



COMPLAINTS
REPORT
2012



DanChurchAid Complaints Report

2012

This is the fourth Complaints Report describing the development of DanChurchAid's Complaints Handling System (CHS). The report covers the calendar year 2012 and is available at the DanChurchAid website together with all previous Complaints Reports (2009, 2010 and 2011).

Part 1 is general information about the daily administration of the Complaints Handling System.

Part 2 is a report on the activities and themes which have given cause to complaints in the DCA Complaints Handling System in Copenhagen.

Part 3 lists the handling of complaints in Kyrgyzstan and Uganda. These two countries have been selected, as they are the latest countries which have introduced decentralised Complaints Handling Systems.

Part 1: General Information

From 1 January to 31 December 2012 the office in Copenhagen received 94 complaints, of which 24 complaints were solely about the wall (the so-called defence barrier built by Israel) that DCA's youth organisation erected at the Roskilde Music Festival in July 2012.

Thus we received in total 59 complaints more than in 2011, in which we received a total of 35 complaints. The complaints are of both sensitive (8) and operational (86) character and include our Danish as well as our international activities.

There is a slight increase in the number of sensitive complaints in 2012 after a considerable decrease in 2011 in the number of such complaints. Specifically, the development in the number of corruption cases has been 11 in 2010, one in 2011 and eight in 2012. It is not clear what has caused this large discrepancy.

Apart from the complaints about the wall at the Roskilde Music Festival, the operational complaints are mainly about our telemarketing campaign, in which we contact people by telephone, totalling 20 complaints.

We still receive complaints about our street fundraising (F2F), and in 2012 we received a total of eleven complaints about this activity. Both telemarketing and street fundraising are very important fundraising activities for DanChurchAid. The number of complaints should be compared to the fact that we contact

approx. 130,000¹ persons annually in the streets through our face-2-face campaign, and that in 2011 we telephoned approx. 223,000 persons. However, some of these did not answer the phone. On that background the number of complaints is very limited, fortunately.

Transparency by publishing corruption cases

The 2012 corruption cases are reported relatively detailed. The purpose is to ensure transparency to donors, media, external donors and other stakeholders. In addition, corruption cases are currently published at the DanChurchAid Danish and English websites, www.noedhjaelp.dk/anti-korruption and <http://www.danchurchaid.org/about-us/quality-assurance/anti-corruption/cases>. We want to show that corruption or suspicion of corruption is taken very seriously and that we have nothing to hide, not even in sensitive cases. Most often, the character of the cases is sensitive and in the investigative phase based on accusations without proof; therefore it is very important that what we choose to publish is not harmful to the person, the organisation or the further investigation of the case. Thus we assess from case to case what should be published. DanChurchAid has decided that the names of individuals involved in a complaint are not published. If we find that publishing the name of the country will harm the victim, or if there is a considerable risk for aggravating the role of the victim, the name of the country in question will not be published. The reason is that DanChurchAid has relatively few employees in each country, and it will be very easy to identify the complainants or the victims. On behalf of DanChurchAid, a DanChurchAid Board member will go through specific cases in order to secure the quality of the processing of the case.

Other cases

Regarding the operational cases, some of the complaints have resulted in an adjustment of procedures or an internal discussion with a view to prevent further complaints. However, we also see that in a number of cases there are already clear procedures and guidelines, which in the specific case may not have been observed; but the case does not necessarily require further follow-up other than stressing the existing guidelines.

In general the system functions well, and there is a basic backing and understanding of the system in the organisation. Thus, the system is now an integral part of the general administration in DanChurchAid.

Part 2: Examples of specific complaints lodged in DanChurchAid's Complaints Handling System in Copenhagen

From 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012

Corruption cases

Summary made by Maja B. Gram

2012.C01 **Contents of complaint:** DanChurchAid received a corruption complaint against a manager and a staff in one of the international offices.

¹ The figure is based on the fact that we get 13,000 new members every year. On average, maybe one out of 100 persons we approach in the streets becomes a member, meaning that we contact approx. 130,000 persons.

