



**ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT ACCOUNTABILITY TO  
AFFECTED PEOPLE: THE CASE OF CONCERN  
WORLDWIDE ETHIOPIA**

**Betsegaw Botamo (ID No: GSE/5749/11)**

**A Research Paper Submitted to  
Postgraduate Extension Program**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Master's  
of Arts Degree in *Project Management (MAPM)***

**Advisor: Dr. Adane Atara**

**Addis Ababa University School of commerce**

**Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

**September 2021**

**Declaration**

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted at any university for a degree.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Betsegaw Botamo, entitled: ‘Assessment of Project Accountability to Affected People: The case of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia’ submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Project Management complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Chair of Department or Graduate Program Coordinator

## **Abstract**

This paper is titled as "Assessment of the Project Accountability to Affected People: The case of Concern Worldwide". The study was conducted with the overall purpose of investigating the humanitarian project accountability to affected people. All humanitarian agencies have multiple stakeholders and a complex array of accountability relationships. In this study, the focus is on accountability to affected people.

The research employed the following four aspects as an accountability framework widely accepted by humanitarian partners and organizations: (1) Information provision, (2) Consultation, (3) Promoting participation, and (4) Complaints and feedback mechanism. A series of detailed questions were included to investigate every framework indicated above.

A total of 40 Concern staffs that were purposely selected from Concern Worldwide Ethiopia from seven different project locations of the organization to participate in the study. Primary data was collected through structured questionnaire and key informant interviews. The primary data were analysed through SPSS and excel sheets. All qualitative data collected were carefully organized and summarized as per the major research questions.

As major findings of the study 62.08% agree or strongly agree that there is information provision in place, 74.2% agree or strongly agree there is consultation, 79.1% strongly agree or agree there is participation, and 80% strongly agree or agree with the presence of complaints and feedback mechanism in place.

The gaps identified include low information provision to beneficiaries on progress reports, updates and key findings from monitoring and evaluation, inconsistent information provision, gaps in documentation and use of consultation outcomes, low involvement of project beneficiaries in project closing, capacity gaps at community levels, low documentation, and limited internal and partner staff capacity building and refresher trainings. The main recommendations made include reinforce capacity building and refresher trainings to internal staffs and beneficiaries, maximize community consultation, strengthen documentation at all levels, and further develop a culture of compiling best practices and widely disseminating the same for use.

## **Acknowledgments**

Foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr Adane Atara, for the continuous support of my MA study and research, for his patience, motivation and enthusiasm. His guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis.

Besides my advisor, I would like to thank my thesis examiners: Dr Meskerem and Dr Wubshet Bekalu for their encouragement, insightful comments, and hard questions.

My sincere thanks also goes to AAU-School of Commerce, the project management department colleagues and my instructors for their relentless efforts and invaluable impacts during my study that equipped and enabled me to qualify in the project management discipline.

I thank my fellow classmate, Mr Alemayehu Dula, for his great support and guidance in my data analysis processes. Also I am grateful to my classmates and group mates for the stimulating discussions, for the sleepless nights we were working together before deadlines, and for all the fun we have had in the last three years.

Finally, to my caring, loving, and supportive wife, Tseganesh Lamboro (Betsue): my deepest gratitude. Your prayer and encouragement are much appreciated and duly noted. My heartfelt thanks, My Love.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	iv
1. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background of the study .....	1
1.2 Problem Statement .....	2
1.3 Research Objectives .....	3
1.3.1 General Objectives .....	3
1.3.2 Specific Objectives .....	3
1.4 Research Questions/Hypothesis .....	4
1.4.1 Research Questions .....	4
1.4.2 Research Hypothesis .....	4
1.5 Significance of the study .....	4
1.6 Scope of the study .....	5
1.7 Limitations of the study .....	6
1.8 Definition of Terms Used in the study .....	6
1.9 Organization of the study .....	8
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	9
2.1 Accountability in NGOs .....	9
2.2 Humanitarian Accountability .....	10
2.3 Related Previous Research Works .....	13
2.4 Theories in Research .....	13
2.5 Conceptual Framework (Conceptual Model) .....	14
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	17
3.1 Introduction .....	17
3.2 Research Approach and Method .....	17
3.2.1 Research Approach .....	17
3.2.2 Research Design .....	17
3.3 Research Population and Sampling .....	18
3.3.1 Sample Design .....	18
3.3.2 Sample Size .....	18
3.4 Data Collection .....	18
3.5 Data Analysis .....	19
3.6 Ethical Considerations .....	19
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....	20

4.1 Introduction.....	20
4.2 Response Rate and Demographic Data.....	20
4.3 Results/Findings.....	23
4.4 Interpretation and Discussion .....	46
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	50
5.1 Introduction.....	50
5.2 Summary .....	50
5.3 Conclusion .....	51
5.4 Recommendations.....	52
5.5 Limitation and suggestion for further study.....	53
References.....	54
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>57</b>

## **Abbreviations**

AAP	Accountability to Affected People
AF	Accountability Framework
AIM	Accountability and Impact Measurement
ECB	Emergency Capacity Building Project
CHS	Core Humanitarian Standard
CRM	Complaint Response Mechanism
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GAP	Global Accountability Partnership
HA	Humanitarian Accountability
HAP	Humanitarian Accountability Partnership
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organization
ISO	International Standards Organization
IWG	Inter-Agency Working Group
KII	Key Informant Interview
MAPM	Master of Arts in Project Management
NPOs	Non-profit organizations
PQAU	Program Quality Assurance Unit

## Table of Tables

Description	Title of the table	Found in page
Table 1	Respondents by their place of work	20
Table 2	Respondents by sex	21
Table 3	Respondents by their number of years stayed in Concern Worldwide	21
Table 4	Respondents by their number of years stayed in humanitarian sector	22
Table 5	Respondents by department	22
Table 6	Results of respondents on information provision	46
Table 7	Results of respondents on consultation	47
Table 8	Results of respondents on participation	48
Table 9	Results of respondents on complaints and response mechanisms	48
Table 10	Accountability status dashboard	49

## 1. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the study

My thesis entitled as ‘**Assessment of accountability to Affected People: The case of Concern Worldwide**’ was conducted taking the case of Concern Worldwide. It focuses on accountability of humanitarian projects to affected people (that is downward project accountability).

Humanitarian project accountability can be upward, downward and horizontal by direction. By upward accountability we mean the accountability of international non-governmental organizations for their donors, project sponsors and other most powerful and influential stakeholders.

In any discussion on accountability, the question as to who one is accountable to whom is of critical essence. All humanitarian agencies have multiple stakeholders and a complex array of accountability relationships. In this study, emphasis has been placed on accountability to beneficiaries and local constituencies (local government authorities and target beneficiaries).

As evidenced in several literatures humanitarian project accountability includes at least four major practices, sometimes referred to as pillars. These are information provision, consultation, promoting participation and collecting & acting on feedback and complaints.

In principle humanitarian organisations are accountable to all of their stakeholders – donors, relevant government authorities, their target communities and the wider poor communities in which they live, to local partners, staff, the general public and other humanitarian actors that work with them. Providing the people they seek to assist with the opportunity to complain and raise concerns about the quality of their work and to ensure that appropriate action is taken and that a response is given to any complainant are essential parts of being accountable.

Concern Worldwide is one of non-governmental humanitarian organizations with over four decades of humanitarian responses experience in different parts of Ethiopia since the nationwide devastating draught of 1985/6. This study was conducted focusing on

investigating the humanitarian project accountability statuses of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia's humanitarian projects as per the humanitarian accountability frameworks (information provision, consultation, promoting participation and collecting & acting on feedback and complaints).

Primary data was collected and analysed with the overall all objective of assessing the accountability situations in Concern Worldwide Ethiopia's humanitarian projects.

Also project plans, project progress reports prepared by field offices, organizational strategic documents, and monthly complaints response mechanism reports, post distribution monitoring formats, final project reports, project monitoring and evaluation reports, project launching presentations, and relevant articles were reviewed in line with the four humanitarian accountability framework: information provision, consultation, promoting participation and collecting & acting on feedback and complaints.

As primary data source structured questionnaire was prepared and completed by a total of 40 humanitarian accountability focal persons and other relevant staffs based at eight offices of the organization (Addis Ababa, Somali, Kombolcha, Tigray, Gondar, Gambella, and SNNPR (in both Wolaita and Guraghe Zones)). The questionnaire was administered through email.

## 1.2 Problem Statement

Humanitarian organisations are accountable to all of their stakeholders – donors, relevant government authorities, their target communities and the wider poor communities in which they live, to local partners, staff, the general public and other humanitarian actors that work with them. Although INGOs' accountability to their beneficiaries is a critical element of both Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC) Code of conduct and Sphere standards which all the IWG agencies have signed up to, the degree to which INGOs are accountable to their beneficiaries and the quality of the mechanisms they use to ensure accountability lack consistency in application and practice (ECB).

Even if humanitarian organizations are expected to be ensure their accountability upward to donors and government, horizontally with other peer humanitarian actors and partners, and downward to beneficiaries, the downward accountability is compromised because of the power imbalance between them.

The focus of this study is on downward accountability: Accountability to affected people. Accountability towards affected people is the process of using power responsibly. AAP is taking account of, and being held accountable by different stakeholders, primarily those who are affected by the exercise of such power (CHS Alliance 2014).

The reason for emphasis on beneficiaries is that current accountability practices are skewed towards the most powerful stakeholders, namely the governments and institutional donors as evident in related literatures. When it comes to the communities (beneficiaries) for which the humanitarian programmes are meant, the accountability relationships are the weakest. INGOs do not behave as if they were answerable to the communities they work with. The result is that the legitimacy and accountability of INGOs become disconnected; legitimacy is based on speaking for disadvantaged people, but INGOs focus on being accountable to donors<sup>1</sup> (ECB).

