



Complaints Report 2016

Contents

Part 1: Introduction and overview of types of complaints	3
Part 2: Complaints lodged in DanChurchAid's Complaint System 2016	6
Corruption cases from 1 January to 31 December 2016.....	7
January 2016: Corruption resulted in discontinuation of partner cooperation	7
January 2016: Fraud in Uganda leads to termination of cooperation with a DCA partner.....	7
February 2016: Harassment and extortion/blackmail of DCA employees in DRC.....	8
May 2016: Demand of facilitation payment developed into blackmail	9
Fundraising in Denmark	11
Organisational issues.....	12
Part 3: Maintenance and quality assurance of the Complaint System in 2016	13
Part 4: Information about our work with anti-corruption	15
International trends og DCA's role	15
Future work	16

Part 1: Introduction and overview of types of complaints

During 2016 we received a total of 28 complaints through our complaint system that is administered from the DanChurchAid (DCA) Head Quarters in Copenhagen. It is a reduction compared to 2015 when we received a total of 55 complaints. So, we received fewer complaints in 2016 than in 2015, however with a large increase in sensitive cases and a considerable decrease in the number of operational complaints.

The complaints include both sensitive (23) and operational complaints (2) as well as complaints (3) that we could not deal with as the complainant was anonymous, and/or the mail address was invalid so that our reply mail could not be delivered. The complaints included our national as well as our international activities.

Overview of complaints received since 2013 broken down in relevant types of complaints and sub-categories

	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total complaints received in Copenhagen	60	72	55	25
Number of sensitive complaints thereof	8	15	15	21
Number of operational cases thereof	52	57	40	2
Number of complaints that could not be dealt with thereof¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	3

Detailed overview of complaints regarding fundraising activities (sub-category of operational cases):

Complaints of telemarketing	17	15	13	0
Complaints of street recruitment	7	9	3	0
Complaints of cancelling of contribution and method	13	10	13	1
Complaints of Parish Collection	4	7	6	0
Complaints of buy aid	3	1	0	0
Total complaints of fundraising activities	44	42	35	1

Sensitive complaints

The sensitive complaints are broken down in categories of corruption, sexual abuse and harassment or other breaches of the DCA Code of Conduct both in relation to our own staff and staff in our partner

¹Complaints we could not deal with as the complainant was anonymous, and/or the mail address was not valid so that our reply mail could not be delivered. 2016 is the first year of making statistics on these cases and filing relevant information about them.

organisations. The corruption cases are categorised as "C" cases, while the remaining sensitive cases most often are related to the organisation and therefore are categorised as "O" cases.

The number of sensitive complaints in 2016 amounted to 21, which is an increase of six complaints compared to the 15 cases in 2015.

The sensitive complaints in 2016 are broken down into 14 corruption cases, while the remaining nine complaints were organisational cases related to employees in our partner organisations and/or DCA employees.

C-cases (as sub-category of the sensitive cases)

The following graph illustrates the tendency in the number of reported C-cases (i.e. complaints of suspicion of corruption during the last 12 years):

Apart from a couple of fluctuations, the tendency shows a steady increase in the number of cases. We consider this tendency a success and the fruit of our targeted and ambitious work with anti-corruption. An increased awareness of the employees and our partners regarding corruption and its negative effect on our work will of course result in more reported cases. Thus we can register a coincidence between the years when we conducted special efforts of anti-corruption and the years when we see fluctuation related to more reported cases. It begins in 2010 with the launching of our anti-corruption policy (after two years of developing it), training and implementation of anti-corruption focal points in 2014 and finally the compulsory training of all employees since 2015 through e-learning (in 2017 we have had 690 individual successful e-learnings). The e-learning is compulsory for all employees in the organisation, and as a result of the increased focus we can see the tendency of more cases in our system continue in 2016-2017.

In 2017-2018 we want to focus on spreading the knowledge and use of our complaint system to partners and communities as well. During the autumn an e-learning course will be implemented about the case work, the complaint system and the access to complain in the entire DCA. We expect this to generate even more activity in the complaint system, as well as more questions.