What did we do: An investigation of the conditions in the office was carried out, a.o. by interviewing all key staff and checking all purchase routines and employment procedures. The investigation did not reveal any documentation of fraud, but examples of nepotism concerning a former employee; in addition there was a breach of some of DanChurchAid's internal policies. The case resulted in disciplinary measures.

Lessons learned: There was no need for further follow-up in relation to our rules and procedures, but we must ensure that rules and procedures really are observed. The effect of the complaint handling system is that cases can be investigated in a systematic and thorough manner so that we can be very sure whether there is a case or not.

2012.C02

Contents of complaint: DanChurchAid supports a local partner organisation in Bangladesh called Warbe DF. Some irregularities were found in connection with documentation and "over-ordering". More specifically, there was a false invoice on office supplies. In addition, an employee with Warbe DF ordered food and office supplies for 155-160 persons although only 90 persons participated in the workshop in question.

What did we do: DanChurchAid asked Warbe DF to delete the false items and figures from the financial report. Warbe DF gave the involved employees disciplinary punishment. Furthermore, Warbe DF has employed an experienced accountant to check the financial transactions.

Lessons learned: The partner organisation is fully responsible for the financial transactions. However, DanChurchAid can assist in building up the competence of financial management, if the partner wishes to invest in capacity building.

The partner is responsible for controlling the financial transactions, and if a small partner has to control a large amount, DanChurchAid should invest in capacity building. In a country like Bangladesh with extensive corruption, DanChurchAid should attach experienced financial employees who can offer the partners the necessary assistance to monitor and revise the projects.

2012.C03

Contents of complaint: DanChurchAid experienced two minor cases of corruption in Malawi. The Zambian immigration authority forced a DCA employee to pay bribe (DKK 87.00, approx. USD 14.50). The Zambian immigration authority claimed that the documents were not in order and on that background threatened to put DCA's employee in prison. The police in Malawi forced the same employee to pay DKK 69.00 to get through a road block. The police demanded the payment because the employee transported fuel apparently without proper permission. The payments have been covered by DCA's own funds.

2012.C04

Contents of complaint: We discovered a corruption case with one of DCA's partners in Uganda. A project coordinator has stolen a camera and a laptop. In addition, an audit report showed that it was not possible to find documentation for one of the implemented activities.

What did we do: We asked the partner to explain, and the partner was very cooperative. The project coordinator has been fired and reported to the local police. A plan of reimbursement has been made, in which the partner accepted to reimburse the undocumented funds (DKK 14,000 (USD 2,330) plus still undocumented DKK 10,760).

Lessons learned: Besides project implementation, the evaluation and monitoring visits should also include investigation of personnel- and organisational issues. These may include

e.g. the competences of the field workers, the frequency of assistance and supervision by the superiors, as well as maintaining the lines of reference and the recruitment policy of the organisation. Furthermore, DanChurchAid should ensure a thorough triangulation of information from the partners, which is an important part of the initial evaluation process. With new partners, transfer of funds to and reporting from the partner should take place 3-4 times per calendar year instead of the present two transfers. These measures should minimise financial losses during implementation and increase the insight in the development of the project.

