficient guidance to support a systematic and robust implementation by staff. • A significant number of relevant staff at Head Office and/or field levels are not familiar with the policies and procedures. • Absence of mechanisms to ensure the monitoring and systematic delivery of actions, policies and procedures at the level of the commitment.
	Score 2 means: The organisation is making systematic efforts towards application of this requirement/commitment, but certain key points are still not addressed. This is worth an observation and, if not addressed may turn into a significant weakness.	
3	Actions respond to the intent of the CHS requirement: • The design of projects and programmes and the implementation of activities is based on the relevant policies and reflects the requirement throughout programme sites. • Staff are held accountable for the application of relevant policies and procedures at operational level, including through consistent quality assurance mechanisms.	Policies and procedures respond to the intent of the CHS requirement: • Relevant policies and procedures exist and are accompanied with guidance to support implementation by staff. • Staff are familiar with relevant policies. They can provide several examples of consistent application in different activities, projects and programmes. • The organisation monitors the implementation of its policies and supports the staff in doing so at operational level.
	Score 3 means: The organisation conforms with this requirement, and organisational systems ensure that it is met throughout the organisation and over time.	
4	As 3, but in addition: • Field and programme staff act frequently in a way that goes beyond CHS requirement to which they are clearly committed. • Communities and other external stakeholders are particularly satisfied with the work of the organisation in relation to the requirement.	As 3, but in addition: • Policies and procedures go beyond the intent of the CHS requirement, are innovative and systematically implemented across the organisation. • Relevant staff can explain in which way their activities are in line with the requirement and can provide several examples of implementation in different sites. • They can relate the examples to improved quality of the projects and their deliveries.

Score	Key actions	Organisation responsibilities
	Score 4 means: The organisation demonstrates innovation in the application of this requirement/commitment. It is applied in an exemplary way across the organisation and organisational systems ensure high quality is maintained across the organisation and over time.	
5	As 4, but in addition: • 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.	As 4, but in addition: • Policies and procedures go far beyond the intent of the CHS requirement and could serve as textbook examples of relevant policies and procedures. • Policy and practice are perfectly aligned.
	Score 5 means: On top of demonstrating conformity and innovation, the organisation receives outstanding feedback from communities and people. This is an exceptional strength and a score of 5 should only be attributed in exceptional circumstances.	