

Certification

Summary Audit Report

of HAP 2010 Standard

Application Organisation Information

Organisation:	Norwegian Church Aid	Audit Ref / No:	E012/0410H
Head Office Location:	Oslo, Norway	Programme Site locations:	Nairobi, Kenya
Date of Head Office Audit:	15 – 18 August 2011	Dates of Programme Site(s) Audit:	29 September – 2 nd October 2011
Agency Representative:	Merete Skjelsbæk Project Manager Accountability Diana Mangeli Human Resource Manager and HAP focal point Kenya	Auditor (s):	Coleen Heemskerk, Chief Auditor Eric Batonon, Independent Auditor trainee

Background:

Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) globally began in 1947 as a small fundraising drive by churches and became an independent organization with its own statutes in 1953 (interviews and website). In Kenya, NCA has worked since 1972 (document 166).

NCA is an **ecumenical, diaconal, humanitarian and non-profit** organization **mandated by churches and Christian organizations** in Norway to work for **global justice**; by empowering the poor and challenging the wealthy and powerful (document 40). Together with its constituency and partners, NCA commits itself to the **vision: *Together for a just world.***

Audit Plan:

At NCA's request, the scope of the audit includes all of NCA's programmes and projects, including long-term development, emergency preparedness and response and advocacy. The baseline analysis was conducted in Oslo, Norway on 26–29 January 2010 and in Ethiopia on 7–13 February 2010 (Documents 113 & 114).

Qualifying Norms for the certification audit were approved on 12 January 2011. The head office certification audit in Oslo, Norway was conducted on 15-18 August 2011 and the programme site audit was conducted in Nairobi, Kenya on 29 August–2 September 2011. The Kenya was selected by HAP, in consultation with NCA, after NCA presented country site summary reports to HAP (documents 189).

Methodology:

The audit comprised of the following phases:

- Phase 1, document review: *Documents of processes and policies presented by NCA in support of their accountability and compliance statement.*
- Phase 2, review of programme site summary reports received. *A summary analysis was reviewed from the completed programme site surveys.*
- Phase 3, on site audit at head office. *Document verification and interviews with head office staff.*
- Phase 4 on site audit at programme site. *Document verification and interviews with disaster survivors, partners and programme staff.*

This report covers the combined summary findings of all four phases. The detailed findings reports compiled by Chief Auditor, Coleen Heemskerk and Trainee Independent Auditor, Eric Batonon, make up the full audit report.

Conclusion

Coleen Heemskerk, HAP Chief Auditor, audited the Norwegian Church Aid (NCA) head office in Oslo and the programme site in Kenya for conformity with the *HAP 2010 Standard in Accountability and Quality Management* (HAP Standard), with the assistance of Eric Batonon, Independent auditor trainee. The audit was carried out in Oslo from 15th to 18th August 2011 and in Kenya from 29th August to 2nd September 2011. The scope of the audit includes the whole organisation, including NCA's long-term development, emergency preparedness and response and advocacy work.

The provision of evidence in support of the Application for Certification is the responsibility of the Board and the Senior Management of NCA. It is the responsibility of the HAP auditors to express an opinion both on the evidence provided and on the interviews carried out during the audit. I, the Chief Auditor confirm that the audit meets the requirements for HAP auditors concerning professional competence and independence.

The audit was conducted in accordance with the procedures approved by the HAP Certification and Accreditation Review Board, and following the ISO 19011:2002 Auditor

Standard, which together require that an audit be planned and performed to obtain reasonable assurance as to the agency's conformity with the HAP Standard. The auditor has audited NCA on a sample test basis through an examination of documentary evidence disclosed and through interviews with NCA staff in the Oslo and Nairobi offices. In the Kenya programme site, the auditor interviewed NCA staff, the staff of NCA partners and disaster survivors of NCA funded programmes. The audit findings provide a reasonable basis for the recommendation.

