

Audit Report

Of HAP 2007 Standard

Summary Findings

Application Organisation Information

Organisation:	Tearfund UK	Audit Ref / No:	E004/0308-HAP
Location:	Teddington, UK Monrovia & Nimba County, Liberia	Head Office/Field Site:	Head Office Field Site
Auditor (s):	Sheryl Haw Asmita Naik	Date (s):	18 th to 20 th March 2008 1 st – 6 th June 2008
Agency Representative:	David Bainbridge Jonas Njelango	Role of Representative	Disaster Management Director Programme Director

Methodology

The scope of Tearfund UK audit was:

- The Head Office – based in Teddington, England – through on site audit.
- The Field Site Operations (6 Emergency Responses) – through self-assessment audit – NB: Self Assessments Received: 5. Liberia was the field site selected for an on site audit, with Nimba County being the project site selected within Liberia.

Note: The certificate quality assurance audit covers all Tearfund UK Emergency Responses, inclusive of direct responses made with the Disaster Management Team and emergency response carried out through Tearfund partners.

The audit comprised of the following approaches:

Phase One: Document Review

Documents of processes and policies presented by Tearfund UK in support of their compliance statement.

Phase Two: On Site Audit at Head Office

Document verification and interviews with Head Office staff took place from 18th to 20th March 2008

Phase Three: On Site Audit in Selected Field Site

Document verification and interviews with Field Office staff, Partners and Beneficiaries took place from 1st to 6th June 2008

Phase Four: Review of Self Assessments received from All Field Sites

A summary analysis was reviewed from relief self-assessments carried out by Emergency Response directors and their teams.

This report covers the combined summary findings of all four phases. The detailed findings report compiled by the independent auditors coupled with corrective action requests combine to make the full audit report.

Outcome

The audit team, comprising one certified independent auditor and the chief auditor, of the HAP 2007 Humanitarian Accountability and Quality Management Standard, audited Tearfund UK Emergency Responses in relation to its conformity with the HAP 2007 Standard. The audit was carried out between 18th to 20th March 2008 and 1st to 6th June 2008.

The evidence provided in support of the Application for Certification is the responsibility of the Board and the Senior Management of Tearfund UK. Our responsibility is to express an opinion both on the evidence provided and the interviews carried out during the audit. We confirm that we all meet the formal requirements for HAP auditors concerning professional competence and independence.

Our 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 about whether the agency is in conformity with the HAP Standard. We have audited the agency on a sample test basis through an examination of documentary evidence disclosed and through interviews with Tearfund UK staff involved in the Head Office and the Liberia operations, which included interviews with staff, partners and beneficiaries. Coupled to this a review of the self-assessment statements jointly summarised from Tearfund UK Emergency Response programmes were considered. We believe that the audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion the agency is in compliance with the HAP 2007 Standard, with findings summarised in the auditor's report, the Head Office and Field Site Findings Reports.



Summary Report Compiled by Sheryl Haw
Chief Auditor
HAP International

18th June 2008

Summary Findings

CAR: Corrective Action Request

Date: Deadline for providing a Corrective Action Response that demonstrates what actions have been undertaken to rectify the minor or major non-compliance identified.

HAP Standard <i>Non-Compliances</i>	Head Office		Field Site(s)		Self Assessments
	MAJOR	MINOR	MAJOR	MINOR	Opinion
Qualifying Norms					Five field sites submitted at self-assessment and a contextual HAF.
Benchmark 1					Clarity on how management system enables HAF still required
Benchmark 2					Systematic information provision throughout DMT projects.
Benchmark 3					Thorough reporting on participatory processes used.
Benchmark 4				Requirement 4.2 CAR: 01/12/09	Staff awareness training started, but as yet not fully linked to HAF expectations.
Benchmark 5		Requirement 5.2 CAR: 01/12/09		Requirement 5.1 CAR: 01/12/09 Requirement 5.2 CAR: 01/12/09 Requirement 5.5 CAR: 01/12/09	Early stages of setting up CM throughout all sites. Consultation with beneficiaries required.
Benchmark 6		Requirement 6.2 CAR: 01/12/09		Requirement 6.2 CAR: 01/12/09	Clarity of expectations for partner support required
Total	0	2	0	5	