- 2012.C05 **Contents of complaint:** Two employees from a DanChurchAid partner in Bangladesh have committed corruption. The case has been handled according to DanChurchAid's principles regarding transparency and responsibility. DanChurchAid supports a project with distribution of calves to beneficiaries in Bangladesh. At the same time fodder for the calves should be distributed, and the beneficiaries should be encouraged and assisted to make savings. Two employees from DanChurchAid's partner abused their position in an illegal way. They did not distribute all the calf fodder and thereby earned DKK 3,180 (USD 530) for themselves. In addition the two employees stole DKK 2,880 (USD 480) from the savings of the beneficiaries. In total the corruption case amounts to DKK 6,060.
- What did we do:** DanChurchAid's partner in Bangladesh has fired the two employees and reported the case to the local police. The case was registered in the police report (the case is reported, but the police will not make further investigation). The two employees have been ordered to repay the stolen amounts. DanChurchAid's partner will keep DanChurchAid updated on the repayment of the amounts.
- Lessons learned:** Improved control mechanisms in the form of regular monitoring of project activities as well as verification by the recipients of the support, that they have in fact received what they are entitled to.
- 2012.C06 **Contents of complaint:** At present DanChurchAid is investigating an accusation made by an employee in one of our partner organisations. The accusation is about misuse of funds donated by DanChurchAid. Updating and result of the investigation will be published on our website.
- What did we do:** DanChurchAid initiated an audit and follows the partner closely.
- 2012.C07 **Contents of complaint:** In October 2012 DanChurchAid was informed about possible fraud with money transferred from DanChurchAid to a partner organisation.
- What did we do:** DanChurchAid carried out an internal investigation of the partner in question. The focus of the investigation was on the purchase procedures and the handling of the petty cash and salaries. All larger purchases made by the partner organisation in 2011 were investigated and cross-checked. The investigation did not give any proof of fraud or misuse of donated funds. All procedures related to cash, salaries and purchases were followed and documented according to DanChurchAid standards. The prices of all the purchases of the partner organisation were according to market prices and with proper documentation. On that background DanChurchAid decided to close the case, and there will be no further investigations.
- Lessons learned:** There will be no further follow-up on this case.

- 2012.C08 **Contents of complaint:** Fraud was discovered in two of DanChurchAid's second-hand shops. The fraud has taken place over a longer period of time and amounts to DKK 60,000 (USD 10,000) and 147,000 respectively. In both cases the fraud was discovered by the accountant of the shop, and in both cases it was because, contrary to normal procedures, the daily turnover had been deposited in a private mail box or had disappeared before being deposited in a bank deposit box, respectively.
- What did we do:** Both cases have been reported to the police, and we have introduced stricter procedures for counting and depositing of cash in bank deposit box. In addition we have discontinued the cooperation with two volunteers although the police had to close the case.
- Lessons learned:** It is necessary to keep current control that the procedures for counting and depositing of the daily turnover are observed.

Follow-up on 2010 corruption cases

- 2010.C07 **Contents of complaint:** It was revealed that a partner in Zimbabwe supported by DanChurchAid used a false branch of a big international auditing company. The auditor's report is being scrutinised to find out if fraud has taken place, and another auditing firm has been hired to revise the activities and the financial capacity of the partner organisation. DCA has currently monitored the partner and the project. In connection with the case DCA has established a close cooperation with the board of the partner organisation who was as surprised at the case as was DCA.
- What did we do:** In close cooperation with other donors of the partner in question, a financial investigation has been made by an external and internationally recognised auditing company. The investigation concluded that there was missing documentation, but that it was not a matter of fraud. In connection with the project three vehicles had been purchased, and DanChurchAid has demanded that the partner reimburses DanChurchAid the corresponding amount.
- Lessons learned:** Although we monitor the project activities closely, there is still a risk of fraud at external partners. In close cooperation with the partner and the other donors of the partner we managed to solve the problem.

Fundraising in Denmark

Telemarketing activities (phoners)

Telemarketing was the area of work from which we received the highest number of complaints in 2012, a total of 20 complaints. The complaints can be broken down into the following themes

- Complaints about repeated calls asking the person to increase his/her contribution
- Complaints in general about being contacted
- Complaints about having to submit cpr number and bank account number by telephone
- Complaints about allegedly impolite/rude behaviour of the phoner
- Complaints about being contacted despite having requested not to be contacted

All complaints have been answered in a friendly and open manner. We have immediately cancelled the contributions of those who wanted it; we have removed telephone numbers from our call lists and we have followed up with the employees/coordinators in question in cases of specific violations of our ethical guidelines for telemarketing.

DanChurchAid's Ethical Guidelines for Telemarketing

Our telemarketing activities build on common principles of good fundraising according to the Ethical Fundraising Guidelines of ISOBRO (umbrella organisation of fundraising NGOs), Danish ethics and morale as well as current Danish legislation.