The major reasons that motivated me to conduct this particular study are in many cases downward accountability is neglected in favor of accounting upward to donors (Slim, 2002), in Ethiopia there are more than 3000 NGOs implementing humanitarian projects spending huge amounts of budgets and absence of documented similar study in Concern Worldwide.

### 1.3 Research Objectives

The study has both main and specific objectives as indicated below.

#### 1.3.1 General Objectives

The overall objective of the study is to investigate the humanitarian project accountability to affected people: The case of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia.

#### 1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study are:

- i. To assess the extents that the four elements of accountability to affected people framework are put into practice (strengths & weaknesses).

---

<sup>1</sup> Pathways to Accountability – The GAP Framework, Monica Blagescu, Lucy de Las Casas and Robert Lloyd, One World Trust, 2005.

- ii. To assess the level of staff awareness & capacity building on accountability to affected people.
- iii. To recommend practical solutions to address the gaps so as to promote accountability to affected people

## 1.4 Research Questions/Hypothesis

### 1.4.1 Research Questions

The study was conducted to address the following major research questions:

1. Is there adequate information sharing in the organization with target beneficiaries?
2. Does the humanitarian projects promote participation of affected people in the decision making processes throughout the project cycle management (designing, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and transition phases)?
3. Is there an effective community feedback and complaints response mechanism in place?
4. Is there a system in the organization to assess, review and amend the humanitarian project accountability systems regularly and systematically?
5. Does the organization learn from its humanitarian project accountability and regularly incorporate the lessons learnt in its decision-making processes?

### 1.4.2 Research Hypothesis

The following four major components of accountability framework ((1) transparency and information sharing with key affected people, (2) target communities' participation in programme design and decision-making, (3) encourage feedback and enable target communities to safely raise concerns or complaints about the work, and be assured that appropriate action will be undertaken and response given, (4) and learn from the experience and make changes to its management systems in light of lessons learned and feedback from target communities) are in place in the humanitarian projects of the organization.

## 1.5 Significance of the study

Firstly, this particular research is significant because it serves as partial fulfilment of the requirements for Master's of Arts Degree in Project Management (MAPM).

Secondly the findings of the study will serve as a reference document for Concern Worldwide Ethiopia, in particular, and other humanitarian project implementing

International Non-Governmental Organization (INGOs), government, and beneficiaries to further reinforce the humanitarian accountability requirements as per the recommendations drawn and made by the researcher as per the results of the study.

Thirdly, the study will fill the existing knowledge gap as it is the first of its kind to be conducted in Concern Worldwide Ethiopia with the focus on accountability to affected people.

Finally, the paper will serve as basis for further in depth study in the area there by addressing the indicated limitations. Also it serves as a reference for other researchers (graduate students or others) that are interested in conducting research in the future in similar topics.

### 1.6 Scope of the study

In this study the humanitarian accountability framework (information provision, consultation, promoting participation and collecting & acting on feedback and complaints) was assessed there by taking the case of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia humanitarian projects. Only the aforementioned four accountability framework were taken into consideration and also the focus is on the humanitarian accountability situations for key local level stakeholders (project beneficiaries, local community, the general public of the operational area and relevant government authorities). The key concern of the study was assessing the prevailing humanitarian project accountability situations within Concern Worldwide Ethiopia operational areas across Ethiopia (Addis Ababa, Somali, Kombolcha, Tigray, Gondar, Gambella, and SNNPR (in both Wolaita and Guraghe Zones)).

Even if the results/findings, discussions and recommendations in this particular research refer specifically to humanitarian projects, all of these may be applicable to ‘development’ projects as well, as it is or thereby making very minimum contextualization. It is up to individual organizations to choose whether they use separate accountability frameworks for all their projects or have one single accountability framework which covers both development and emergency projects. But as one can see and understand, the basic constituents of accountability frameworks are basically similar for both emergency and development projects.

### 1.7 Limitations of the study

This particular research has the following limitations:

- The study would have been included the project beneficiaries in the primary data collection. Even if FGDs with representatives of project beneficiaries and community members was envisioned at the research proposal it was not put into practice because of the COVID-19 related restrictions and Ethiopian 2021 national election related tensions and security concerns which all affected travel to areas selected for the data collection.
- Time spent for the study was short (around six months) which affects the quality of the results and pauses need for an in depth study there by allocating adequate time.
- The framework of humanitarian accountability consist of only four key elements such as information provision, consultation, promoting participation and collecting & acting on feedback and complaints. It does not consider other components of accountability framework such as leadership, staff competence and HR management.
- Also the study is limited to humanitarian accountability to affected people i.e. downward accountability but not the upward (accountability to donors and other powerful stakeholders) and horizontal/lateral accountabilities.

### 1.8 Definition of Terms Used in the study

**Accountability:** Accountability refers to the responsible use of power (resources, decision making) by humanitarian actors, combined with effective and quality programming that recognises the community of concern's dignity, capacity, and ability to be independent.

**Accountability to affected people:** Accountability to Affected People (AAP) is widely used in the humanitarian community to refer to the related commitments and mechanisms humanitarian agencies have in place to ensure that communities are meaningfully and continuously involved in decisions that directly impact their lives.

**Complaint:** A **complaint** is an expression of dissatisfaction. It is a specific grievance of anyone who believes that the organisation has failed to meet a stated commitment, or of anyone who has been negatively affected by an organization's programmes or its staff.

**Complaints and feedback:** The humanitarian agencies need to have feedback and complaints response mechanisms in place which affected people feel safe and confident to use to provide their opinion and raise their complaints if there is any.

**Complaint and Feedback Mechanism:** A complaints and feedback mechanism is a set of clear, transparent procedures that provide children and communities with access to a safe, confidential means of voicing complaints on issues within the control of the agency

**Design, monitoring and evaluation (DME):** Encompasses the processes through which an organisation, with involvement from affected communities, monitors and reviews its progress and results against goals and objectives; feeds learning back into the organisation on an ongoing basis; and reports on the results of the process. To increase accountability to affected communities, goals and objectives must be designed in consultation with those stakeholders.

**Feedback:** The systems, processes, attitudes and behaviours through which an organisation listen to its targeted communities. Feedback is an essential part of the above three dimensions and essential for organisations to understand whether they are meeting the agreed needs of the affected population or not.

**Participation:** The process by which an organisation enables communities to play an active role in the decision-making processes that affect them. It is unrealistic to expect an organisation to engage all stakeholders in all kinds and levels of decision-making. Therefore, the organisation must have clear guidelines and practices enabling it to prioritise stakeholders including targeted communities appropriately and to be responsive to the differences in power between them. In particular, mechanisms need to be in place to ensure that the most marginalised and affected communities are represented and have influence.

**Transparency:** The provision of accessible and timely information to communities and the opening up of organisational procedures, structures and processes that affect them. To be transparent an organisation needs to do more than disclose standardised information. It also needs to provide communities with the information they require to make informed decisions and choices. In this way transparency is more than just a one-way flow of information; it is an ongoing two-way dialogue between an organisation and its targeted communities over information provision.

## 1.9 Organization of the study

The contents of the study are organized into five chapters as summarized below. Chapter One is Introduction and it consists of background of the study, problem statement, research objectives (general and specific objectives), research questions, significance of the study, scope of the study, limitation of the study and definition of terms. Chapter Two covers literature review and it includes humanitarian accountability, related previous research works, theories in research and conceptual framework (conceptual model). Research methodology is organized in Chapter Three and the sub-topics under it include research approach, research design, research population and sampling, data collection, data analysis, and ethical consideration. Chapter Four covers results and discussion with sub-topics as response rate and demographic data, results/findings, and interpretation and discussion. The last chapter that is Chapter Five covers summary, conclusion, recommendation, and limitation and suggestion for further study.

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### 2.1 Accountability in NGOs

Non-Governmental Organizations and humanitarian aid organizations make it their business to demand accountability from governments, employers, and community members; it is therefore of acute importance that NGOs are accountable themselves. Accountability generally comprises two concepts. The first concept is veracity, asking, “Do you have the empirics to prove your claims?” The second is authority, asking, “From where do you derive the power to speak?” (Slim, 2002).

Given the widespread acceptance of accountability, it is surprisingly difficult to find a common definition of what it means. Many definitions of accountability tend to confuse it with concepts such as responsibility and transparency, while others do not define accountability per se at all, focusing instead on describing mechanisms to enhance it. Below is a selection of definitions, drawn from a search of the Internet and other literatures: the state of being accountable, liable, or answerable (<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/accountability>); Accountability, principle according to which a person or institution is responsible for a set of duties and can be required to give an account of their fulfilment to an authority that is in a position to issue rewards or punishment (<https://www.britannica.com/topic/accountability>); Accountability is when an individual or department experiences consequences for their performance or actions. Accountability is essential for an organization and for a society. Without it, it is difficult to get people to assume ownership of their own actions because they believe they will not face any consequences. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/accountability>; ‘To be answerable for the results of an assigned action. Accountability is associated with delegated authority and is distinct from responsibility. A supervisor can assign responsibility but cannot give away his/her accountability; the manager is ultimately accountable’ (University of California, Santa Cruz); ‘Accountability involves rendering an account to someone such as Parliament or a superior, on how and how well one’s responsibilities are being met, on actions taken to correct problems and to ensure they do not reoccur’ (Canadian Food Inspection Agency); The means through which power is used responsibly. It is a process of taking account of, and being held accountable by different stakeholders, and primarily those who are affected by the exercise of power (HAP Standard Guide, 2010).