Operational complaints

Operational complaints are complaints of non-sensitive character. E.g. personnel cases or activities related to fundraising (telemarketing, street recruitment, various campaigns and the Parish Collection), but also complaints concerning activities at our country offices. The latter may be taken care of by the country offices themselves, however with compulsory reporting to the DCA HQ. See Chapter 3 in this report.

In 2016 DCA received two operational complaints. One was about our fundraising activities – i.e. activities regarding telemarketing, street recruitment, various campaigns and the Parish Collection. In this case the complainant had by mistake donated DKK 150 through sms to 1243. The mistake was corrected, and the amount returned to the complainant. The other case was about a reminder in connection with the complainant's cancellation of his donation, e.g. a complaint about the formal handling of a cancellation.

In 2016 we have not received any complaint in our system of our street recruitment. Both telemarketing and street recruitment are very important fundraising activities for DCA. The number of complaints should thus be seen in the context of our annual contact with 130,000² persons in the streets through our face-to-face campaign and our phone calls to approx. 223,000 persons. We did not get through to a number of these persons, though. On that background the number of complaints in 2016 is quite low.

Transparency in the publication of corruption cases

Again this year we have described in detail the reported corruption cases because we want to be transparent to our donors, the media and other stakeholders. In addition, corruption cases are published currently on the DCA English website. We want to demonstrate that corruption or suspicion of corruption is taken very seriously, and that we have nothing to hide, even in sensitive cases.

As the character of the cases most often is sensitive and during the investigation phase based on allegations without proof, it is very important that what we select for publication cannot harm the person, the organisation or the further investigation of the case. Thus we decide from case to case what to publish.

DCA has decided not to publish the names of individuals involved in a complaint. If we find that publication of the country in question will harm the victim, the name of the country will not be published either. The same procedure is used in situations with a great risk of making matters worse for the injured party. In such situations the name of the involved country will not be published either. The background of this is that DCA has relative few employees in each country, and it would be very easy to identify the persons who have lodged a complaint, who are the object of the complaint, or who are involved in the complaint one way or the other.

On behalf of the DCA Board of Directors a member of the Board has assessed selected cases for the sake of quality assurance of the case work.

² The number is based on 13,000 new members annually. On average we get one member out of 100 calls. This means that we contact up to 130,000 persons. These figures are unchanged from 2015.

Organisational complaints

This category includes e.g. complaints of volunteers in the second-hand stores, complaints from volunteers abroad and complaints of possible breach of internal management values or policies in the organisation. You will find more in-depth accounts of the cases in Part 2 of this report.

2016 shows an increase in the number of organisational complaints from five in 2015 to 13 in 2016. It was not possible to follow up on three of the 13 complaints. Two of them were reported anonymously, and it was not possible to contact the sender which was necessary as the information available in the original complaint was not sufficient to investigate the cases. The third complaint did not concern DCA's work, employees or partners, but referred to circumstances in a country where DCA is not working. In such cases we try to send the complainant on to the correct authorities.

Follow-up on the cases

Regarding operational cases some of the complaints have resulted in an adjustment of procedures or an internal discussion in order to avoid similar situations in the future, which may lead to complaints. However, we see quite often that clear procedures and guidelines are already in place, but that formalities in the specific case have not been observed. Most often these cases do not require further follow-up other than enjoining to observe already existing guidelines.

As to the sensitive cases it is important that the follow-up takes place as discreetly and confidential as ever possible. Often a complaint committee is formed. As a rule, depending on the nature of the complaint, the immediate superior is informed, unless it is not appropriate in the light of the character of the complaint and/or if the immediate superior is also involved. Then the committee representatives are selected individually according to the nature of the case and its contents; thus DCA makes sure that the most competent persons within country, region and contents of the complaint will do the case work.

In general the system functions well internally, and there is fundamental backing and understanding of the system in the organisation. We have a well-working system in DCA. Our focus now is to see to it that the system is maintained and that we continuously strengthen our work with partners and communities. We want to be even better at sharing the knowledge about our complaint system and information of what can be complained about, and that we are pleased to receive complaints and feedback.