- *Our employees are trained to do their job and are well informed about the objectives and the work of the organisation, including especially the use of the collected funds and the ethical guidelines for telemarketing*
- *Our employees agree that they work under the rule of confidentiality, and that it is valid during the employment and after*
- *If asked, we inform openly about our working conditions; that we are paid by the hour and not by commission*
- *We endeavour not to call private persons who have asked not to be contacted by telephone, or persons whom we assess are minors or incapable of taking responsibility for their actions*
- *If asked, we tell the persons we call how they have been selected and which criteria are used for the selection, e.g. previous contact or segmentation*
- *All conversations begin with a presentation of who is calling and the purpose of the call*
- *We respect any wish to discontinue a conversation*
- *We respect a 'no' and end all conversations in a polite and respectful manner*
- *We give correct and complete information about all relevant conditions*
- *If asked, we submit the name and contact information of a contact person in the organisation*
- *We follow up on all complaints*
- *All information regarding the payment agreement is used in relation to the purpose for which it has been collected, and will, at any time, be treated as confidential and according to the Data Protection Law.*

Street Fundraising (F2F)

We still receive complaints about street fundraising. In 2012 we had 11 cases.

The complaints can be broken down into the following themes

- Complaints about donations, which the donor thought was a one-time donation, but instead turned out to be a current donation agreement
- Complaints about the behaviour of the street fundraisers
- Complaint about signing donor agreement with a drunken person at the Roskilde Music Festival

All complaints have been answered in a friendly and open manner. We have immediately cancelled the contributions of those who wanted it, and we have followed up with the employees/coordinators in question in cases of specific violations of our ethical guidelines for street fundraising.

Ethical Guidelines for F2F Employees in the member organisations of ISOBRO

- *F2F employees sign a document to observe the below mentioned ethical guidelines whether they are employed directly by an organisation or are employed by a company working for a member organisation of ISOBRO. The guidelines cover F2F activities in the public space*
- *We always work dressed in the organisation's campaign coat and/or T-shirt, and we wear ID clearly stating the organisation we represent*
- *We are aware that in the street we represent the organisation and that our behaviour should be accordingly*
- *We respect the common rules of the public space. We only recruit in places with common public traffic. We respect and observe permissions given by a third party*
- *We never recruit in private places or at private addresses, including cafés and shopping malls, without prior permission from the owner or his/her representative*
- *We inform the recruited person how the organisation will communicate with him/her in future*
- *We respect a 'no' and always end a dialogue in a polite and respectful manner*
- *We do not recruit persons who we assess are not able to be responsible for their actions; e.g. minors, persons under the influence of alcohol or other substances and mentally ill persons*
- *We make sure that we inform correctly and that we behave as agreed upon and as stipulated by the organisation*
- *In the street we do not act in a provocative or dominating manner, and we are not manipulative in our recruiting methods*
- *If asked we inform that we are employed on contract with fixed salary by the organisation or the company working on behalf of the organisation. The work is not carried out by volunteers. No commission is paid*
- *Any complaint will be followed up*
- *All information about the recruited person will be treated as confidential and according to the Data Protection Law*
- *As employees we are trained to do the job, and we are well informed about the organisation and its work*
- *We coordinate our street campaigns with other organisations and other similar campaign activities, so that the street space is not overcrowded*
- *We do not accept money in the street.*

Approved by the member organisations 6 August 2007

Buy aid

In 2011 we received five complaints about our business cooperation with buy aid. In 2012 it was reduced to three complaints. In all the cases the complainants felt cheated because they thought that they supported a humanitarian purpose 100% through their purchase and not with only the 10%, which buy aid donates to DanChurchAid. In all cases we followed up with buy aid and stressed that they should make it clear to the buyers that they are contacted by buy aid and not DanChurchAid and how much of their donation will go to the humanitarian purpose.