According to these definitions, accountability refers to the notion that one has responsibility for one's actions, and for the outcomes of those actions. There is a requirement to provide information on one's actions, and the outcomes. Therefore, the concept is closely linked to notions of power, responsibility and transparency.

The concept of accountability has been defined in numerous ways. Ebrahim (2003a, p. 194) describes it as follows: 'Accountability may be defined as the means through which individuals and organizations are held externally responsible for their actions and as the means by which they take internal responsibility for continuously shaping organizational mission, goals and performance.' This definition stresses that accountability exists in several dimensions: upward accountability, internal accountability, and downward accountability.

The first refers to accountability towards donors, foundations and government (Ebrahim, 2005; Fowler, 1996), the second towards staff and the NGO's mission, and the latter towards beneficiaries and communities or regions indirectly affected by NGO programs (Najam, 1996).

The term 'downward accountability' refers to aid organisations being accountable to their beneficiaries. ... In effect, downward accountability (accountability to beneficiaries), may be given less attention compared to upward accountability (accountability to donors) [https://www.investopedia.com › terms › accountability](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/accountability)

Accountability towards affected people (AAP) is the process of using power responsibly. AAP is taking account of, and being held accountable by, different stakeholders, primarily those who are affected by the exercise of such power (<https://www.chsalliance.org/get-support/article/accountability-to-affected-populations/>).

When reviewing related literatures, there seems to exist numerous empirical research on accountability towards beneficiaries (Benjamin, 2012; Wellens & Jegers, 2014).

## 2.2 Humanitarian Accountability

The World Humanitarian Summit seeks to improve future humanitarian action by addressing a set of issues that are crucial to how humanitarian action is funded,

coordinated, implemented and morally guided. Accountability has arisen as one of these key issues. This is unsurprising, as accountability has become a crucial component of modern humanitarian action, reflected in the increasing number of international humanitarian NGOs with accountability frameworks as well as the prioritisation of accountability to affected people by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee. Yet, accountability remains an area of practice in which many in the sector feel there is a need for improvement (Brown, D. & Donini, A. 2014).

In humanitarian action, accountability often tends to be defined quite broadly to include anything that qualifies as ‘good’ or ethical (Mitchell, 2003). This is largely for historical reasons: in the aftermath of the humanitarian response to the Rwandan genocide in 1994, the international system grappled with how it could act more responsibly and ethically, by seeking to define what ‘good’ [humanitarian aid] looks like and how actors could better meet their responsibilities. Accountability, as embodied in the ‘accountability revolution’, became a catch-all phrase to describe the very broad and varied issues that the sector was engaging with to improve humanitarian action.

Reflecting this history, a common definition of humanitarian accountability is that it is “the means by which power is used responsibly.”<sup>3</sup> This phrase has been important for getting humanitarian actors to think more explicitly about themselves as power holders and about the ethical obligations arising from their power. However, this broad definition combines at least three distinct areas of concern: Doing good humanitarian work; giving affected people influence over decision-making; and giving others the opportunity to assess and, if appropriate, sanction your actions.

According to literatures, there are four general directions of accountability. (a) NGOs are upwardly accountable to donors, government and other sources of financial support. Upward accountability can present a problem when NGOs are in a position where they cannot reveal sensitive contacts or sources, leaving donors in the dark about some of the “how” of the operation (Slim, 2002). (b) NGOs are inwardly accountable to their staff and mission. (c) NGOs are horizontally accountable to their peers in the humanitarian aid sector. Finally, (d) NGOs are downwardly accountable to their clients. This is a moral and ethical accountability that can raise many questions (Loyd, 2005). The unique nature of humanitarian work makes accountability particularly important for the following reasons: Acute needs

People who have survived conflict or a natural disaster often have acute needs. ... Life and death decisions Finally, in humanitarian situations the consequences of decisions can be particularly severe. ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humanitarian\\_Accountability\\_Partnership\\_International](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humanitarian_Accountability_Partnership_International)).

According to Nick Stockton, the head of HAP-I: Accountability is not simply about accounting for one's decisions and actions, it is also about first taking account of the interests, views and preferences of those affected by your actions. There can be no exclusions from this principle without simultaneously reducing the affected person to sub-human status ... while humanitarian strategies go on being designed and implemented without the informed consent of those whose lives are the object of the humanitarian endeavour, the prospects for good humanitarian outcomes are deeply compromised. Instead, a considerable proportion of humanitarian resources are consumed by the effort to make humanitarian strategies satisfy the utility of donors and operational agencies (variously for propaganda, force protection, meeting growth targets) while barely any effort is made to verify the relevance and logic of humanitarian strategies with the subject population itself.

In line with this, HAP-I defines humanitarian accountability as follows: Accountability involves two principles and mechanisms: (i) those by which individuals, organisations and States account for their actions and are held responsible for them, and (ii) those by which they may safely and legitimately report concerns and complaints and get redress where appropriate. Humanitarian accountability is concerned with ethics, rights and responsibilities ... and agreed standards and benchmarks. Men, women and children affected by disasters have a right to assistance and protection. They also have a right to information, to participation, to be heard, and to redress.

Amongst the dozen or so well-known principles and accountability standards used in varying degrees by humanitarian organisations, the following five standards were considered most important (more frequently mentioned in the interviews and also better understood): Core humanitarian Standard (CHS), Sphere Standards, Global Accountability Partnership Standards (GAP Standards), HAP 2007 Standards, and ISO 9000 series.

Accountability is not primarily about fulfilling one's responsibilities: it is primarily concerned with adjusting power and information imbalances in relationships. By

definition, accountability cannot be achieved by a single actor on its own—it requires other actors to whom accountability mechanisms are oriented.

### 2.3 Related Previous Research Works

In their study of accountability in the World Bank and NGOs, Fox and Brown (1998, p. 12) describe accountability as “the process of holding actors responsible for actions.” In a special issue of the IDS Bulletin on “Accountability through Participation,” Cornwall, Lucas, and Pasteur (2000, p. 3) broaden this perspective by suggesting that accountability is both about being “held responsible” by others and about “taking responsibility” for oneself. As such, accountability has both an external dimension in terms of “an obligation to meet prescribed standards of behavior” (Chisolm, 1995, p. 141) and an internal one motivated by “felt responsibility” as expressed through individual action and organizational mission (Fry, 1995).

Barriers of community participation identified in related researches include the necessity to obey to rigid rules, bureaucratic requirements, and hierarchical decision-making structures. In addition, several researchers refer to the reluctance of some stakeholders (other than beneficiaries) towards mechanisms involving beneficiaries in the NPO governance (Dom & Verhoeven, 2006; O’Dwyer and Unerman, 2009; Sitzia, Cotterell, & Richardson, 2006). Some stakeholders question the beneficiaries’ competences to positively influence policy (e.g. Cornwall, 2008). In addition, an important challenge of implementing participatory mechanisms is the danger of elite representation (e.g. Cornwall, 2008).

### 2.4 Theories in Research

Accountability framework is about *standards of quality* for which the agency is *accountable* to its stakeholders. An Accountability Framework is a statement containing a set of definitions, procedures, and standards that specify how an agency will ensure accountability to its stakeholders.

It has three elements<sup>2</sup>:

---

<sup>2</sup> HAP-I Implementation Manual

- i. A statement of the commitments made – commitments may include external standards, codes, principles, and guidelines, in addition to internal values, mandate, principles, charter and guidelines.
- ii. A baseline or an analysis of the current status of the organisation’s accountability framework. Indicators can then be drafted that capture where the organisation wants to go within a specified time frame.
- iii. An action or implementation policy, strategy or plan - is an outline of how the above needs are planned into the organisation’s management approach and activities.

### 2.5 Conceptual Framework (Conceptual Model)

Ebrahim (2003b, p. 813) distinguishes five broad mechanisms to put accountability into practice: ‘Disclosure statements and reports, performance assessments and evaluations, self-regulation, social auditing and participation.’

Concepts:
Answerability
Answerability to “stakeholders”
Answerability to aid recipients
Unspecified answerability
Participation
Active participation of “stakeholders”
Active participation of aid recipients
Passive participation of “stakeholders”
Passive participation of aid recipients
Unspecified participation
Receiving feedback from aid recipients
Giving authority to others
Responsible use and regulation of power
Respecting human rights and humanitarian standards
Integrity
Responsible use of resources
Performance monitoring and assessment
Fulfilling legal or moral duties
Fulfilling commitments
Responding to aid recipients

Balancing of needs
Transparency
Responsibility
- Taking responsibility for actions and/or consequences of actions - Taking responsibility for decisions
Enforcement and enforceability

Tan © 2015 Prehospital and Disaster Medicine

The above table indicated concepts of accountability identified from the various definitions.

There are four general directions of accountability. (a) NGOs are upwardly accountable to donors, government and other sources of financial support. Upward accountability can present a problem when NGOs are in a position where they cannot reveal sensitive contacts or sources, leaving donors in the dark about some of the “how” of the operation (Slim, 2002). (b) NGOs are inwardly accountable to their staff and mission. (c) NGOs are horizontally accountable to their peers in the humanitarian aid sector. Finally, (d) NGOs are downwardly accountable to their clients. This is a moral and ethical accountability that can raise many questions (Loyd, 2005). First there is the question of voice; is the organization speaking as the poor, with the poor, or about the poor? Is the pursuit of accountability being used to enhance the quality of service provided or is it simply used to attract additional funding? Unfortunately, in many cases downward accountability is neglected in favor of accounting upward to donors (Slim, 2002).