Part 2: Complaints lodged in DanChurchAid's Complaint System 2016

Here follows a report on the activities and themes of the complaints received during 2016 at DCA Head Quarters in Copenhagen through our Complaint System.

Corruption cases from 1 January to 31 December 2016

As far as possible we publish the corruption cases we receive. You can read them on our English website where we currently update the development of the cases: <https://www.danchurchaid.org/about-us/quality-assurance/anti-corruption/cases>

There can be cases of such a character that they cannot be published due to the security of organisations or individuals. A report of corruption may end in nothing, and consequently it is not mentioned on the website. Thus, the number of cases below does not reflect the total number of reported cases, but a summary of the cases we published during 2016 and then included in the year's complaints report. The remaining cases are still registered, handled and documented.

January 2016: Corruption resulted in discontinuation of partner cooperation

Contents of complaint: In January 2016 DCA received a complaint of a partner organisation in one of our focus countries. The complainant claimed that the partner organisation was corrupt and misused funds transferred from DCA and other donors. The allegations included also nepotism, embezzlement, fraud and sexual harassment.

What did we do: To begin with DCA initiated an internal investigation of the partner organisation and immediately froze all transfers to the organisation while the investigation was ongoing. The internal investigation led to further suspicion of fraud. Together with a sister agency DCA initiated a special audit of the partner. This audit confirmed the corruption, and the cooperation with the suspected partner organisation was immediately terminated. DCA saw to it that the ongoing project continued through other channels. DCA has asked the accused organisation to reimburse the missing funds within a reasonable time limit. Due to the judicial situation in the country in question the case is very sensitive, and DCA is doing everything possible to protect the whistleblower as well as the persons under suspicion by handling the case confidentially.

Lessons learned: The case has stressed the importance and significance of not only having financial monitoring- and control systems, but also the importance of having trust in employees and colleagues, as it will increase the possibility of whistleblowers to come forward and inform DCA when something is not right.

January 2016: Fraud in Uganda leads to termination of cooperation with a DCA partner

Contents of complaint: DCA was informed about suspicious irregularities at our partner Uganda Land Alliance (ULA). The partner was suspected of nepotism, embezzlement, forgery and other forms of corruption made by several persons in the organisation.

What did we do: The first step DCA took was to inform the independent auditors about the suspicion in connection with DCA's regular audit. This resulted in further indications of fraud and also that other donors'

projects with ULA could be affected; this led to a joint audit. This audit found clear proof that ULA was involved in fraud and corruption. Consequently, the cooperation with ULA was terminated, and the organisation was asked to reimburse the lost funds. On their own initiative the Danish embassy in Uganda has taken over the follow-up on the case and is keeping the affected donors, including DCA, oriented. According to the embassy the case has not been reported to the police. Thus, DCA is not directly involved in the follow-up vis-à-vis ULA.

The case had also consequences for another of DCA's partner cooperations in Uganda, as the chairman of the ULA Board was also the chairman of this organisation. DCA informed the partner that the cooperation was suspended until they found a new chairman of the organisation. The Board of directors of the partner organisation reacted immediately and found a new chairman. As we have found no indications of other irregularities in the organisation, the cooperation with DCA continues with the new chairman of the board.

Lessons learned: DCA experienced difficulties in revealing fraud and corruption in spite of regular and solid procedures as well as monitoring of partner activities, including especially the situations when persons from the management are involved. It also shows how dependent DCA is on a well-functioning complaint handling system in relation to such cases. DCA will now increase the number of spot checks and unannounced monitoring visits, both in the form of general field visits and to the head quarters of the individual partners.