Parish Collection

In 2012 we received six complaints about the Parish Collection. The complaints included

- Complaint about using by name a well-known celebrity as role model
- Complain about spending money on TV advertising
- Complaints about brochures/giros left on the address

Regarding the complaints about the celebrity, this person has been a keen collector for DCA many times; however, we took the complaint seriously. As to spending money on TV advertising we explained the rationale behind it, meaning that we can reach and at the same time encourage many more people to be active in the Parish Collection through TV than e.g. by sending out printed material. We apologized for the brochures left at private addresses.

Complaints about cancelling of donations and technical issues

13 complaints were about cancelling donations and more technical issues, e.g.

- Cancelling an agreement due to various conditions
- No or wrong registration with the tax authorities
- Change of name in agreements
- Letter to a deceased
- Links in mails and at websites that did not work
- Impossible to print a gift voucher
- Donation withdrawn twice

We have followed up on all complaints of this kind and thereby ensured that the contribution was cancelled, that the correct amount has been registered with the tax authorities and that links and other technicalities are working again.

Miscellaneous

Finally we received seven complaints about conditions that cannot be categorised above, e.g.

- Complaints about unethical "Give-a-goat" campaign due to use of live animals
- Complaint about Bilka Supermarket carrier bags, with which the customer supports a project in Malawi
- Christmas Aid to Muslim families
- Complaints about sms-campaign or material sent out in general

In all the cases DanChurchAid answered the complainants and explained the background and purpose of the campaigns.

Organisational matters

The number of complaints about organisational matters has increased from one complaint in 2011 to 26 complaints in 2012. The complaints were about the following issues

- The wall at the Roskilde Music Festival (the so-called defense barrier built by Israel) (24 complaints)
- Complaints about second-hand shops

The wall at the Roskilde Music Festival resulted in the biggest number of complaints (24 plus a number of comments) about a specific theme ever received in the DanChurchAid Complaints Handling System since its implementation in 2009.

In our reply to the complainants we tried hard to explain DanChurchAid's attitude and purpose of erecting a copy of the wall at the Roskilde Music Festival, and the replies were very detailed in the explanations as can be seen in the below quotes from a typical reply.

On the one hand we recognise Israel's right to protect its citizens against any kind of attack. We condemn any use of violence and terror to obtain political goals. We recognise the Israelis' right to live a life in dignity in security and peace with their neighbours.

Our youth organisation's purpose of erecting a copy of the wall at the Roskilde Music Festival was not to point at specific political solutions to a difficult political situation. Our purpose was primarily to draw attention to the humanitarian situation in the area.

At the wall at the Roskilde Music Festival written material was distributed which pointed at three basic areas, that DanChurchAid always investigates in humanitarian crises

- According to UN's latest figures, 44% of the Palestinians are depending on assistance from outside.*
- According to UN figures the inhabitants have access to only half of what WHO recommends as daily water ration.*
- Right now the population has no access to 40% of their land (the occupied West Bank).*

DanChurchAid is a church-based and humanitarian organisation which works to save lives and create possibilities for people to live a life in dignity.

The new Danish development strategy that has been approved with support from all parties ascertains that Denmark's development aid should be carried out from a human rights perspective and the UN Conventions.

The human rights, International Law and the Conventions are the foundation for DanChurchAid's work.

Consequently we consider it our task to inform about what we see and hear in the areas we are working – whether it is popular, whether it is considered political, and irrespective of it taking place in Malawi, Honduras, Burma or Israel and the occupied territories.

We believe that in order to obtain sustainable peace – no matter where in the world – it has to build on the human rights and the international conventions.

We share this point of view with very many Israelis, e.g. Avraham Burg, former chairman of Knesset (1999-2003) and chairman of the Jewish Agency and World Zionist Organisation. In a feature article in the Danish daily BerlingskeTidende he precisely argues, that the world's leaders should demand that Israel observes international law – because only then Israel can have a democratic future. (<http://www.b.dk/kommentarer/boykot-af-bosaetter-produkter-redder-israel>)

We received two complaints about our second-hand shops about the use of the pavement for exhibition of goods and throwing out delivered clothes respectively. Both cases were followed up. As to the thrown-away clothes, then it takes place after a thorough assessment if the clothes can be sold at all. Some shops have agreements with other organisations, that clothes that cannot be sold in Denmark will be transported to other countries in Europe.