The preference of upward to downward accountability can be explained using economic principles. In terms of incentives, NGOs have a strong incentive to be accountable to donors since the NGO is partially or entirely reliant on these donors’ funds. However, the incentive to be downwardly accountable to clients is less quantifiable. When an NGO does not articulate the value of downward accountability, it is simple to see that upward accountability may receive greater focus.

What does accountability look like in practice? (According to Save the Children (2013). *Programme Accountability Guidance Pack*): (i) Regular, timely and accessible information, (ii) Participation – discussing together, deciding together and working together, (iii) Proactively seeking feedback from children and communities and

handling their complaints. (iv) Monitoring, evaluating and learning, and (v) Building staff competencies for accountable programming

The purpose of this paper is to assess accountability situations of humanitarian projects to affected population. First, I draw upon numerous definitions of accountability in order to develop an integrated perspective. I then explore four key accountability mechanisms used by INGOs in practice: information provision, participation, consultation, and feedback and complaints mechanism. The conceptual framework of accountability to affected people used in this particular study is as indicated in the table below which is widely accepted by humanitarian organization and partners (CHS Alliance, 2014).

<b><u>Accountability to Affected People</u></b>			
↓	↓	↓	↓
<p><b>1. Providing information</b> so beneficiaries can make informed decisions, knowing what to expect from the aid organization.</p>	<p><b>2. Consulting with communities</b> so they are aware of, understand and can influence key decisions related to the programming of the aid organization.</p>	<p><b>3. Promoting participation</b> so that beneficiaries are involved in, and take ownership of, the activities that affect their lives.</p>	<p><b>4. Collecting and acting on feedback and complaints</b> so beneficiaries can voice their ideas and concerns, enabling the works of aid organization to be more relevant, effective and safe.</p>

## CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research approach, methods and design being used by the study, while highlighting the population and issues related to sampling technique, sample size determination, and data collection instrument. Besides, the chapter outlines the approach to data collection and analysis for the purpose of answering the major research questions.

### 3.2 Research Approach and Method

#### 3.2.1 Research Approach

Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data gathering approaches were used in the research. Structured and semi-structured questionnaire was used to collect qualitative and quantitative primary data from the purposely selected and identified relevant staffs of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia. Whereas key informant interview with selected management level and technical staff based at Head Office was used as qualitative data source whose findings is discussed in the result and discussion part of the research complementing and supplementing the quantitative data of the study. Likewise, various major project/programme documents of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia were assessed to gather various qualitative and quantitative data in the area of humanitarian accountability of the organization, with the special emphasis on project accountability to local level stakeholders such as beneficiaries, program participants, and community and local level relevant government authorities.

#### 3.2.2 Research Design

Coming to the research design, descriptive research methods was utilized in this study. As it is well known, descriptive research especially case studies are concerned with identifying the existing status of the object and finds out measure of improving the status of the object. Similarly this research is primarily concerned with assessing the existing humanitarian project accountability situations and systems and identifying the existing gaps and finds out measure to fill their gaps so that to flourish international humanitarian accountability standards and requirements applicable for the projects.

### 3.3 Research Population and Sampling

#### 3.3.1 Sample Design

Non-probability techniques such as convenience and judgmental sampling techniques are used in the study as it is predominantly descriptive and exploratory research in design that aims to assessing the humanitarian accountability situation to affected people. Accordingly accountability focal persons and frontline staffs of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia participated from the Head Office and all field offices across the country such as Addis Ababa, Somali, Kombolcha, Tigray, Gondar, Gambella, Wolaita and Guraghe offices of the organization were considered for the primary data collection.

#### 3.3.2 Sample Size

As non-probability and judgmental sampling technique was applied in this particular study, a total of 5 selected staff (project managers, accountability focal persons, and frontline staff) took part in filling questionnaire. Accordingly, first hand data was collected from 40 staff/respondents as depicted above. Both closed and open ended questions were used. Definitely, the questionnaire designed and administered was more of closed ended for the sake of ease of analysis and getting objective responses. In addition to the above, key informant interview (KII) was conducted at Head Office with key management and technical staff working in charge of humanitarian project accountability.

### 3.4 Data Collection

**”Everything that can be counted does not necessarily count; everything that counts cannot necessarily be counted.” (Albert Einstein).** As much as possible only necessary data was collected. The main tools used for data collection were document reviews, questionnaire and KIIs. The tools were pre-tested before the actual data collection and amendments made as per the findings of the pre-testing exercises.

The questionnaires and key informant interview schedules contained mostly close-ended questions, though some open-ended questions were included. If the selected staff faces difficulty in answering the questions, other members of the team approached to support the staff in difficulty to answer the questions. As the staff are educated, graduates and skilled employees the likely chance of occurrence of such problem was found to be very minimal.

In addition to the questionnaires and interview schedule, observation and assessment of various project documents of the organization (such as humanitarian project plans,

proposals, progress reports, monthly reports, monitoring and field visit reports, policies, procedures, guidelines and strategic documents of the organization, among others,) were reviewed as secondary data sources..

The key informant interviews were conducted by myself as a researcher with the overall intention of improving data quality and avoiding possible errors that may arise from the enumerator and the respondents' sides.

### 3.5 Data Analysis

The primary data collected from a total of 40 Concern staffs working in seven work locations (Addis Ababa, Kombolcha, Gondar, Tigray, Somali, SNNPR and Gambella) was quantitatively analysed through relevant statistical software, SPSS, in accordance with the proposed objectives of the study. This was complemented and supplemented by key informant interview, observations and assessment of various project documents of the organization (such as humanitarian project plans, proposals, progress reports, monthly reports, monitoring and field visit reports, policies, procedures, guidelines and strategic documents of the organization, among others,). Qualitative data collected through KII was carefully summarized qualitatively in line with the major research questions.

### 3.6 Ethical Considerations

In this paper all ethical concerns and issues are taken into consideration throughout the research, from administration of the research instrument with respondents to the acknowledgement of all the secondary sources being used in order to avoid any possibility of plagiarism.

Research participants were given freedom to participate in the study, by filling the questionnaire, and the results of the research analysed and summarized without biasedness of the researcher.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Introduction

The findings of the study are summarized in to four major categories such as information provision, consultation, participation, and complaints and response mechanism as per four accountability frameworks indicated in the research design. The details are discussed below.

### 4.2 Response Rate and Demographic Data

The response rate is 100% as per the sample size. All of 40 respondents participated and responded to the questionnaire administered by email.

Location of work	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Addis Ababa	7	17.5	17.5	17.5
Gambella	5	12.5	12.5	30.0
Gondar	7	17.5	17.5	47.5
Kombolcha	5	12.5	12.5	60.0
SNNPR	6	15.0	15.0	75.0
Somali	6	15.0	15.0	90.0
Tigray	4	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Table 1: Respondents by their place of work

As indicated in table 1 above, the 40 respondents of the study were selected from seven different project operational locations of the organization such as Addis Ababa (7), Gambella (5), Gondar (7), Kombolcha (5), SNNPR (6), Somali (6), and Tigray (4).

Out of the 40 respondents of the study, 14 (35%) are females the remaining 26 (65%) being male staffs as indicated below.

Sex	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	26	65.0	65.0	65.0
Female	14	35.0	35.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Table 2: Respondents by sex

From the 40 respondents, 22 (55%) indicated that they have less than 2years of work experience with Concern Worldwide. Whereas 12 (30%) stayed 2 to 5 years in Concern. The rest of them have above 5 years of work experiences with Concern. Details are indicated in the table below.

Years in Concern	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid less than 2Yrs	22	55.0	55.0	55.0
Between 2 to 5Yrs	12	30.0	30.0	85.0
Between 5 to 10Yrs	3	7.5	7.5	92.5
Greater than 10Yrs	3	7.5	7.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Respondents by their number of years stayed in Concern Worldwide

Out of the total 40 respondents, 5(12.5%) indicated that they have less than 2years of work experience in the humanitarian sector. Whereas 8(20%) stayed 2 to 5 years. The rest 27 (67.5%) of them have above 5 years of work experiences in the humanitarian sector. Details are indicated in table 4 below.

Experience in humanitarian sector	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid less than 2Yrs	5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Between 2 to 5Yrs	8	20.0	20.0	32.5
Between 5 to 10Yrs	15	37.5	37.5	70.0
Greater than 10Yrs	12	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Table 4: Respondents by their number of years of work experiences in humanitarian sector

From the total respondents, 37 (92.5%) are technical staffs working in projects. Whereas only 3 (7.5%) are operational staffs by profession as shown below.

Department	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Project	37	92.5	92.5	92.5
Operational	3	7.5	7.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Table 5: Respondents by department

As indicated in the above table, the lion share of the respondents (92.5%) are technical staffs working directly in the projects. This has to do with the accuracy of the responses because of their direct engagement in the project implementation works.

### 4.3 Results/Findings

Likert scale with five scales was used in the questionnaire where the respondents were requested to rank as per the serious of questions listed under the four accountability framework (information provision, consultation, participation and complaints and feedback mechanism). The numbers 1-5 in the scale represent: 5= Strongly Agree; 4= Agree; 3= neutral; 2= Disagree; 1= Strongly Disagree. A total of 6 selected sub-questions were used to assess information provision, consultation and participation. Whereas 9 inter-related questions were used to assess the status of complaints and feedback mechanism. The details of the questionnaire and Likert scale attached as annexes in this paper.