February 2016: Harassment and extortion/blackmail of DCA employees in DRC

Contents of complaint: Goma Harbour, DRC. An internationally employed person with double citizenship was on his way to Bukavu to finish his field visit. In DRC and other African countries internationally employed persons of African nationalities are more often exposed to harassment by the authorities than employees of western nationalities. As the employee's travel documents have been the object of unnecessary complication at the immigration authorities, the employee preferred to use his Congolese ID – especially a document known as "Carte d'electuer". According to the authorities in Goma Harbour, the document in the possession of the employee was forged. However, the document was issued by the same authorities in 2011 and been used earlier without problems. Fortunately, the employee had other ID documents, including a Congolese passport which could verify the authenticity of the employee's Congolese citizenship which in the end convinced the authorities. In spite of this the authorities, however, maintained their point of view and demanded that the employee must pay a fee for possession of forged ID documents, as this is a serious break of the law. After extensive discussions the employee was asked to pay a fee of USD 300 and did not get a receipt, even if the employee insisted that a receipt be issued.

What did we do: On the following day the employee managed to retrieve the document from the immigration authorities. DCA contacted all relevant authorities in order to try to get a formal explanation

why this happened and hopefully obtain an official receipt of the fee as well as a valid "Carte d'electuer". So far we have not been successful.

Lessons learned: The episode has been reported to the local INGO community. They suggest that the various focal points discuss the problem with the national authorities, so that internationally employed of African nationalities (or any other internationally employed) will not be harassed or exposed to accusations of forged ID documents, or of being spies etc.

May 2016: Demand of facilitation payment developed into blackmail

Contents of complaint: A team of internationally employed was stopped by local police at a check point near DCA's office after a work dinner and just before the official curfew. It was close to 22 hrs when the curfew begins in the country in question. The police asked for facilitation payment, and as the employees refused, the police officers became aggressive. The situation developed and the officers threatened our employees with detention until the next morning. The employees then decided to pay for security reasons. It was a question of USD 33, or approx. DKK 200.

What did we do: In situations like the above, DCA cannot do much. It is our clear policy that if you feel that your personal security is in danger, you pay. The demand for facilitation payment is recurrent, and it is our clear policy to refuse and not meet the demand. However, in situations this it developed into blackmail.

Lessons learned: Unfortunately, there is not much to learn from this type of cases. It is unpleasant for those involved and a sad fact that in many countries it is normal practice that the police try to increase their income this way. If we should do something about this problem, we need to collect a lot of evidence for such problems with the individual authority and then confront them. Therefore, cases like this are reported and registered so that we can follow up if it is a recurrent problem for our employees with the authority in question in that area.

July 2016: Suspicion of fraud in a programme supported by DCA

Contents of complaint: DCA was co-financing a programme in the Sudan implemented together with one of our ACT Alliance partners. The partner's financial report for 2015 included a note that it was highly probable that fraud had occurred in connection with the purchase of fuel. The financial controller discovered it, and DCA asked the partner organisation to explain what had taken place earlier. The explanation was that in January 2016 the partner organisation had found out that in December 2015 an employee had stolen money from the organisation. The employee paid the money back and was fired immediately. In addition they suspected misuse in connection with the purchase of fuel. This was, however, due to lack of documentation and not fraud.

What did we do: When DCA read the notes in the financial report we immediately contacted the partner

who reported all the details in the case to us. We stressed to the partner that cases like this must be reported to us already when there is reason for suspicion.

Lessons learned: The case made it clear that there is a need for systematic support to the partner organisation regarding purchase procedures. Thus, we have budgetted extra support and monitoring of the partner's purchases in 2017.

September 2016: Partner suspected of misuse of funds

Contents of complaint: In September we found out that a central partner for the implementation of our humanitarian aid might not live up to our requirements. It was not clear whether it was a matter of corruption or a weak organisation with insufficient capacity to meet our and other donors' demand for financial management.

What did we do: All funds were frozen and all implementation through this partner was immediately stopped when the suspicion arose. At first we initiated an internal investigation by sending out our own financial controller. The conclusions from this visit pointed to so many weaknesses in our partner's financial management that we found it necessary to initiate a special audit. We did this in cooperation with another donor that we have been in contact with during the whole process, as they also suspected misuse.