Part 3: Reports from DanChurchAid's Regional Offices in Central Asia and Uganda

Our rough figures by year end 2012 show that we have 219 partners and approx. 15 Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) partners. 59 of the partners have complaints mechanisms and 20 more are in the process.

All DCA's regional offices, except for Central America, have Complaint Handling Systems in place, and as the systems are being rolled out to DCA's Regional Offices and partners it has become too comprehensive and time consuming to collect information from all the systems. However, the regional offices are able to provide more detailed information upon request.

Instead, we have asked the DCA Regional Offices in Central Asia and Uganda to provide us with information about the progress of the Complaints Handling Systems that have been established there in 2012.

The 2010 and 2011 Complaint Reports have more information about the Complaint Handling Systems in Malawi, Ethiopia, Cambodia, India, Myanmar and the HMA office in Angola.

Brief Report on Complaints Handling System in Central Asia

1) Short description of the progress of the implementation and the challenges occurred, if any

- ✓ 18 partner organisations (12 partners funded by DCA and 6 by ICCO within joint PT1 regional programme) have developed and approved their complaint handling policies based on their work context, resources and capacities
- ✓ 18 partners have conducted information sessions in the target communities among right holders, duty bearers and other stakeholders about the complaint handling mechanisms developed and distributed information materials with contacts for complaints/feedback
- ✓ 12 partner organisations have used various tools of complaints handling mechanisms: special mail boxes in the offices, logbooks for registering complaints, e-mail system via organisation's web-sites, hotline mobile phone, complaint handling committees established in the organisations

2) Is the system valuable for the organisation

The system is valuable for the partners because it

- ✓ contributes to the improvement of human resource management and quality of organisational performance (quality of services)
- ✓ promotes organisational transparency and accountability towards beneficiaries/right holders and duty bearers
- ✓ makes organisations more accessible for the right holders/beneficiaries, local partners and duty bearers
- ✓ promotes increased awareness of beneficiaries and confidence in claiming their rights
- ✓ ensures right responses to right holders' needs through planning and implementing more relevant and effective activities
- ✓ contributes to raising funds for the projects due to the improvement of organisations' accountability and transparency

3) Short description of some of the complaints received and how the partner has dealt with the complaints

- ✓ One (Advocacy Center in Osh, Southern part of Kyrgyzstan) out of 18 partner organisations practising complaint mechanisms has received two complaints related to its programme staff's

rude attitude towards clients when providing legal consultations in the fields. The complaints have been received via e-mail box at the organisation's website. According to the organisation's policy the director is the responsible person who deals with all complaints. Special warnings have been given to this staff based on the complaints received.

4) What are the lessons learned and has there been any change in procedures etc.?

- ✓ Complaint mechanisms is just in the process of being introduced to the partner organisations, so more time is needed for promoting and ensuring application of the complaint mechanisms by the right holders/beneficiaries, duty bearers, partners and other stakeholders
- ✓ Culture and mentality of local people in the region should be taken into account while working with such systems/mechanisms. Sometimes rights holders are not used to complain about partner organisations' work as they fear to be excluded from getting support from the them
- ✓ There can be misunderstanding of the purpose of the complaint mechanisms, so in some cases complaints do not relate to the programme/project implementation and/or services provided by the partner organisations (e.g. requests for money support).

Brief Report on Complaints Handling System in Uganda

1. Short description on the progress of the implementation and the challenges occurred, if any

Only LWF Uganda has a fully operational Complaints Handling System (CHS) and is HAP certified (Humanitarian Accountability Partnership).

