

# THE HAP STANDARD REVIEW MEETING REPORT

## 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Location of the consultation: **Tbilisi, Georgia**

1.2 Date of the consultation: **22 March, 2010**

1.3 Hosting Agency: **Danish Refugee Council**

1.4 Person responsible for organizing the consultation and contact details: **Michael Possmayer, email: Michael.possmayer@drc.dk**

1.5 Time allocated to the consultation: **4 hours, from 13:00 until 17:00p.m**

1.6 Brief overview of method used in the consultation:

**Consultation method was applied. Representatives from different agencies were invited to partake in the HAP review process.**

1.7 Number of individuals who were consulted: **13 individuals attended the meeting**

1.8 Brief overview of the context: **All participants were from the international organizations representing 1 HAP certified member organization (DRC), two full member organizations (Care, NRC), 3 member organizations (World Vision, Save the Children, Oxfam) and 1 associate member organization (Transparency International)**

## 2. FACILITATORS AND PARTICIPANTS

### 2.1 Consultation facilitators

Name	Position	Organization	Email
Michael Possmayer	Deputy Regional Representative	Danish Refugee Council	Michael.possmayer@drc.dk
Tinatin Shengelia	Programme Officer	Danish Refugee Council	tinatin@drc.ge

### 2.2 Consulted individuals

Name	Position	Organization	Email
Michael Possmayer	Deputy Regional Representative	Danish Refugee Council	<a href="mailto:michael.possmayer@drc.dk">michael.possmayer@drc.dk</a>
Tinatin Shengelia	Programme Officer	Danish Refugee Council	<a href="mailto:tinatin@drc.ge">tinatin@drc.ge</a>
George Datusani	Humanitarian Program Manager	Oxfam	<a href="mailto:gdatasani@oxfam.org.uk">gdatasani@oxfam.org.uk</a>
Mariam	Research Assistant	Transparency	<a href="mailto:mariam@transparency.ge">mariam@transparency.ge</a>

Khotenashvili		International	
Caitlin Ryan	Program Coordinator/Analyst Making Aid Work	Transparency International	<a href="mailto:caitlin@transparency.ge">caitlin@transparency.ge</a>
Tina Gewis	Protection and Advocacy Adviser	Norwegian Refugee Council	<a href="mailto:tinagewis@nrc.ge">tinagewis@nrc.ge</a>
Salome Odisharia	Program Development Manager	CARE International	<a href="mailto:Salome_odisharia@care.org.ge">Salome_odisharia@care.org.ge</a>
Nelly Revazishvili	CHD Project Coordinator	World Vision Georgia	<a href="mailto:Nelly_Revazishvili@wvi.org">Nelly_Revazishvili@wvi.org</a>
Teona Kupunia	Human Rights Program Manager	World Vision Georgia	<a href="mailto:Teona_Kupunia@wvi.org">Teona_Kupunia@wvi.org</a>
Miroslava Pinkova	Intern	Danish Refugee Council	<a href="mailto:Miroslava.pinkova@gmail.com">Miroslava.pinkova@gmail.com</a>
Vano Grigolashvili	HEALD Director	World Vision Georgia	<a href="mailto:Vano_grigolashvili@wvi.org">Vano_grigolashvili@wvi.org</a>
Jonathan Puddifoot	Country Director	CARE International	<a href="mailto:Jonathan_puddifoot@care.org.ge">Jonathan_puddifoot@care.org.ge</a>
Leslie Wilson	Country Director	Save the Children	<a href="mailto:lwilson@savechildren.org">lwilson@savechildren.org</a>

### 3. USE OF THE STANDARD, POSITIVE EXPERIENCES, THE IMPORTANCE OF HAP

Participants of the meeting prepared brief presentations about the accountability work of their organizations, how they have used HAP standard and what positive experiences they have observed.

Agency	BM 1	BM 2	BM 3	BM 4	BM 5	BM 6
WVI	HAF framework document prepared; Differentiating accountability levels (scorecards, self-assessment, baseline, PMG audit)	Brochures Info provision guidelines for beneficiaries, staff;	Focus group discussions; Community initiative groups	Trainings on accountability	Complaints mechanism in place; Community help desk processing complaints; Available 13 boxes for complaints	In place
NRC	Guiding documents; code of conduct for implementing	Info available on NRC website; Fact sheets	Beneficiaries involved in protection project	Trainings on protection, staff competencies, performance	Complaint system had been used in shelter project	

	partners			appraisal system		
TI	Accountability mechanism employed by donors; Implementing agencies required to comply with the standard					
Oxfam	Their accountability principles are in line with HAP; Four areas identified: transparency, participation, info sharing, feedback mechanism; matrix is used and each area is scored					
Care	Positive experiences of BMs: better assessment of needs	Reduces conflict	Efficient use of funds	Better trained staff	Takes pressure off individual staff	Feed into global organization
DRC	HAF document developed	Information sheets prepared for each project	Beneficiaries involved in community development project; feedback from beneficiaries received by field officers;	Trainings on advocacy, capacity building; Training on accountability will be provided for complaint officers	Complaints mechanism has been used in several projects.	