In my opinion, the Norwegian Church Aid conforms with the requirements of the HAP 2010 Standard. Detailed findings are laid out in the rest of this report.



Coleen Heemskerk, Chief Auditor
Regulatory Services, HAP International
15 November 2011

Summary Table of Findings

The table below captures a summary version of the findings – a detailed report follows.

HO – Head Office

PS – Programme Site

HAP Standard	
General Requirements	MINOR NON-COMPLIANCE
Risk Management and the HAP Standard Principles	
Declaration of Interests	
Specific Requirements	MINOR NON-COMPLIANCE
Benchmark 1	
Benchmark 2	<p>2.7 HO – Establish a time bound roll-out plan for working with partners to agree on the knowledge, skills behaviours and attitudes that a partner's staff need to meet agreed commitments, and to ensure these are reflected in a staff code of conduct (as in requirement 2.2). Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS – Put in practice a plan on how NCA Kenya will work with its partners to agree on the knowledge, skills behaviours and attitudes that a partner's staff need to meet agreed commitments, and to ensure these are reflected in a staff code of conduct (as in requirement 2.2). Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>2.8 HO – Establish and implement a time bound roll-out plan for working with partners to improve how partners implement and monitor their staff codes of conduct. Timeframe 12 months</p> <p>PS - Put in practice a plan on how NCA Kenya will work with its partners to improve how partners implement and monitor their staff codes of conduct. Timeframe 18 months</p>
Benchmark 3	<p>3.1 HO – Develop a corporate statement that defines and documents processes for sharing</p>

	<p>information that meets the HAP Standard requirement 3.1 and ensure staff are aware of the statement. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>3.2 HO – Establish a time bound roll-out plan for developing context specific information plans and ensure staff are aware of and implement the plan(s) relevant to them. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS - Develop a Kenyan specific information plan that includes the 6 criteria in requirement 3.2 and ensure staff implement this plan systematically. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>3.4 HO – Ensure staff identify themselves to the people NCA aims to assist and other stakeholders, including through identity cards with validity dates, organisation name and contact details, where appropriate. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>3.6 HO - Establish a time bound roll-out plan for working with partners on how and when to share information, including with the rights holders, and put the agreements into practice. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>PS – Develop agreements with the Kenyan partners on how and what information to share, including with the rights holders, and put the agreement into practice. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>3.7 HO - Establish a time bound roll-out plan on how NCA will work with its partners to improve how partners meet requirements 3.1 to 3.4. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS – Develop a plan together with partners on how NCA Kenya will work with its partners to improve how partners meet requirements 3.1 to 3.4. Timeframe: 12 months</p>
Benchmark 4	<p>4.1 HO – Develop a corporate statement or formalise the guidelines that defines and documents processes for sharing information that meets the HAP Standard requirement 4.1 and ensure staff are aware of them. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>4.2 PS – Develop a context-appropriate participation plans which met requirement 4.2 and put it into practice. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>4.4 HO - Establish a time bound roll-out plan for working with partners on how the people their aim to assist will participate in different stages of the project, and put the agreements into practice. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS – Develop a plan on how NCA Kenya will work with its partners to agree on how the people their aim to assist will participate in the different stages of the project, and to put this agreement into practice. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>4.5 HO - Establish a time bound roll-out plan on how NCA will work with its partners to improve how partners meet requirements 4.1 to 4.3. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS – Develop a plan on how NCA Kenya will work with its partners to improve how partners meet requirements 4.1 to 4.3. Timeframe: 12 months</p>
Benchmark 5	<p>5.2: HO – Develop and implement a roll-out plan for consulting rights holders and partners</p>