**Information provision-question 1:** Communities are informed about the organization’s mandate, core values and role, expected staff behaviour, planned activities, and targeting criteria, among others.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	5	12.5	12.5	15.0
Agree	22	55.0	55.0	70.0
Strongly agree	12	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** As indicated above, 85% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that communities are informed about the organization’s mandate, core values and role, expected staff behaviour, planned activities, and targeting criteria, among others. Whereas 12.5% remain neutral and as low as 2.5% of the respondents disagree with it. From this, it is possible to conclude that the organization is very good in informing communities about the organization’s mandate, core values and role, expected staff behaviour, planned activities, and targeting criteria, among others.

**Information provision-question 2:** Your organization provides communities important contextual information in a disaster.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	3	7.5	7.5	7.5
Neutral	9	22.5	22.5	30.0
Agree	19	47.5	47.5	77.5
Strongly agree	9	22.5	22.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The result indicated in the table above shows that 70% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization provides communities important contextual information in a disaster. Whereas 30% respondents remain neutral or disagree. The organization needs to further improve this aspect as 30% is a significant number.

**Information provision (question 3):** Communities are informed about project timeframe, goals and objectives, code of conducts (Red Cross/Crescent and NGO Code of Conduct), financial info, and how complaints are handled.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Neutral	10	25.0	25.0	37.5
Agree	14	35.0	35.0	72.5
Strongly agree	11	27.5	27.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table indicates that 62.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the communities are informed about project timeframe, goals and objectives, code of conducts (Red Cross/Crescent and NGO Code of Conduct), financial info, and how complaints are handled. Whereas 37.5% are neutral or disagree. This is very significant number and the organization needs to work in order to further improve this aspect of information provision.

**Information provision (question 4):** Your organization adjusts the methods used to share information based on community feedback.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	7	17.5	17.5	17.5
Neutral	8	20.0	20.0	37.5
Agree	16	40.0	40.0	77.5
Strongly agree	9	22.5	22.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above findings show that 62.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization adjusts the methods used to share information based on community feedback. On the other hand, 17.5% and 20% of the respondents disagree and remain neutral, respectively. Again here the results show gaps in the organization in adjusting the methods used to share information based on community feedback.

**Information provision (question 5):** Your organization informs communities about all plans, activities and relevant financial information throughout the entire project cycle through agreed, multiple methods.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	7	17.5	17.5	17.5
Neutral	13	32.5	32.5	50.0
Agree	15	37.5	37.5	87.5
Strongly agree	5	12.5	12.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table summarizes that as high as 50% of the respondents disagree or neutral that the organization informs communities about all plans, activities and relevant financial information throughout the entire project cycle through agreed, multiple methods. As complemented by the key informant interviews and organizational document reviews, there are gaps with regards to financial information provision and consistently providing information throughout the project cycle. The findings of the key informant interviews shown that there are major gaps in information provision during the designing and implementation phases. According to the reflections of the key informant interviewee, the organization provides adequate information during project launching and closing.

**Information provision (question 6):** Your organization provides communities with relevant progress reports, updates and key findings from monitoring and evaluation that are communicated in appropriate ways.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Disagree	9	22.5	22.5	25.0
Neutral	13	32.5	32.5	57.5
Agree	11	27.5	27.5	85.0
Strongly agree	6	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** As per the above findings, 25% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree and 32.5% remain neutral. Whereas 42.5% agree or strongly agree that the organization provides communities with relevant progress reports, updates and key findings from monitoring and evaluation that are communicated in appropriate ways. According to the key informant interviews, there are significant gaps in the organization with regards to providing relevant progress reports, updates and key findings from monitoring and evaluation to the affected people.

**Consultation (question 1):** Your organization tells communities about their right to be consulted about key project decisions.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	4	10.0	10.0	10.0
Neutral	6	15.0	15.0	25.0
Agree	19	47.5	47.5	72.5
Strongly agree	11	27.5	27.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table shows that 75% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization tells communities about their right to be consulted about key project decisions. On the other hand 10% and 15% of the respondents disagree and neutral, respectively.

**Consultation (question 2):** Your organization consults with communities on project activities through community meetings and project assessments.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	8	20.0	20.0	22.5
Agree	18	45.0	45.0	67.5
Strongly agree	13	32.5	32.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table shows that 77.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization consults with communities on project activities through community meetings and project assessments. On the other hand 2.5% and 20% of the respondents disagree and neutral, respectively. This finding indicates that there are growth areas in the organization as far as community consultation is concerned.

**Consultation (question 3):** Your organization consult communities on design and implementation, through focus group discussions, surveys, and other methods.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Disagree	5	12.5	12.5	15.0
Neutral	4	10.0	10.0	25.0
Agree	15	37.5	37.5	62.5
Strongly agree	15	37.5	37.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The results of the study indicated in the above table indicates that 75% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization consult communities on design and implementation, through focus group discussions, surveys, and other methods. Whereas 15% strongly disagree or agree; the remaining 10% being neutral. As evidenced by the key informant interview, there are gaps in the organization with regards to consulting communities during designing phase. According to the key informant interviewee, usually the project designing phase is conducted with rush because of the time pressure and as a result community consultation becomes low in this particular stage of the project cycle. This shows that the organization should think of corrective actions in order to promote community consultations consistently and systematically.

**Consultation (question 4):** Your organization works with community organisations or structures as a vehicle for community consultation, decision-making and information sharing to beneficiaries and communities

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	4	10.0	10.0	10.0
Neutral	7	17.5	17.5	27.5
Agree	12	30.0	30.0	57.5
Strongly agree	17	42.5	42.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The findings of the study as indicated in the table above shows that 72.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization works with community organisations or structures as a vehicle for community consultation, decision-making and information sharing to beneficiaries and communities. The remaining 27.5% disagree or neutral.

**Consultation (question 5):** Your organization documents consultation outcomes, use them to influence programme design and implementation, and regularly share them with communities.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	6	15.0	15.0	15.0
Neutral	11	27.5	27.5	42.5
Agree	16	40.0	40.0	82.5
Strongly agree	7	17.5	17.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** According to the data analysis findings of the study, 57.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization documents consultation outcomes, use them to influence programme design and implementation, and regularly share them with communities. Whereas as high as 42.5% of the respondents disagree or neutral. It was also complemented by the key informant interview findings that there are significant gaps in the organization with regards to documentation and use of consultation outcomes to influence programme design and implementation. Also in most cases even the documented outcomes are not regularly and systematically shared with communities.

**Consultation (question 6):** Your organization jointly conducts project meetings with community committee.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	4	10.0	10.0	12.5
Agree	16	40.0	40.0	52.5
Strongly agree	19	47.5	47.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

The findings of the paper as indicated in the above table shows that 87.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization jointly conducts project meetings with community committee. Whereas the rest 12.5% of the respondents disagree or neutral. As evidenced and complemented by the key informant interview, this is one of the strengths of the organization in that the organization uses as many existing community committee and structures as possible such as father to father group, mother to mother group, water, sanitation and hygiene committee, complaints response mechanism committee, health development army, among others, to conduct joint project meetings in various project cycles such as designing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, transition and close out as required.

**Participation (question 1):** Your organization ensures that communities participate in the development of targeting/ beneficiary selection criteria and process.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	1	2.5	2.5	5.0
Agree	18	45.0	45.0	50.0
Strongly agree	20	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** As indicated in the above table, 95% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization ensures that communities participate in the development of targeting/ beneficiary selection criteria and targeting processes. Only 2.5% of the respondents disagree and the rest 2.5% remain neutral. This was also complemented by the key informant interview that the organization strongly involves communities in beneficiary targeting criteria setting and beneficiary selection processes. Targeting criteria setting as well as the selection are conducted with strong participation of community representatives such as elderly, community based organizations, religious leaders, representatives of women and youth, and vulnerable and marginalized group such as people living disabilities, old age, female and child headed households, if any.

**Participation (question 2):** Your organization identifies community capacities through assessment and planning processes.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
Neutral	6	15.0	15.0	20.0
Agree	20	50.0	50.0	70.0
Strongly agree	12	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table shows that 80% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization identifies community capacities through assessment and planning processes. Whereas 15% and 5% of the respondents are neutral or disagree, respectively. This is also one of the strong areas of the organization. The organization conducts context assessments and baseline surveys using internationally accepted tools that help to systematically analyze the existing capacities and prevailing vulnerabilities.

**Participation (question 3):** Your organization establishes or strengthens community organisations and structures (such as committees) to facilitate improved community participation and consultation.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
Neutral	5	12.5	12.5	17.5
Agree	14	35.0	35.0	52.5
Strongly agree	19	47.5	47.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table shows that 82.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization establishes or strengthens community organisations and structures (such as committees) to facilitate improved community participation and consultation. Whereas 12.5% and 5% of the respondents are neutral or disagree, respectively. Also this is also one of the strong areas of the organization. The organization makes its project intervention there by ensuring do no harm principle. It was well emphasized by the findings of the key informant interview that the organization implements its project activities with due care and attention for using indigenous knowledge and building the existing local capacity.

**Participation (question 4):** Your organization builds the capacity of community organisations and structures so they can better participate in the programme.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Disagree	3	7.5	7.5	10.0
Neutral	7	17.5	17.5	27.5
Agree	13	32.5	32.5	60.0
Strongly agree	16	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table shows that 72.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization builds the capacity of community organisations and structures so they can better participate in the programme. Whereas 10% and 17.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree, or neutral respectively. Here the finding of the study shows that there are significant gaps with regards to systematically building the capacity of community organisations and structures so they can better participate in the programme. The gap of the organization is regarding consistently and systematically empowering the community organizations and structures as evidenced by the key informant interview. As shown above, gaps in documentation and use of monitoring and evaluation outcomes is also reflected here.

