

7th General Assembly

5-6 May 2009

Maison International de l'Environnement 2, Chemin de Balexert, Genève

May 5 (DAY 1)

1. Introduction

The Chair welcomed all participants to the 7th HAP General Assembly and thanked the Secretariat for their work in 2008, noting the progress made despite the apparent financial constraints. A warm welcome was extended to the eleven new members since the last General Assembly, marking a 40% increase in membership in one year.

Participants introduced themselves (see Appendix 1)

2. Adoption of the agenda for the 7th General Assembly

DECISION: the agenda was adopted.

3. Minutes of the 6th General Assembly:

a. Approval

DECISION: The minutes were approved.

b. Matters Arising:

The following matters arising had been addressed as requested.

- Second election for independent Board members was arranged by email
- Disclaimer to Chapter 3 (2007 Humanitarian Accountability Report) was included
- The Board finalised the Terms of Reference for the CARB
- Secretariat redrafted the Standard Review process ToR for Board approval

There were no further questions of clarification.

4. Election: Independent Board Members:

The chair listed the candidates for election:

- Antonio Donini – Board Member since 2004
- Mary B. Anderson – Board Member since 2007

DECISION: The General Assembly unanimously elected the two candidates for another term each.

5. 2008 Full Member's Annual Reports:

Participants were provided with guidance and divided into the 5 groups in section 6 below.

6. Annual Reports Plenary Session

a. Report back from small groups

Each Group was asked to report back to the General Assembly utilising three headings: main challenges, key learning points, and future options/suggested steps to explore.

HAP International 7th HAP General Assembly draft minutes (website)

Group 1: Humanitarian Accountability Frameworks (rapporteur: Lyla Rogan, HAP)

Challenges

- Agencies are at different stages in the development of their Humanitarian Accountability Frameworks (HAF).
- Weaving the HAF into an agency's practice can be difficult but once completed it becomes a key management tool that enables the agency to deliver its commitments.
- It was noted that large agencies had particular issues with priorities and challenges across departments. There is a need to be more explicit about whether the HAF applies to humanitarian sections of the whole agency.

Key learning:

- Demystifying (development; translation and dissemination to internal stakeholders) the HAF within the agency was seen as a key approach in implementing the framework across the agency.
- The HAF, once constructed, was a good management tool for driving organisational change forward (with staff, partners, and beneficiaries).
- The HAF was seen as a strong tool in defining the linkage between the requirements and roles of various quality and accountability initiatives that agencies commit to.
- The value of a HAF is the associated institutional ownership of accountability; ownership of the HAF allows it to become a vehicle with which to hold the agency accountable to its vision and mission.
- A HAF can galvanize and institutionalise continuous improvement and external recognition.

Future options:

- HAP has an important role to play in stronger advocacy of accountability to beneficiaries.
- Keeping accountability high on the agenda continues to be a challenge for agencies (particularly so in the current financial environment) and the group felt the HAF could also function as an organisational focusing tool.

Group 2: Information Dissemination (rapporteur: Michelle Brown, SCUK)

Challenges/Successes:

- The Listening Project was seen as a success of (peer to peer) information sharing but also a challenge for the sector to learn from the Project's findings.
- Ensuring buy-in from senior management can be challenging but is required for success.
- The format, length and content of the information shared to beneficiaries can create a number of challenges.
- Managing Head Office demands for information vs. the time spent with the community has been a major hurdle for medium and small agencies.
- How do we get agencies to share information from lessons learnt *the hard way*, when project or programmes failed to meet established goals?

Key Learning:

- By investing time and energy in information flow there is evidence of better accountability (examples were highlighted from the group members).
- Information needs to be included in the primary needs assessment exercise and reviewed throughout the project cycle. When an assessment of information needs is included in the project cycle, it has led to improvements in accountability.
- Information at programme level enables staff members to feel more secure and empowered.
- Agencies have to make the commitment to "corporately" stick to and implement transparent approaches.
- HAP/Sphere deployment in Myanmar was seen as a great example of sharing information across agency and to the beneficiaries.

Future options:

- Peer to peer learning from and sharing of information at the agency level ought to be led, encouraged and supported by HAP members.
- Involve national staff (and programme staff) more in the information flow within agencies – bottom up knowledge is still neglected in project management.
- Crosscheck the information flow to show that accountability is understood and incorporated throughout the different tiers of the agency (so that it leads to organisational change).