However, out of the 14 partners that were trained in HAP and Complaint Mechanism and Response in March 2012, only three (UJCC, RACA and RACOBABO) have gone beyond internal consultations and have managed to come up with the appropriate policy environment to incorporate a Complaints Handling System in their organisations. The three organisations have tested and rolled out Complaint Handling Mechanisms, also developed a staff Code of Conduct that guides staff behaviour and interaction both within and outside the organisation, and also seeks to protect staff as well as every woman, man, girl and boy that the organisations work with from abuse by individuals or groups from within the organisations.

The rest of the organisations are still at various stages of consultation within their organisations and at board level, and are implementing some of the HAP benchmarks, most notably Benchmark 3 on information sharing with rights holders and with local authorities.

Some challenges are listed below:

- i. Staff turnover and capacity to implement the CHS within partner organisations: Staff that were trained in March have since left the various organisations, leaving a capacity gap.
- ii. Some complaints are beyond the capacity of the organisation to handle, for example, failure by local leaders to fulfil their pledges to the community. Most complaints received by partners in their CHS relate to issues that are totally unrelated to project implementation. Rights holders do not know how to and what to complain about.

- iii. Challenges also exist in regular information sharing with rights holders due to the high rates of illiteracy, especially in the Karamoja region. Information is shared through verbal means as well as translated, simplified and pictorial materials. Verbal communication is extremely time consuming, and the information shared is subject to distortion during dissemination, while using appropriate materials incurs high printing costs. The need to follow up to ensure that vulnerable rights holders effectively and meaningfully participate in project activities, and have the ability to use the CHS is also costly in terms of resources and time. The most vulnerable are also the ones who have little time and ability to attend community meetings, and partners have to make extra effort to look for and encourage their participation in project activities.
- iv. Communities prefer suggestion boxes rather than using short text messages, e-mails (where there is access) or verbally communicating their complaints to senior staff within an organisation. Suggestion boxes are expensive to set up in every parish.
- v. Some stakeholders, particularly local authorities, have vested interests in the projects and may thus undermine project successes.

2. Is the system of valuable for the organisation?

Most partner organisations acknowledge that a CHS is valuable. UJCC, RACA and RACOBABO say that the system is valuable since it motivates staff to maintain a high standard of service to the community. It also prevents tendencies to corruption. Having the system in a policy contributes to improving the policy environment within an organisation, clarifies issues and thus helps to improve on efficiency within the organisation.

3. Short description of some of the complaints received and how the partner has dealt with the complaints

All complaints that partners received in 2012 have been operational in nature and had to do with community members not understanding the nature of the project and deliverables expected. When these were explained, the communities were satisfied. Some examples are given below:

a) At the onset of the VSLA implementation, RACOBABO received complaints from one group against the CBT that they were required to buy their own ring fenced box, yet other groups received free ring fenced boxes. They claimed unfair treatment from the CBT and RACOBABO. RACOBABO complaints handling committee appointed one staff member to investigate the claims. The investigator interviewed both the VSLA group members and the CBT and reported back to the committee. The report highlighted the fact that the group was one of the groups that began at a later stage and were required to purchase their own boxes. The committee met the VSLA members and explained the VSLA methodology. The committee further explained why RACOBABO provided free boxes to the pioneer groups that were used as a pilot. The VSLA group members were satisfied. A similar complaint was received by RACA and more or less the same answer provided, leaving community members satisfied that they had understood.

b) A complaint was received by RACA concerning a parent/guardian of a vulnerable child whose school fees were paid by RACA under the SHARP project, but no school materials provided. The complainant thought that RACA staff had misappropriated the funds for this. RACA complaints handling committee explained to the lady that school support was being phased out, and the guardians of the children were introduced to the VSLA methodology in order to assist them save,

access credit and start small scale enterprises from which they could feed and provide school and other materials for the children. The lady understood and was satisfied.

4. What are the lessons learned and has there been any change in procedures etc.

In addition to incorporating the CHS in their policies, UJCC, RACA and RACOB AO have learned the importance of continuously sharing clear and complete information about what the projects are about, who the targeted rights holders are and what the rights holders should expect from the projects.

Gitte Krogh