#### What effects have you seen from its implementation?

- better assessment of needs
- better design of selection criteria
- improved project redesign process/implementation
- efficient use of funds
- increased trust of the organization/beneficiaries changed positively their attitude towards the organization
- more efficient work of the organization
- Reduced conflict, takes off pressure from staff
- enables to assess shortcomings in implementation
- increased responsibility from staff
- getting updated/latest information from the field
- saving time and resources
- engagement of government

#### 4. SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS TO THE EXISTING TEXT OF THE STANDARD

##### 4.1 What participants liked most and least about the HAP Standard

##### What participants liked most:

- HAP is easy and flexible to adapt to various contexts; it gives a lot of space for action

- the core idea is easy to communicate and creates buy-in by most actors
- it enables to keep continual improvement for humanitarian accountability framework and quality management system
- mainstreams INGOs efforts in accountability to concrete frame for major humanitarian actors
- it is good measurement tool how well we are performing our work/responsibility
- complaint mechanism - easier for field staff
- it is key for accountability
- emphasis on true partnership
- compelling us (NGOs) to put our belief in transparency (accountability) to the test; resourcing accountability mechanisms
- it gives a structure/procedures to aim for; it can help coordination among the agencies

**What participants liked least:**

- implementation of the HAP standard requires lots of time, human and financial resources
- it makes unrealistic demands of people/organization during the emergency period
- transparency can reduce flexibility in programming
- donors are not signed up for HAP
- gaps in clear definition of some benchmarks
- not enough explicit focus on donors/power players (moving the HAP beyond implementers)
- complex
- bureaucracy of more systems (accountability)
- HAP does not clarify why donors/NGOs should sign it and apply these principles

**4.2 What would you change about the HAP standard**

- HAP needs to be more straightforward and obligatory for organizations
- Some suggested adding additional benchmarks to be met.
- The question arose how can beneficiary feedback be used to change a program when the budget is already fixed?
- Further guidance/reflection on how agencies can actually follow standards and principles during the “heat” of an emergency?

THE HAP BENCHMARKS	SUGGESTED CHANGES AND COMMENTS
Benchmark 2	<u>Comments</u> Information to be shared publicly under this benchmark must be contextualized concerning personal privacy and security (of staff and beneficiaries);

	Minimum requirement of information to be shared with stakeholders should be defined (partial agreement among participants on this point).
<b>Benchmark 3</b>	<p><u>To add</u></p> <p>3.1.3 interview staff about the processes for enabling participation to assess compliance with the Standard</p> <p><u>Requires clarification</u></p> <p>3.2.1 Whose “analysis” and whose “capacity” is being referred to? We assume this means <i>our</i> (NGOs) analysis of <i>beneficiary</i> capacity to implement the initiative being discussed with beneficiaries, but this could be clearer.</p>
<b>Benchmark 4</b>	<p><u>To add</u></p> <p>4.4.1 Review staff training records against identified training needs</p>
<b>Benchmark 5</b>	<p><u>Requires clarification</u></p> <p>The benchmark definition refers to “specified bodies”. Who are the “specified bodies”? These are to be specified by whom? (partial agreement among participants on this point)</p> <p><u>To add</u></p> <p>5.2 (sixth bullet “The process for safe referral...”): Here, there should be a reference to the NGO’s responsibility to “follow-up” of referrals.</p> <p>5.4.1 Also review the sample of responses to complaints (or is this included within “processed complaints”?)</p>

#### 4.3 HAP for partners

- HAP-compliant NGOs should require HAP members working with partners to:
  - educate and inform partners in HAP
  - encourage them to use a CM: either LNGOs own CM, or tie into HAP member’s CM
  - commit to capacity building of accountability of local NGO partners
  - monitor the accountability compliance of partners

#### 5. OTHER ISSUES

*1.2 Putting Principles into Practice (page 6 of 2007 Standard doc)* – The second paragraph refers to categories of principles (primary, secondary, tertiary). Some participants in the consultation questioned the merit of ranking the principles, and would like to know how this prioritization was developed, as its usefulness is not apparent. Another comment is that the following (third) paragraph of this section provides an excuse for non-compliance with easy principles. This leaves the question of whether this provides an “escape clause” for some groups to be non-compliant.

## **6. FEEDBACK**

Participants of this consultation noted the importance of holding such a meeting which enabled them to share their accountability practices and suggest changes. It was proposed to follow-up on the meeting and further to continue cooperation on the HAP standard and accountability in general.