Group 3: Complaints handling systems (rapporteur: Niels Bentzen, DRC)

Group 3 focused their feedback under 3 headings particular to their topic

Concept of complaints:

- Conflicting meanings of the concept of “complaints” were discussed –an example from OFADEC was given where the agency developed its own term for “making a complaint”.
- The importance of consulting with end users prior to implementing a complaint handling system cannot be repeated enough – they help us translate the concept into an understandable term (noting that gender-sensitivity ought to be considered).

Systems of handling complaints:

- Buy-in from management is required.
- Complaints handling becomes part of the project cycle.
- Two-way trust is a necessary component when working with partners.
- It was noted that agencies ought to seek coordination between the complaints handling approaches when working in the same areas or with the same community; this will lead to less community (and, at times, staff) confusion.

How do we handle sensitive complaints?

- Sensitive complaints particularly related to sexual exploitation and abuse do not often surface, yet a lack of complaints does not equate to a perfect programme; instead it most likely highlights an imperfect complaints handling system,
- Issues around the security of people, confidentiality, and anonymous complaints made up the majority of the Group’s discussion, including related topics such as: difficulties in investigations and feedback without a named source (a responsible agency *has* to investigate, even anonymous complaints, but how?); the seriousness of sensitive complaints can often explain why these complaints are not brought forward and a discussion took place on ways of improving safe spaces (particularly during an emergency response).

Group 4: Working in partnership (rapporteur: Libby Powell, MAP)

Challenges:

- Should the term be “working with” as opposed to “through” partners – working through a channel sometimes includes a leap of faith; different models, risks, and advantages are inferred by agencies’ relationships with local partners; lots of assumptions are frequently made (partners are more often held to account directly by communities because of their closer proximity).
- There exists a great need to develop a shared strategy for relevant and accepted levels of accountability for those working with partners – ought agencies impose a standard of accountability within the partnership?
- It was noted a need for caution when setting accountability standards with partners which, at times, can create barriers.
- The following question was debated: *Is institutional trust (supported by a partnership contract) within the working relationship enough in lieu of a verification system?*. It was noted that a part of this trust is to encourage partners to share difficult issues (between themselves and the beneficiaries, the agency, and the host government) in order to support and take forward the programme.
- Bottom-up learning is just as important as top-down.

Key learning:

- Learning has to be taken from the significant changes in the humanitarian system over the past 10 years, particularly so for supporting partners; humanitarian accountability must be the core of project development with partners – a willingness to demonstrate accountability to beneficiaries and partners is fundamental.

Future options:

- Share the HAP Standard with partners (and the wider base of stakeholders); building the HAP Standard into the field-based emergency preparedness; ensuring space/time is included in the project cycle to verify that expectations are met; make sure that captured learning is acted upon.

Group 5: Accountability in new emergencies (rapporteur: Manzoor Ahmed, SUNGI)

Group 5 focused on providing a general discussion summary:

- One challenge was expressed by two agencies – the closure of the HAP office in Pakistan. The presence of a HAP (member-based) network is important and needed in the region.
- Multiple stakeholders require a well thought out and implemented humanitarian accountability plan prior to a new emergency, particularly in high-risk areas; the HAP Standard can be integrated into the organisational culture of members and mainstreamed in the project cycle.
- Experiences of good practice in new emergencies were shared across the group (including the importance of sharing information in local language); local agencies are also engaged and interested in the HAP Standard and capacity building
- Having sufficient resources to deliver accountable programmes is critical to the effectiveness of interventions in new emergencies (donors have to be sensitive of this issue)
- Constructive engagement and inter-operability between quality and accountability initiatives (HAP and Sphere in particular) is welcome and requires more attention.
- Commitment of leadership affects agencies' ability to act on humanitarian accountability.

b. Discussions and conclusions

There was no further discussion.

7. The 2008 Humanitarian Accountability Report

a. Overview of Humanitarian Accountability in 2008: John Borton

John Borton presented Chapter 1 of the Report: An overview of humanitarian accountability in 2008. John's presentation slides are available on-line here:

<http://www.hapinternational.org/pool/files/overview-of-humanitarian-accountability-in-2008.pdf>

Discussion Highlights

A short discussion took place on the application of accountability frameworks to the cluster groups and UN agencies and opportunities to advocate for the integration of humanitarian accountability indicators in future evaluations.