The audit showed that the partner has spent quite some funds in a different way than stated in the approved budgets. First of all, more money had been spent on salaries than budgetted. We cannot conclude that it was a deliberate intention of corruption, but it is a question of a partner who cannot live up to the necessary requirement for financial management. Another decisive factor was that prior to September 2016 we had repeatedly asked for information about which other projects the partner implemented in the same area and with which donors, which the partner had not reacted to. Consequently, DCA decided to terminate the cooperation and find alternative ways of implementing the humanitarian aid project in the area in question.

Lessons learned: The case highlighted a recurrent challenge in the partner-based work – especially in humanitarian situations with limited access. Sometimes it becomes too difficult for a relatively new and inexperienced organisation to shoulder the demands from many different donors. In this case we have supported the partner in the implementation of a new financial management system and supported them in making budgets and accounts. This should probably have been followed closer in order to avoid such a case. In addition there was lack of transparency of the partner's total budget portfolio, and this proved to be a decisive factor in discovering this kind of misuse.

December 2016: Suspicion of corruption in connection with construction work

Contents of complaint: In connection with a humanitarian project that DCA implements in Uganda, we

suspected irregularities and/or corruption. It was reported to DCA's complaint handling system by the end of December 2016. The suspicion was related to the tender process in connection with the construction of a big tent with a cement floor (for teaching purposes), one smaller tent and two latrines. The contract work was carried out as planned and the buildings put up, but the employment of the contractor did not follow the standard procedures in relation to tender; unfortunately it was carried out without the necessary documents – a.o. the purchase inquiries, approvals and other documents had not been finalised. This fuelled the suspicion that not all of the three offers were genuine and that the contractor had been offered the job on unequal parameters/conditions.

What did we do: The authorised coordinator at our country office in Uganda carried out the investigation of the case and wrote an internal report to DCA. The report was distributed to the management in Copenhagen. Based on the conclusions of this report, the following two points were decided and effected:

1. We employed a new procurement officer, who is expected to strengthen our procurement procedures.
2. The country director has made it very clear to all employees that there will be consequences if these guidelines are not followed (employment, judicial and demand for reimbursement).

Based on the above DCA considers the case closed. DCA covers the extra expenditure due to the internal failure of the procurement procedures.

Lessons learned: It is a well-known fact that procurement processes are vulnerable in emergency and urgent situations, as well as in situations with lack of resources. DCA takes this very seriously, and that is why we have helped by adding extra resources to our local procurement team in peak periods. A case like this underlines the importance of constant focus on education and capacity building regarding relevant procurement processes.

Fundraising in Denmark

Telemarketing activities (phoners):

In 2016 we received only a limited number of complaints of our telemarketing activities. We received a total of one operational complaint within our fundraising activities. However, we were informed that regarding the face-to-face area we got a total of three complaints of facers sent to our general mail address: mail@dca.dk and then forwarded directly to the relevant unit. Thus they do not appear in the overall statistics of complaints in the complaint handling system.

All complaints were answered in a polite and friendly way, and we have always immediately cancelled the donations from the persons who wanted it and deleted their telephone numbers from the call list.

Our ethical guidelines for telemarketing can be seen on the DCA website.

Street recruitment

Street recruitment is an area in which we did not receive any direct complaints through our complaint handling system. We received three cases directly at our office in Aarhus (outside the official complaint handling system), and they were all handled between the complainant and the relevant employees. As long as it is a question of operational cases, it is not against our guidelines to handle the complaint locally as long as it is registered.

Parish Collection

We did not receive any complaints of the Parish Collection 2016. Considering that we receive 18-20,000 complaints annually, this result is very excellent.

Complaints of cancellation of donations and technique

We received one complaint regarding donation and technique in 2016. It came from a person who by mistake had donated DKK 150 to DCA by sms. The person contacted us and we refunded the DKK 150.

All in all we find it very satisfactory that in 2016 we received only one complaint of DCA's fundraising activities.

Organisational issues

Below you will find some examples of the types of complaints we received regarding organisational issues in 2016.