	<p>and contextualise the global CRP based on their preferences. Record consultations with rights holders and partners. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS - Consult Kenyan rights holders and partners on their preferences for the complaints procedures and revise the contextualise CRP based on their preferences. Record consultations with rights holders and partners. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>5.3: HO – Implement a process to ensure that rights holders and other stakeholders understand the contextualised complaints procedure relevant to them. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>PS - Implement a process specific to Kenya to ensure that rights holders and other stakeholders understand the contextualised complaints procedure. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>5.4: PS - Handle all complaints in line with NCA procedures, in particular following the ACT Investigation Guidelines and tracking of non-serious complaints. Timeframe: 6 months</p> <p>5.5 HO – Develop and implement agreements with partners on how NCA and its partners will raise and handle complaints against each other in a safe and accessible way. Document each agreement. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>PS - Develop and implement agreements with Kenya partners on how NCA and its partners will raise and handle complaints against each other in a safe and accessible way. Document each agreement. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>5.6 HO - develop written agreements with partners on how NCA will work with them to enable people they aim to assist to raise complaints. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>PS - develop written agreements with Kenyan partners on how NCA will work with them to enable people they aim to assist to raise complaints. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>5.7 HO – Work with partners to improve how partners meet requirements 5.1 to 5.4. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>PS – Work with Kenyan partners to improve how partners meet requirements 5.1 to 5.4 Timeframe: 18 months</p>
<p>Benchmark 6</p>	<p>6.2 HO – Develop a plan to regularly monitor its performance, including in relation to the accountability framework, staff competencies, sharing information, enabling participation, handling complaints, and learning. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS – Develop in Kenya a plan to regularly monitor its performance, including in relation to the accountability framework, staff competencies, sharing information, enabling participation, handling complaints, and learning. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>6.3 HO – Develop and include an objective to assess progress in delivering its accountability framework in the scope of evaluations. Timeframe: 12 months</p> <p>PS – Develop and include in Kenya an objective to assess progress in delivering its accountability framework in the scope of evaluations. Timeframe: 12 months</p>

	<p>6.5 HO – Establish a time bound roll-out plan for working with partners on how to jointly monitor and evaluate programmes, and put the agreements into practice. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>PS – Develop agreements with its Kenya’s partners on how they will jointly monitor and evaluate programmes and put the agreement into practice. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>6.6 HO - Establish and implement a time bound roll-out plan on how NCA will work with its partners to improve how partners meet requirements 6.1 to 6.4. Timeframe: 18 months</p> <p>PS – Develop a plan on how NCA Kenya will work with its partners to improve how partners meet requirements 6.1 to 6.4 and put it into practice. Timeframe: 18 months</p>
Total	37

Audit Key

<p>Major Non Compliance: this will result in a delay in the recommendation for certification process, which can only proceed once the correction actions have been met and verified. A major non-compliance could be due to a number of reasons such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete absence of a procedure as noted in the Standard • A series of minor non-conformances all focused on the same element of the standard; unless, at re-certification, a time frame agreed for corrective action on first certification has not expired, and the auditor assesses that corrective action is likely to be completed within that time frame • A serious violation of qualifying norms and/or humanitarian principles • A clear lack of control on some key management issues • Immediate dangers for the beneficiaries or for the quality of the service to the beneficiaries • A Minor detected in a previous audit not addressed within the specified time • False Declarations <p>Minor Non Compliance: this will not result in a delay of the recommendation for certification but will require corrective action within a specified time frame. Certain corrective actions on first certification may warrant a time frame of more than three years (but never more than six years).</p> <p>A minor non-compliance could be due to a number of reasons such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to implement management system policy / guidelines systematically • Incomplete key documents / records • Oversight <p>Exoneration: this is when, due to the context of the location audited, a justifiable and up to date explanation has been given by the agency as to why a benchmark / requirement has not been met – rationale should be based on the humanitarian accountability principles in the Covenant.</p> <p>Recommendation: This is a non-binding improvement proposition given by the auditor that if not addressed could weaken the agency’s humanitarian accountability and quality management assurance.</p> <p>Observation: An observation is the value added input an auditor can give to draw the agency’s attention to issues noted during the audit that could impact the agency either negatively or positively. It captures both observed good practice and areas where improvement should be looked into.</p>