Antonio Donini summarised the discussion:

- OCHA and the clusters are starting to engage closer with the accountability frameworks. UNHCR has taken a positive step with the HAP baseline analysis.
- The HAP Secretariat could include a discussion in future annual reports on the update of accountability frameworks.

ACTION: HAP and its members to explore options to facilitate, and advocate for, the inclusion of accountability to beneficiaries in evaluation TORs.

Points b) and c) on the Agenda were postponed to DAY 2.

The Session ended at 17.54pm

May 6 (DAY 2)

Session opened 9.20am

b. Discussion on framework for assessing progress against HAP's vision

John Borton requested participants to contact him and the Secretariat with specific suggestions on the overview of humanitarian accountability in 2009. John will attend relevant meetings and engage in consultation with members and beyond in the preparation of the chapter for next year.

c. The Annual Humanitarian Accountability Report

Monica Blagescu presented the remainder of the 2008 Humanitarian Accountability Report and the discussion paper for the 2009 report. Slides are available on-line here:

<http://www.hapinternational.org/pool/files/hum-acc-report-presentation.pdf>. The following changes were presented for feedback:

- The 2009 Perceptions of humanitarian accountability survey to be completed by the end of the year (moving the survey timeline forward) to enable results to be available by Jan 2010 and feed into the overview chapter.
- Instead of including the members' accountability workplan implementation reports in the Humanitarian Accountability Report, they would be made available online and their synthesis be included in the Report.
- The Secretariat's report to be removed from the Humanitarian Accountability Report; published separately and made available online.

ACTION: the preparation of the 2009 Humanitarian Accountability Report will follow the following format:

Chapter 1 Voices of disaster survivors

Chapter 2: Annual perceptions survey

Chapter 3: Synthesis of Members' Reports

Chapter 4: Overview of humanitarian accountability in 2009

ACTION: The Secretariat will contact participants to contribute suggestions and data to the proposed chapter on voices of disaster survivors and members will provide testimonials from their activities.

8. HAP in 2008

a) Chair's Report

The Chair urged all members to work closer together to promote accountability to increase membership and the number of certified agencies by next year's GA. It was suggested that members have to take responsibility and actively contribute to the success of the Secretariat, including its fundraising efforts, stating, in the current global financial context, funding is the biggest challenge faced by HAP in its efforts to improve accountability and certify members accordingly.

The Chair concluded by reminding the audience that HAP provides a rigorous verification system that enables agencies to improve the accountability and quality management systems, thus assisting them to continuously strengthen their programmes, and drawing on the positive experience of certified members to date, urging agencies to enrol in the certification process.

b) The Secretariat's Report

Nicholas Stockton presented an overview of the 2008 Secretariat Report. (See Appendix 2.)

ACTIONS:

- ***The inter-operability paper developed by the Sphere Project to be circulated to all quality and accountability initiatives and made publicly available.***
- ***The findings coming from the HAP evaluation to be incorporated into the Standard review process.***

- ***The quality and accountability initiatives invited to develop a key messages paper to be presented at a GHD meeting by SIDA.***

9. Treasurer's Report

The Treasurer presented an overview of the Secretariat's 2008 financial report and the 2008 audit report. The Treasurer noted that:

- the accounting rules have been changed and better reflect the true financial situation of HAP;
- there has been progress with the service fees to members;
- the reserves have been reduced.
- in spite of considerable uncertainty and donations below budget, the Secretariat has done a good job in managing expenditure against actual income.

The Treasurer recommended that the General Assembly approve the audited accounts for 2008

DECISION: The General Assembly unanimously approved the 2008 audited accounts.

10. HAP Evaluation

a. Introduction: Geoffrey Salkeld

The timing of the evaluation is designed to support the development of the next Strategic Plan, with some preliminary findings to feed into that process by the beginning of June.

b. Small groups:

It was noted that the results from the groups will guide development of the evaluation and will be followed-up by an email questionnaire. Participants were divided into 5 groups for the remainder of the morning.

c. Report back from small groups

Small groups were asked to report back, keeping their comments to 3 points per heading. The headings are Successes, Setbacks, and Lessons Learnt.