**Participation (question 5):** Your organization ensures communities and local stakeholders play a significant decision-making roles in the entire project cycle management.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly disagree	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
Disagree	3	7.5	7.5	12.5
Neutral	12	30.0	30.0	42.5
Agree	16	40.0	40.0	82.5
Strongly agree	7	17.5	17.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The above table shows that 57.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization ensures communities and local stakeholders play a significant decision-making roles in the entire project cycle management. Whereas 12.5% and 30% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree, or neutral respectively. As indicated in the key informant interview, there is a significant gap in the organization with regards to ensuring that communities and local stakeholders play a significant decision-making roles in the entire project cycle management. Even if the communities and local stakeholders are involved in the project cycle management by the organization, their voices are not meaningfully considered in the decision making processes.

**Participation (question 6):** Your organization ensures participation is gender balanced and actively includes the vulnerable and marginalised.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	5.0
Neutral	3	7.5	7.5	12.5
Agree	23	57.5	57.5	70.0
Strongly agree	12	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** According to the findings of the above table 87.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization ensures participation is gender balanced and actively includes the vulnerable and marginalised. Whereas 5% and 7.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree, or neutral respectively. This finding was also complemented by the key informant interview. The organization is pointed out to be a gender sensitive in all its intervention as well as staffing processes. It was reflected by the key informant interview participants that the organization has short, mid-term and long term gender equality strategy that guides and governs its responses and actions.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 1):** Your organization informs communities about their right to provide feedback and to complain.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Neutral	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
Agree	19	47.5	47.5	52.5
Strongly agree	19	47.5	47.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** As indicated in the above table, the results of the study show 95% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization informs communities about their right to provide feedback and to complain. Whereas only 5% of the respondents remain neutral to this. As complemented by the findings of the key informant interview and other relevant organizational document reviews, the organization is very strong in systematically informing communities about their right to provide feedback and to complain. According to the findings of the study, the organization does so through community sensitization and consultation works that is done by every project staffs based community levels.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 2):** Your organization puts feedback and complaints mechanisms in place.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	3	7.5	7.5	10.0
Agree	17	42.5	42.5	52.5
Strongly agree	19	47.5	47.5	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The result of the study as indicated in the above table shows 90% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization puts feedback and complaints mechanisms in place. Whereas 2.5% and 7.5% of the respondents disagree and neutral, respectively. Again this is one of the strong areas of the organization. In the key informant interview it was indicated that the organization establishes feedback and complaints mechanisms during the project launching period and jointly implements, reviews and amends the system throughout the project cycle.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 3):** Your organization informs communities of its response to their feedback and complaints.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Neutral	8	20.0	20.0	20.0
Agree	22	55.0	55.0	75.0
Strongly agree	10	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** According to the findings of the data analysis of the study as indicated in the above table 80% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization informs communities of its response to their feedback and complaints. Whereas the remaining 20% of the respondents are neutral to it. This finding was complemented by the key informant interview in that the organization does not systematically and regularly provide responses to complainants. In most cases, on the spot responses are provided to the complaints by the field level staffs of the organization.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 4):** Your organization gives communities the opportunity to identify their preferred methods for collecting and responding to feedback and complaints.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
Neutral	10	25.0	25.0	30.0
Agree	20	50.0	50.0	80.0
Strongly agree	8	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** According to the findings of the data analysis of the study as indicated in the above table 70% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization gives communities the opportunity to identify their preferred methods for collecting and responding to feedback and complaints. Whereas the remaining 5% and 25% of the respondents disagree and neutral, respectively. Here as indicated by 30% of the respondents the gap is significant. During the key informant interview it was identified that in some cases the organization shares the methods for collecting and responding to feedback and complaints that are found to be effective in a given project operation locations regardless of providing communities the opportunity to identify their preferred methods. According to the key informant interview, the complaints response mechanism in place is not consistent across the organization and there are variation and inconsistencies in some places. This means, it is strong in some places depending on the staff awareness, commitment and management staff support and vice versa.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 5):** Your organization have clear feedback and complaints response guidelines that appropriately deal with sensitive complaints and are accessible to communities.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Neutral	3	7.5	7.5	7.5
Agree	21	52.5	52.5	60.0
Strongly agree	16	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** The findings of the study as indicated in the above table shows that 92.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization have clear feedback and complaints response guidelines that appropriately deal with sensitive complaints and are accessible to communities. Whereas the remaining 7.5% of the respondents responded neutral to this question. This was also complemented by the key informant interview and relevant organizational document review that currently the organization has up to date, functional and effective guidelines regarding feedback and complaints response mechanisms.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 6):** Your organization trains staff and communities on the feedback and complaints handling guidelines.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	6	15.0	15.0	17.5
Agree	17	42.5	42.5	60.0
Strongly agree	16	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** As indicated in the above table, the findings of the study show that 82.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization trains staff and communities on the feedback and complaints handling guidelines. Whereas the remaining 17.5% of the respondents disagree or remain neutral. The results of the data analysis show that the organization is good in conducting community and staff capacity building works on the feedback and complaints handling guidelines. But it was indicated by the key informant interviewee that the community and staff capacity building works are significantly affected because of the COVID-19 pandemic related meeting and gathering restrictions and prevention protocols. Recently the staff capacity building trainings were indicated to be conducted virtually using various virtual meeting technologies and soft wares such as zoom, Microsoft teams, among others.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 7):** Your organization integrates collecting and acting on feedback and complaints into overall office system, including consideration at senior management meetings.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly disagree	2	5.0	5.0	5.0
Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	7.5
Neutral	10	25.0	25.0	32.5
Agree	19	47.5	47.5	80.0
Strongly agree	8	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** According to the findings of the data analysis of the study as indicated in the above table 67.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization integrates collecting and acting on feedback and complaints into overall office system, including consideration at senior management meetings. Whereas the remaining 7.5% and 25% of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree, and neutral, respectively. As

evidenced by the responses of over 30% of the respondents, the organization has a significant gap in integrating, collecting and acting on feedback and complaints into overall office system. The findings of the key informant interview shown that the organization is very good regarding the feedback and complaints system to its externally to its target communities and partners. But gaps exist with regards to internal system strengthening in feedback and complaints mechanisms for its staffs.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 8):** Your organization uses programme related feedback and complaints to adapt and improve programme delivery.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	6	15.0	15.0	17.5
Agree	23	57.5	57.5	75.0
Strongly agree	10	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** According to the findings of the data analysis of the study as indicated in the above table 82.5% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization uses programme related feedback and complaints to adapt and improve programme delivery. Whereas the remaining 2.5% and 15% of the respondents disagree and neutral, respectively. This is also one of the areas of strength in the organization as evidenced by over 82% of the respondents. Relevant organizational document reviews and key informant interview findings confirmed the same. There is monthly reporting system and arrangement in the organization for feedbacks and complaints which in turn determine and guide the changes made by the organization with the aim of improving future programme quality as per the received feedbacks and complaints.

**Complaints and feedback mechanism (question 9):** Your organization monitors its feedback and complaints mechanisms to ensure they are being used by a range of community members and to understand whether communities (particularly vulnerable children and marginalised groups) are satisfied with the system.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Disagree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
Neutral	15	37.5	37.5	40.0
Agree	18	45.0	45.0	85.0
Strongly agree	6	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

**Description:** As indicated in the above table, the findings of the study show that 60% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the organization monitors its feedback and complaints mechanisms to ensure they are being used by a range of community members and to understand whether communities (particularly vulnerable children and marginalised groups) are satisfied with the system. Whereas the remaining 2.5% and 37.5% of the respondents disagree or remain neutral, respectively. This was also reflected in the findings of the key informant interview that the gaps fall with regards to systematically and regularly monitoring the feedback and complaints mechanisms.

## **Major findings of the key informant interviews (KII)**

### **A) Information provision**

Strengths:

- The organization provides the following information to affected people: vision, mission, core values and mandate of the organization; expected staff behavior, planned activities, targeting criteria, project timeframe, goals and objectives, entitlements, budget, project donor, and how complaints are handled.
- Project launching workshops are used to create common understanding in aforementioned areas.
- Entitlement banners and complaints response mechanism posters are displayed to the project beneficiaries in public centers and visible places within the vicinity of the target communities.

Gaps/Growth Areas

- Low in providing beneficiaries with relevant progress reports, updates and key findings from monitoring and evaluation.
- The information provision is not as such systematic, consistent and standardized.
- It was mentioned that sometimes the quality and consistency of information provision is subjective to field staff in charge of the project.
- Information provision is not consistent throughout the project cycle. It is low in project design and implementation phases and relatively adequate in project launching and close out phases.

### **B) Consultation**

Strengths

- The organization has policy in place
- Consultations conducted across the project life cycle and adjustments are made as per the feedbacks of the beneficiaries.

#### Gaps/Growth Areas

- There are gaps in consistently documenting consultation outcomes
- Gaps in using the documented consultation outcomes to influence next programme design and implementation.

### **C) Participation**

#### Strengths

- The organization has in place the following participatory tools: participatory rural appraisal, joint beneficiary selection and validation sessions, capacity and vulnerability assessments and various community level committee (father to father groups, mother to mother groups, community engagement meetings and sessions, among others).
- The project beneficiaries are involved throughout the project life cycle

#### Gaps/Growth Areas

- Low involvement of project beneficiaries in project closing and transition
- In some cases, even if the beneficiaries are represented in various community engagements, they are dominated and do not influence the decision making processes

### **D) Complaints and feedback mechanisms**

#### Strengths

- The organization has updated guideline for complaints and feedbacks mechanisms
- High emphasis given to community sensitisation on complaints and feedback mechanisms
- Adequate focal and qualified staffing at all levels (Head Office, Area Offices and Woreda levels)
- Strong internal monthly as well as immediate reporting systems created for non-sensitive and sensitive complaints, respectively.