Complaint from one of our partner organisations who stated that they had had financial problems as a consequence of actions from a former DCA employee.³ We initiated an internal investigation of our own actions regarding the then case and concluded that DCA as an organisation was partly to blame for the loss the partner organisation had suffered, and we offered to cover part of the loss. Our offer was accepted, and it is our belief that the partner organisation felt that we had acted in a friendly and respectful way.

Complaint from a customer in one of our second-hand shops of the behaviour of the volunteers in the shop. DCA received a complaint from a customer in one of our second-hand shops who had tried several times to donate some items without success. Every time the customer contacted the shop he/she felt that she was talked down to and that the volunteers treated her in a bad way. After the complaint we contacted the shop and the items were collected at the customer's place. The manager of the second-hand shop in

³Out of respect for the involved parties we opt not to publish more case details, but mention the principles important for understanding the case and our handling of it.

question was informed about the incident, and the volunteers were told that DCA will not tolerate such a behaviour.

Internal complaint from one employee about a colleague employed in one of our regional offices. The complaint from one of our regional offices about cooperation problems between two employees was taken very seriously at HQ; we suspected that one of the parties was leaking false information to the local authorities in order to make the issuing of a work- and residence permit difficult. An internal investigation was initiated and a report made that was distributed to the responsible manager at HQ and the responsible country director, who then took action on a number of the incidents in the report. The factual claim in relation to the authorities was not confirmed through the internal investigation. The lesson DCA learned from this complaint was that communication and regular follow-up by the manager is especially important in situations with a conflict between two colleagues. It is further important to stress that a manager has the overall responsibility of the well-being of the office staff.

Complaint of wrongful dismissal from terminated employee. In the complaint of the termination procedure at one of our offices in Jutland, both the process and the contents of the dismissal were targeted. In this case DCA used her membership of 'Dansk Erhverv' to ensure that the contents of the complaint was investigated and clarified, and the case was closed without further complications.

The sensitive cases DCA received in relation to organisational issues are often complaints of purely management character and the general handling of staff matters etc. Therefore, they are handled as HR cases. Out of respect for the parties involved those cases cannot be published in this report.

Part 3: Maintenance and quality assurance of the Complaint System in 2016

DCA is certified according to Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS), and our complaint system is part of this standard that states minimum quality requirements to development- and humanitarian organisations. CHS replaces the earlier certification standard, Humanitarian Accountability Standard (HAP). 2016 was a transition year for DCA, as by the end of 2016 we changed from HAP to CHS certification carried out by external auditors.

Thus, to a certain degree, 2016 was affected by training and getting to know the CHS – which is more demanding than the HAP – both internally and for our partners. In addition to the general training and adjusting to the new standard we maintained our focus on support to the partners in order to develop safe and transparent complaint systems. Out of a total of 184 partners we are working with in the countries we are represented, 95 partners (51.1%) had established a complaint system. This a relative improvement

compared to 2015 when 93 partners out of 217 (43%) had established complaint systems. See the table below with status per country.

As mentioned above the work with complaint systems in 2017 will focus on a number of recommendations from the certification report in order to improve our local complaint procedures and the support we offer our partners. More details can be seen in the certification report on our website.

Country	Total number of partners			Partners with Complaint systems	
	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015
SARO:					
Nepal	38	44	20	19	16
Bangladesh			8		
India			4		
Pakistan			1		
Cambodia	27	22	19	5	5
Myanmar/Thailand	20	18	21	5	4
Palestine/Israel	17	14	18	9	7
Ethiopia	14	13	10	10	10
South Sudan	18	17	13 ⁴	7	8
Sudan	1	1	4	1	0
Kenya	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A
Uganda	20	17	13	12	14
Malawi	21	22	18	19	16
Zimbabwe	N/A	13	12	N/A	0
Syria	3	1	6	0	0
Lebanon	2	1	2	1	1
Jordan	N/A	1	1	N/A	1
Libya	N/A	N/A	10	N/A	N/A
Laos	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A
TOTAL:	205	217	184	99	93

⁴Until 2016, partners in Kenya and parts of Sudan.