Group 1:

Successes

- 1) Principles of accountability have been translated into practical tools
- 2) Certification system has been proven to work and is available
- 3) HAP is investing in working collaboratively with other quality and accountability initiatives

Setbacks:

- 1) Some of the larger NGO members not yet certified
- 2) Some members are not championing HAP
- 3) Sustainable funding base not yet established.

Looking ahead:

- 1) A need for a resource mobilisation that recognises the changes in HAP; learning from other Initiatives on how they have a sustainable funding base; increased marketing to donors
- 2) Reflecting on the multi-mandate NGOs, make the Standard more explicitly applicable to them and reduce the complexity of language; Should HAP become AP?
- 3) Set a realistic pace of certification; rethink membership requirements; review the role of the accountability workplans and set an expiry date on baseline analysis.

Group 2:

Successes

- 1) Development of the HAP Standard
- 2) HAP is the recognised champion of beneficiary voices
- 3) Engaging with donors and UNHCR on accountability
- 4) Joint HAP-Sphere Project deployment to Myanmar

Setbacks:

- 1) Number of certified agencies is too small
- 2) No integrated communications strategy (HAP Secretariat and members) resulting in a lack consistent messaging (combined with the lack of sufficient evidence on the effects of accountability and quality assurance).
- 3) Lack of coherence (including effective communication of differences and similarities) amongst the quality and accountability initiatives.

Looking ahead:

- 1) Opportunity from the respective reviews of Sphere and HAP standards to align them
- 2) A need for understanding of the root causes of the slow pace of certification
- 3) Better understanding of accreditation opportunities at national level

Group 3:

Successes

- 1) Contribution of HAP to the humanitarian sector debates (“coining” humanitarian accountability and quality assurance)
- 2) Brand of HAP is recognised in the sector
- 3) Push by HAP members to apply and verify implementation of the Standard

Setbacks:

- 1) Number of certified agencies and how it fits with multi mandated agencies, the timeframe of certification
- 2) The usability of the Standard is limiting due to complicated language
- 3) Members are not taking full responsibility to engage more with HAP and the agenda setting

Looking ahead:

- 1) Engage more positively with the Good Humanitarian Donorship
- 2) Promote inter-operability between quality and accountability initiatives, focus on the field
- 3) Capture learning from members that are already certified (resources, time). Look at the flexibility of the Standard and how to use it in approaching a broader range of agencies.

Group 4:

Successes:

- 1) A tested and useable Standard linking management to beneficiary accountability
- 2) Improvement in communications and visibility of HAP
- 3) HAP continually present at different fora and pushing for accountability
- 4) Merger between HAP and BSO

Setbacks:

- 1) Given the present financial situation, many targets will be difficult to meet: reduce the ambitions or focus concentrated efforts on increasing funding base
- 2) Did humanitarian reform take away the interest on accountability and refocused that on coordination? Did HAP miss out on its ability to influence the systems more effectively?
- 3) Can the Standard work for large and small organisations?

Looking ahead

- 1) Be less ambitious in the new strategic plan
- 2) Focus on members’ partnership arrangements; members working with partners to pass the accountability management to their partners to increase impact
- 3) Use existing evaluation protocols in the current evaluation

Group 5:

Successes:

- 1) HAP’s role in the surge of interest in accountability
- 2) Good quality services to members (unique relationship)
- 3) Diversity of membership
- 4) The Standard development process and its relevance

Setbacks:

- 1) Reach is not as wide as planned, not to Latin America and French speaking countries; limited UN and donor engagement
- 2) System wide disconnect between what agencies say they do and what happens in practice for beneficiaries
- 3) Rate of certification is lower than planned (various reasons: larger NGOs not engaging, lack of evidence to support certification)

Looking ahead:

- 1) HAP should promote evidence-based messages
- 2) Accessible versions of the HAP Standard (the membership ought to be able to support and share their versions and language translations)
- 3) Budgeting for accountability within the membership in a better way

No further questions were raised from the floor.

11. HAP Strategic Planning Process

a. Introduction: Cowan Coventry

The 2010-2012 Strategic Plan will utilise the feedback from the GA and the evaluation. A draft will be produced by the end of July.

b. Small groups: discussion guided by the following questions:

What key external trends have emerged during the period of the HAP 2007-2008 Strategic Plan with potential implications for the next HAP planning cycle?