### Gaps/Growth Areas

- Some capacity gaps reported to exist at community levels
- Inconsistency of documentation of complaints and feedbacks
- Limited internal and partner staff capacity building and refresher trainings on complaints and feedback mechanisms
- Delay in providing due responses to complaints that involve the decisions of higher level

### 4.4 Interpretation and Discussion

#### 1) Information Provision to affected people

A total of six selected questions were carefully included to assess the information provision practices of the project under consideration with the overall objective of assessing accountability to affected people. The details of the questions used can be seen at the appendices of the paper. The responses received from the respondents of the study by the questionnaire administered for the primary data collection concerning information provision has been summarized in a Likert scale as indicated below.

Likert Scale ↓	Information Provision (Sub-questions 1-6 used to assess it)						Overall average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5	30.0%	22.5%	27.5%	22.5%	12.5%	15.0%	<b>21.70%</b>
4	55.0%	47.5%	35.0%	40.0%	37.5%	27.5%	<b>40.40%</b>
3	12.5%	22.5%	25.0%	20.0%	32.5%	32.5%	<b>24.20%</b>
2	2.5%	7.5%	12.5%	17.5%	17.5%	22.5%	<b>13.30%</b>
1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	<b>0.40%</b>
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>

Table 6: Results of respondents on information provision

## 2) Consulting affected people

Likewise, a total of six selected questions were carefully included to assess the existing practices of the project under consideration in line with consultation as a means to ensure accountability to affected people. The details of the questions used can be referred to in the appendices of the paper. The responses received from the respondents of the study by the questionnaire administered for the primary data collection regarding consultation has been summarized in a Likert scale as indicated below.

Likert Scale ↓	Consultation (Sub-questions 1-6 used to assess it)						Overall average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5	27.5%	32.5%	37.5%	42.5%	17.5%	47.5%	<b>34.20%</b>
4	47.5%	45.0%	37.5%	30.0%	40.0%	40.0%	<b>40.00%</b>
3	15.0%	20.0%	10.0%	17.5%	27.5%	10.0%	<b>16.60%</b>
2	10.0%	2.5%	12.5%	10.0%	15.0%	2.5%	<b>8.80%</b>
1	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.40%</b>
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>

Table 7: Results of respondents on consultation

## 3) Participation of affected people

In the same manner, a total of six inter-related questions were carefully included to assess the prevailing practices of the project under consideration regarding participation with the overall objective of assessing accountability to affected people. The details of the questions used can be referred to in the appendices of the paper. The responses received from the respondents of the study by the questionnaire administered for the primary data collection to assess participation as a means to exercise accountability has been summarized in a Likert scale as indicated below.

Likert Scale ↓	Participation (Sub-questions 1-6 used to assess it)						Overall average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5	50.0%	30.0%	47.5%	40.0%	17.5%	30.0%	<b>35.80%</b>
4	45.0%	50.0%	35.0%	32.5%	40.0%	57.5%	<b>43.30%</b>
3	2.5%	15.0%	12.5%	17.5%	30.0%	7.5%	<b>14.20%</b>
2	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	7.5%	7.5%	2.5%	<b>4.60%</b>
1	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	5.0%	2.5%	<b>2.10%</b>
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>

Table 8: Results of respondents on participation

#### 4) Complaints and feedback mechanism to affected people

In the same fashion, a total of nine selected inter-related questions were carefully included to assess the prevailing practices of the project under consideration as far as complaints and feedback mechanism is concerned as a means to ensure accountability to affected people. The details of the questions used can be referred to in the appendices of the paper. The responses received from the respondents of the study by the questionnaire administered for the primary data collection regarding complaints and feedback mechanisms has been summarized in a Likert scale as indicated below.

Likert Scale ↓	Complaints and Feedback (Sub-questions 1-9 used to assess it)									Overall average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
5	47.5%	47.5%	25.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	25.0%	15.0%	<b>31.10%</b>
4	47.5%	42.5%	55.0%	50.0%	52.5%	42.5%	47.5%	57.5%	45.0%	<b>48.90%</b>
3	5.0%	7.5%	20.0%	25.0%	7.5%	15.0%	25.0%	15.0%	37.5%	<b>17.50%</b>
2	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	<b>1.90%</b>
1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.60%</b>
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	<b>100%</b>

Table 9: Results of respondents on complaints and feedback mechanisms

**Accountability status dashboard: Summary of the above findings**

Likert Scale ↓	Accountability Framework				
	Information provision	Consultation	Participation	Complaints & feedback mechanism	<b>Overall summary</b>
5	21.67%	34.20%	35.80%	31.10%	<b>31%</b>
4	40.41%	40%	43.30%	48.90%	<b>43.10%</b>
3	24.20%	16.70%	14.20%	17.50%	<b>18%</b>
2	13.30%	8.70%	4.60%	1.90%	<b>7%</b>
1	0.42%	0.40%	2.10%	0.60%	<b>0.90%</b>
Total %	100%	100	100	100	100

Table 10: Accountability status dashboard

## CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Introduction

The findings of the study are summarized in tables as indicated above. The main primary data sources were primary data sources that were collected through structured questionnaire and key informant interviews. The secondary data sources were document review. The overall results of the research are as summarized below.

### 5.2 Summary

As summarized in the accountability status dashboard in table 10 above, from the total of 40 respondents involved in the study 74.1% (31% strongly agree and 43.1% agree) responded as strongly agree and agree that there is information provision, consultation, participation and complaints and feedback mechanism. Whereas 25% of the respondents are neutral or disagree (18% neutral and 7% disagree). In general, based on the findings of the study it can be concluded that the project is good with regards to accountability to affected people even if there are growth areas that need corrective actions for better project accountability to affected people.

Also the findings of the key informant interview and document review complement and supplement the results shown above. As indicated by the 74.1% of the respondents that they agree or strongly agree with the presence of accountability to affected peoples as per the four accountability framework selected for this particular study: Information provision, consultation, participation and complaints and feedback mechanism.

As per the results of the study, regarding the information provision, the organization is very good in informing communities about the organization's mandate, core values and role, expected staff behaviour, planned activities, and targeting criteria as confirmed by 85% of the respondents. Whereas the areas emphasized as gaps with regards to information provision include limited financial information, low in adjusting the methods used to share information based on community feedback, inconsistency in informing communities about all plans, activities and relevant financial information throughout the entire project cycle through agreed, multiple methods, and lack of progress reports, updates and key findings.

Regarding the consultation, it was identified as the strength that the organization jointly conducts project meetings with community committee. On the other hand, the major

gap identified with regards to consultation is that the organization has significant gaps in documenting consultation outcomes, use them to influence programme design and implementation, and regularly share them with communities as supported by 42.5% of the respondents.

Coming to the findings in relation to participation, participation of communities in the development of targeting/ beneficiary selection criteria and process, and ensuring gender balance were areas of strength as supported by 95% and 87.5% of the respondents, respectively. But there is a gap in the organization in ensuring communities and local stakeholders play a significant decision-making roles in the entire project cycle management as per the 42.5% of the respondents.

In the same manner, the organization is identified to be strong in informing communities about their right to provide feedback and to complain, putting feedback and complaints mechanisms in place, and availability of clear feedback and complaints response guidelines that appropriately deal with sensitive complaints and are accessible to communities. In contrary, according to the study, the organization has significant gaps in giving communities the opportunity to identify their preferred methods for collecting and responding to feedback and complaints, integrating collecting and acting on feedback and complaints into overall office system, and monitoring its feedback and complaints mechanisms to ensure they are being used by a range of community members and to understand whether communities (particularly vulnerable children and marginalised groups) are satisfied with the system.

### 5.3 Conclusion

From a total of 40 participants involved in the study, 62.08% agree or strongly agree that there is information provision in place, 74.2% agree or strongly agree there is consultation, 79.1% strongly agree or agree there is participation, and 80% strongly agree or agree with the presence of complaints and feedback mechanism in place.

According to the findings of the paper, it is possible to conclude that there is accountability to affected people in the organisation considered for the case study, Concern Worldwide. But yet there are gaps and growth areas in all four areas of the

accountability framework (information provision, consultation, participation and complaints and feedback mechanism) used in this specific research.

Some of the major gaps identified are low information provision to beneficiaries on progress reports, updates and key findings from monitoring and evaluation, the information provision was said to be unsystematic, inconsistent and unstandardized across the various projects and operational areas; gaps in consistently documenting consultation outcomes and making use of it to influence next programme design and implementation; low involvement of project beneficiaries in project closing and transition, in some cases, even if the beneficiaries are represented in various community engagements, they are dominated and do not influence the decision making processes; capacity gaps reported to exist at community levels, inconsistency of documentation of complaints and feedbacks, limited internal and partner staff capacity building and refresher trainings on complaints and feedback mechanisms, and delay in providing due responses to complaints.

#### 5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendation are pointed out in order to strengthen accountability to affected population:

- As the responses of the project participants are relatively low for information provision (62.08%) and consultation (74.2%), the organization should further promote information provision and consultation works. The information provision has to be consistent, systematic and standardized in order to maintain uniformity across the various projects and operational areas.
- There should be regular capacity building and refresher trainings on accountability to affected people for internal staff and representatives of the project beneficiaries.
- During the staff capacity building works emphasis should be given to internationally accepted standards and documents (such as humanitarian accountability partnership, core humanitarian standard, Sphere standard, Inter Agency Standing Committee, among others) with regards to accountability to affected people.
- In order to address the growth areas in all the four accountability framework considered in this paper (information provision, consultation, participation and complaints and feedback mechanism), the organization should develop practice of

reviewing the AAP systems in regular basis (say quarterly) and take corrective actions as per the findings of the monitoring.