Part 4: Information about our work with anti-corruption⁵

It is a key issue for DCA to make an ambitious effort regarding anti-corruption, and it has been a focus area since we launched our anti-corruption policy in 2010 after two years of developing it by involving a broad section of partners and staff. Since then we have added an e-learning course including corruption dilemmas and anti-corruption principles closer to the daily work of the staff, thus making the policy easier to implement. Since the launching in 2015 approx. 700 persons have attended our online training about anti-corruption, including employees and volunteers in our partner organisations. The course is now placed on our open learning platform, www.actlearn.org. In 2016 the course was updated with new video statements from the management as well as other minor adjustments. Finally the course was translated into French, so that it is accessible for those of our employees who have French as their first language. We can also mention that DCA's sister agency, FinnChurchAid, has produced an adjusted version of the course.

In addition to the above, each of our regional and country offices has one dedicated person to take care of training and counselling about corruption and anti-corruption. These persons are employees, who as part of their job description are considered "focal points" for our anti-corruption efforts. These employees have undergone extensive training by our counsellor at HQ and are currently supported with counselling and various materials. It has turned out to be a very efficient methodology to have these local ambassadors for anti-corruption, both because they are closer geographically and because they know the relevant local context. Corruption is both a common challenge in all the countries we work in, and at the same time occurs in different forms according to the locality. In some areas we are challenged by blackmail, in others by conflicts of interest, and in others it is the demand for the small bribes that we are facing.

International trends og DCA's role

Internationally we can see that the legislation regarding anti-corruption demands still more attention from companies and organisations. At the same time it is expected that companies and organisations are working to build up an "anti-corruption culture". This means that besides working with compliance and risk mitigation systems, we also have to work with spreading the ethical mindset regarding anti-corruption. Over the last few years DCA has worked very successfully with this issue through the work with Focal Points, training and e-learning.

Denmark's strategy for development and humanitarian aid highlights a Danish ambition of being in the forefront and promoting the agenda of international anti-corruption. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs want to support the fight against corruption by increasing the partners' capacity to fight corruption and through that ensure that the results of the development aid are not eroded by corruption. The Ministry of Foreign

⁵This chapter explains the special efforts and focus areas in 2016. If you want to read more about our general risk management in relation to corruption and how we work with partners and stakeholders on this problem in our daily work, we refer to relevant chapters about our work as described on our website.

Affairs have several times expressed their acknowledgement of DCA's ambitious approach and appreciate a continuous dialogue about anti-corruption.

DCA is considered a "driver" on the anti-corruption agenda. Other organisations and companies are looking to DCA for inspiration and sparring regarding anti-corruption and complaint systems (compliance and whistleblowing).

DCA is still active in the debate and visible on the issue of anti-corruption, and has on several occasions presented our work with anti-corruption. In November 2016 a new international standard on anti-corruption was issued, which states common guidelines and requirements on what an organisation should be in control of in order to avoid corruption (the standard is formally known as ISO 37001). From Denmark, DCA contributed actively in the development of the standard (see more here). In December we were part of a panel organised by 'Dansk Standard', 'Dansk Erhverv' and Transparency International, in which we shared our experience with anti-corruption work in international NGOs.

In addition, DCA is the only NGO member of a work group about facilitation payment (sometimes called small bribes) under 'Dansk Industri' in cooperation with progressive companies regarding anti-corruption and compliance.

Future work

As described above 2017-2018 are dedicated to the spreading of the knowledge and use of our complaint handling system, also to our partners and the local populations. By the end of 2017 an e-learning course on the complaint system will be distributed to the whole organisation.

DCA is currently in dialogue with Danida about the work with anti-corruption and the specific handling of the incoming cases. We are also part of relevant work groups in order to join forces with actors about meeting the challenges we are facing, such as the fight against facilitation payment. Following the good dialogue, Danida have also asked DCA to contribute to a big international conference about anti-corruption taking place in autumn 2018 (International Anti-corruption Conference, IACC, 2018).