What options might these trends present for HAP in the 2010-2012 Strategic Plan?

Participants were divided into small groups to focus on the two questions.

c. Report back from the small groups

Group 1:

Trends:

- Global financial crisis
- Role of national NGOs in surge capacity on rapid disasters
- Globalisation of communications producing greater and critical views of humanitarian action
- Increased challenges to principles of humanitarian action; increasingly direct political interventions
- Climate change

Implications/Options:

- Support partnerships for capacity building in 6 countries that are perceived at high risk
- Advance communication on humanitarian accountability and training modules
- Communicating the importance of humanitarian accountability in all emergencies

Group 2:

Trends and opportunities

- Humanitarian reform process → closer alignment of HAP, grounding accountability to beneficiaries as a key issue and providing technical guidance to the clusters, joint opportunity for members to be involved in; position papers on community engagement within the processes of the clusters
- Recognised need to understand and respect local capacity → HAP could consolidate the learning from the Listening Project on particular countries or undertake risk assessments on supporting humanitarian accountability in fragile states
- Understand the actual versus the perceived difference between the Q&As. What is valuable to the end-users?

Group 3:

Group 3 suggested areas for consideration in the strategic plan:

- There is a need to strengthen the financial base of HAP

- How will HAP sustain its support to certified agencies and those enrolled in certification as membership grows and demand for certification increases?
- Will accountability become unfashionable? How will HAP communicate the identified need for it and its relevance in non Anglo-Saxon countries and cultures?
- What is the vision of HAP for the future? Where next for HAP in terms of its membership?
- How will HAP continue to promote (and lead by example) voices of beneficiaries? What scope is there for working with the military and governments?

Group 4:

Group 4 offered the following reflections:

- Trends: Economic crisis, food crisis, humanitarian space, humanitarian reform and the increased pressure for showing value for money; the latter is an opportunity for HAP.
- The Standard is the tool for keeping accountability to beneficiaries high on the agenda. The challenge is to have ONE certification system widely accepted by all stakeholders. HAP could then be more involved with the humanitarian reform process, strategic partners, donors).

Group 5:

Group 5 offered the following reflections:

- There is an increased number of humanitarian players within the system; how can HAP prioritise between advocacy and service delivery?
- HAP represents an innovation in the humanitarian sector and it ought to stay as it is
- Climate change and the changing nature of vulnerability will affect HAP and its members; as part of the strategic plan, look at longer-term scenarios.

12. Summary of Evaluation and Strategic Planning Sessions

Discussion focused on the increased recognition of the collaboration between quality and accountability initiatives, the need for improving the HAP “brand”, an increased sense of pressure by donors and the UN system for HAP certification. Concerns were raised over sustainable funding, which were paired by positive comments from participating donor representatives. The Standard’s language and its accessibility were also discussed.

Suggestions were made to explore options for “universalising” the agenda of accountability beyond the current Anglo-Saxon groups, and to look for greater participation of disaster survivors in the work of HAP.

13. Climate Change and HAP’s Governance: Discussion Paper

NS noted the importance of face-to-face meetings based in the small group discussions held over the past two days and introduced the discussion paper and the issues for consideration:

- GA meetings (related to the HAP’s business) to occur more frequently electronically
- GA (learning meetings) could be held as “Humanitarian Accountability Conference” every 2 or 3 years
- Allow for “special issue” General Assemblies to be held when required

Discussion:

Although there was general support for reviewing the frequency of the General Assembly meetings, the benefits from the membership coming together was also expressed and would need to be weighted as part of the decision-making process.

DECISION: the matter was referred to the Board.

14. Date of the next General Assembly

ACTION: dates to be discussed at the Board meeting

There was no further business and the Chair closed the meeting extending thanks to all participants, both members and non-members

CLOSE May 6, 2009. 16.48 pm

Appendix 1: List of Participants

Full members (in alphabetical order, by organisation)

1. Act International: Robert White
2. Act International: Marian Casey
3. CAFOD: Matthew Carter
4. CAFOD: Claire Goudsmit
5. CARE International: Jonathan Mitchell
6. CARE International: Jock Baker
7. Christian Aid: Juliet Parker
8. CODEC: Kamal Senguta
9. Concern Worldwide: Laura Cometta
10. CWS Pakistan/Afghanistan: Zainab Raza
11. CWS Pakistan/Afghanistan: Nejabat Khan
12. CWS Pakistan/Afghanistan: Kyoko Sakurai
13. Danish Church Aid: Lisa Henry
14. Danish Refugee Council: Andreas Kamm
15. Danish Refugee Council : Niels Bentzen
16. Focus Humanitarian Assistance: Zaynah Marani
17. MAP – UK : Libby Powell
18. MERCY Malaysia: Jemilah Mahmood
19. MERCY Malaysia: Nisha Sabanayagam
20. Merlin: Richard Cobb
21. Medair: John Farmer
22. Medair: Mark Wooding
23. OFADEC : Mamadou Ndiaye
24. Oxfam GB: Yo Winder
25. Oxfam International: Aimee Ansari
26. Save the Children UK: Michelle Brown
27. Sungi Development Foundation: Samina Khan
28. Sungi Development Foundation: Manzoor Ahmed
29. Tearfund: Matthew Frost
30. Tearfund: David Bainbridge
31. World Vision International: Ton van Zutphen

Associate members

32. Danida: Pernille Hougesen
33. People In Aid: Jonathan Potter
34. SIDA: Maria Thorin

Independent Board member

35. Antonio Donini – Feinstein International Center, Tufts University

Invited guests

36. ALNAP: Kim Scriven
37. Belgian Mission: Claudine Aelvoet
38. Canadian Mission: Pascal Desbiens
39. French Mission: Bouchra Benfatah
40. Help Age International: Lucy Blown
41. ICCO – KiA: Henja Visser-Boeve
42. HAP consultant: Cowan Coventry
43. HAP consultant: Geoffrey Salkeld
44. HAP consultant: John Borton
45. Independent: Pauline Wilson
46. Independent: Nicholas Morris
47. Independent: Yeshey Pelzom
48. INTOSAI: Jan Pieter Lingen
49. Oak Foundation: Jane Warburton
50. OCHA : Gweyn Lewis
51. OCHA: Rachel Quick
52. OECD: Steve Darvill
53. SCHR: Eva von Oelreich
54. Sphere Project: John Damerell
55. Transparency Int. Marie-Luise Ahlendorf

HAP Secretariat Staff (in alphabetical order, by family name)

56. Monica Blagescu – Policy Services Coordinator
57. Ester Dross – Complaints Handling Training Officer
58. Sheryl Haw – Chief Auditor
59. Pascale Guillot – Finance and Donor Relations Manager
60. Coleen Heemskerk – Complaints Handling Training Officer
61. Maria Kiani – Field Representative
62. Jamie Munn – Research and Communications Manager
63. Smruti Patel – Training Coordinator
64. Lieske Pott-Hofstede – Human Resources Manager
65. Lyla Rogan – Organisational Development Advisor
66. Katharina Samara Wickrama – Regulatory Services Director
67. Nicholas Stockton – Executive Director
68. Barb Wigley – Programme and Membership Services Coordinator

Appendix 2: Secretariat Report Summary

2008 – Financial Overview

- CHF 3.35m strategic plan budget
- CHF 3.14m approved budget
- CHF 2.31m expenditure (69% of Strategic Plan)
- CHF 2.09m incoming funds (66% of revenue target)
- Self generated income grew from 5% to 18% of incoming resources
- CHF 300k operating loss

Challenges

- In a hardening climate, fundraising took more time and more donors insisted on earmarked project funding. Average time from application submission to final decision: 8 months
- During most of 2008, the Secretariat managed with 1 out of the 4 senior post filled

Policy Services

- Launch of *The Guide to the HAP Standard* hosted by Save the Children UK in London, with 1,500 print copies sold by the end of the year – 980 downloads from the Oxfam website;
- *"To complain or not to complain: still the question"* published;
- International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) recognised HAP as *"one of the key standard setting bodies in the field of humanitarian aid"*;
- HAP Standard Review process started; HAP, the Sphere Project and People In Aid commit to inter-operability;
- Over 15 presentations on HAP or its research interests delivered at strategic fora;
- 500 copies of the *2007 Humanitarian Accountability Report* printed and distributed;
- HAP Newsletter re-launched, incorporating the BSO Investigator;
- New HAP website launched

Development Services

- Annual Peer Support Group organised and hosted by members, with attendance from 19 agencies;
- Two NEP protocol meetings: Cyclone Nargis (Myanmar) and Baluchistan earthquake (Pakistan);
- Deployment of Roving Team in Sidr-affected areas in Bangladesh and in Myanmar;
- First HAP-Sphere joint deployment in a new emergency;
- Continuing work in Pakistan;
- Increase in agency-specific services in response to member requests during emergencies;
- Nine baseline analyses undertaken against the HAP Standard, including for UNCHR;
- Technical support provided to three regional networks and the ECHA ECPS UN and NGO Taskforce on protection from sexual exploitation and abuse.

Regulatory Services

- Certification of two more agencies against the HAP Standard
- 19 corrective action requests followed up with certified agencies
- 14 member agencies enrolled in the certification scheme
- Three organisations open discussions about accreditation (to run certification "franchises") by HAP
- ToR for the CARB developed

Governance & Management

- New membership services statement published
- Certification and Accreditation Review Board established
- Board and CARB elections completed
- 16 membership applications received and 11 approved
- Board endorsement for promoting inter-operability of products and services of the quality and accountability initiatives
- 65% of the 2008 workplan was completed with 61% of the approved expenditure budget
- 60% of the annual budget revenue target was achieved, resulting in a CHF 300,000 operating deficit on the year, although this would have shown as a CHF 250,000 surplus without the changes to the accounting rules.

- HAP entered 2009 with reserves of CHF 360,000 and contracted funding for over 58% of its 2009 workplan

Strategic Progress – components

- Standards development – delays in the development of the 2007 standard knocked on to HAP standard revision process which is now on track but a year behind the strategic plan schedule
- New Emergencies Policy – members engagement tools (contracts) developed and used successfully in Bangladesh and Myanmar. NEP recruitment of new members slower than anticipated in the SP
- Accreditation & Certification – Achieved only 28% of certification target (5/18) (but process began 9 months later than expected). ISO/SAI recognition not thought to be strategically helpful at this stage.
- Research – Commissioned research programme defined – slower than anticipated progress on advocacy and institutional linkages.
- Growth of membership – Redefined membership categories not adopted by General Assembly in 2007. Thus membership and certification growth strategy has been pursued with weaker incentives for associate membership than expected. However, diversity targets being met and 50% increase in full membership achieved in 2008.
- Accountability Workplans – strategic plan envisaged AWP's being dropped as certification became requirement of full membership. As this has not happened, AWP's remain primary basis of assessing membership commitment and updated guidelines introduced.
- Complaints handling - "Expert witness" capacity developed (through merger with Building Safer Organisations). Complaints advisory service launched on website
- Advocacy – Beneficiary Accountability Awareness Campaign and NGO Accountability Awards scheme not launched.
- Marketing – Certification scheme and complaints-handling services promoted as planned.
- Website development – New website with focus on HAP membership and membership services launched. Steady improvement in usage statistics.
- Funding – Met self-generated funds ratio. Overall funding at 54% of strategic plan target
- Governance – major membership category reform not agreed in 2007
- Strategic Partners – Limited progress in strengthening relationship with GHD, although UK, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, and Norway now making stronger policy commitments to HAP Accountability Principles and Standard.
- Quality Management – Organisational development support (HAP Standard Baseline Analysis, complaints handling and investigation training) provided
- Capacity Building – Consultancy services not launched as proposed. Specialised in-house capacity seen as better alternative

2009 – Pointers

- 2009 Budget of CHF 2.18m approved (38% below strategic plan indicative budget and 31% below 2008 budget)
- Budget review in April set a revised expenditure parameter of CHF1.81m (17% in year cuts)
- Exchange rate changes have reduced contracted income from 64% to 58% of budget
- INTOSAI describes the HAP Standard as "promising" in its search for a single global audit framework for disaster assistance
- Norway makes new commitments (policy and finance)
- ACFID re-opens discussion on integrating HAP Standard into Australian NGO Code of Conduct
- Progress on accreditation with ACT International
- Rapid growth in UK certification enrolment