- Develop a guideline for accountability to affected people addressing the four components (information provision, consultation, participation and complaints and feedback mechanism) for the context of the organization, operational area and apply it consistently.
- The organization should maximize the culture of compiling best practices in regular basis with regards to accountability to affected people and widely disseminate it internally with staffs and externally with project beneficiaries for due internalization and application.

### 5.5 Limitation and suggestion for further study

Because of the covid-19 and security related challenges and travel restriction, the primary data was mainly collected from selected Concern staff through questionnaire that was administered through emails. In addition, the time allocated was relatively short as compared to the scope of the topic of study. The primary data collection should have been included the project beneficiaries for crosschecking and triangulation of the responses obtained from the staffs. Thus, I suggest further in-depth research in the area there by taking adequate timeframe, including project beneficiaries in the primary data collection and increasing sample size.

## References

- Accountability to Affected People Institutional Framework. (2020, January 27). Retrieved from <https://www.icrc.org/en/publication/accountability-affected-people-institutional-framework>
- Accountability to Affected Populations - IASC. (n.d.). Retrieved from [https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/legacy\\_files/TOOLS to assist in implementing the IASC AAP Commitments.pdf](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/legacy_files/TOOLS%20to%20assist%20in%20implementing%20the%20IASC%20AAP%20Commitments.pdf)
- Anderson, M. (2005) *Accountability Beyond Counting: What Is Humanitarian Aid Responsible For?*, Discussion Paper for the SSRC Seminar Series ‘The Transformations of Humanitarian Action’, [www.ssrc.org/programs/emergencies/publications/ Anderson.pdf](http://www.ssrc.org/programs/emergencies/publications/Anderson.pdf)
- Benjamin, L. M. (2012). The potential of outcome measurement for strengthening non-profits’ accountability to beneficiaries. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 20, 1–21.
- Brown, D. & Donini, A. (2014) *Rhetoric or Reality?: Engaging with Crisis-Affected Populations*. 29th ALNAP Meeting Paper, London: ALNAP.
- Brown, L. D., & Moore, M. H. (2001). Accountability, strategy, and International Nongovernmental Organizations. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 569–587.
- Chisolm, L. B. (1995). Accountability of non-profit organizations and those who control them: the legal framework. *Non-profit Management and Leadership*, 6(2), 141–156.
- CHS Alliance (2014). *Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability*. Available at: <https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/files/files/Core%20Humanitarian%20Standard%20-%20English.pdf>
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking “participation”: Models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43, 238–269.
- Cornwall, A., Lucas, H., & Pasteur, K. (2000). Introduction: accountability through participation: developing workable partnership models in the health sector. *IDS Bulletin*, 31(1), 1–13.
- Coule, T. M. (2015). Non-profit governance and accountability: Broadening the theoretical perspective. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(1), 75–97.

- Ebrahim, Alnoor, (2003) 'Accountability in Practice: Mechanisms for NGOs', World Development, Vol.1394
- Ebrahim, A. (2010). The many faces of non-profit accountability. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Fowler, A. (1996). Demonstrating NGDO performance: Problems and possibilities Development in Practice, 6, 58–65.
- Fox, J. A., & Brown, L. D. (Eds.). (1998). The struggle for accountability: The World Bank, NGOs, and grassroots movements. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Fry, R. E. (1995). Accountability in organizational life: problem or opportunity for non-profits? Non-profit Management and Leadership, 6(2), 181–195.
- Global Humanitarian Overview 2020. (2019, December 10). Retrieved from <https://www.unocha.org/global-humanitarian-overview-2020>
- HAP International (2010). Guide to the 2010 HAP Standard in Accountability and Quality Management. Available at: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/2010-hap-standard-accountability-and-quality-management-enar>
- Hilhorst, D. (2002). Being good at doing good? Quality and accountability of humanitarian NGOs. Disasters, 26(3), 193–212.  
<http://www.hapinternational.org/what-we-do/hap-standard.aspx>
- IASC (2012). *Accountability to Affected Populations: Tools to Assist in Implementing the IASC AAP Commitments*. Available at: [https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/legacy\\_files/TOOLS%20to%20Assist%20in%20implementing%20the%20IASC%20AAP%20Commitments.pdf](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/legacy_files/TOOLS%20to%20Assist%20in%20implementing%20the%20IASC%20AAP%20Commitments.pdf)
- IFRC (2011). *Beneficiary Communication and Accountability: A Responsibility, not a Choice*. Available at: [https://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/94411/IFRC%20BCA%20Lesson%20Learned%20doc\\_final.pdf](https://www.ifrc.org/PageFiles/94411/IFRC%20BCA%20Lesson%20Learned%20doc_final.pdf)
- Loyd R (2005). The Role of NGO Self-Regulation in Increasing Stakeholder Accountability. One World Trust.
- M. K. Dewi, M. Manochin and A. Belal, Towards a conceptual framework of beneficiary accountability by NGOs: An Indonesian case study, Critical Perspectives on Accounting, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2019.102130>
- Mitchell, J. (2003) 'Accountability; The Three-lane Highway', Humanitarian Exchange Network, no. 24, July.

Najam, A. (1996). NGO accountability: A conceptual framework. *Development Policy Review*, 14, 339–353.

O'Dwyer, B., & Unerman, J. (2010). Enhancing the role of accountability in promoting the rights of beneficiaries of development NGOs. *Accounting and Business Research*, 40(5), 451–471.

Save the Children (2013). *Programme Accountability Guidance Pack: A Save the Children Resource*. Available at:

<https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/library/programme-accountability-guidance-pack-save-children-resource>

Slim H (2002). *By What Authority? The Legitimacy and Accountability of Non-governmental Organisations*. The Council on Human Rights Policy.

Van Brabant, K. (2002) 'Accountable Humanitarian Action: An Groupe URD (ongoing) Quality COMPAS, [www.projetqualite.org/compas/outil](http://www.projetqualite.org/compas/outil).

Wellens, L., & Jegers, M. Beneficiary participation as an instrument of downward accountability: A multiple case study. *European Management Journal* (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.03.004>

## Appendices

### I. Questionnaire used for primary data collection

#### Dear Participant;

This questionnaire is developed to conduct a study on “**Assessment of Project Accountability to Affected People: The case of Concern Worldwide Ethiopia**” for the partial fulfilment of Masters of Arts Degree in Project Management at Addis Ababa University, School of Commerce.

With the feedback from relevant staff for data collection, like you, working in Concern Worldwide Ethiopia; these research questionnaire aims to gather data on existence and extent of the various challenges of accountability in humanitarian projects, particularly accountability to community and local partners. As a person working in Concern Worldwide you are selected to participate in this research. Kindly note that the responses to the questions do not necessarily relate to your experience with your current position or employer; they relate to the humanitarian accountability in general. Your inputs are crucial to attain the objectives of this research. I kindly request you to take some minutes of your time and respond to all questions honestly.

I guarantee that your responses are used for academic research purpose only. Your responses will be kept confidential and appropriate and necessary coding will be done to ensure anonymity.

Should you have any enquiry, feel free to contact the researcher at:

Email: [betsegawbotamo@gmail.com](mailto:betsegawbotamo@gmail.com)

Telephone: 0912-18-72-66

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation!!

#### **Notice:**

- No need to write your name
- You are kindly requested to respond to all questions (if you need clarity, please contact me)

Kindly return the filled questionnaire within five days.

**PART A: General Information (Double click inside the box to mark your choice,  
No need to print)**

a) Please indicate your sex

Male  Female

b) Please indicate below your department in the organization

Programs (Development, emergency, compliance...)

Operations (HR, Finance, Supply Chain...)

c) Which one better describes your current role in the organization

Management staff

Technical Program staff

Support staff

d) How many years of experience do you have in the humanitarian work with Concern?

Under 2 years

6-10 years

2-5 years

Over 10 years

e) For how many years you engaged in humanitarian sector?

Under 2 years

6-10 years

2-5 years

Over 10 years

**Part B: Accountability to Affected People**

**General Instructions: Please put “X or ✓” in the space provided on your respective responses.**

**I) Information Provision**

S/N	Please rate the following questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Communities are informed about the organization’s mandate, core values and role, expected staff behaviour, planned activities, and targeting criteria, among others.					
2	Your organization provides communities important contextual information in a disaster (humanitarian crisis)					
3	Communities are informed about project timeframe, goals and objectives, code of conducts (Red Cross/Crescent and NGO Code of Conduct), financial info, and how complaints are handled.					
4	Your organization adjusts the methods used to share information based on community feedback.					
5	Your organization informs communities about all plans, activities and relevant financial information throughout the entire project cycle through agreed, multiple methods.					
6	Your organization provides communities with relevant progress reports, updates and key findings from monitoring and evaluation that are communicated in appropriate ways.					
	Any remarks you want to make in the above questions:					

**II) Consulting with communities and local stakeholders (Put “X or ✓”)**

S/N	Please rate the following questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Your organization tells communities about their right to be consulted about key project decisions.					
2	Your organization consults with communities on project activities through community meetings and project assessments.					
3	Your organization consult communities on design and implementation, through focus group discussions, surveys, and other methods.					
4	Your organization works with community organisations or structures as a vehicle for community consultation, decision-making and information sharing to beneficiaries and communities.					
5	Your organization documents consultation outcomes, use them to influence programme design and implementation, and regularly share them with communities.					
6	Your organization jointly conducts project meetings with community committees.					
	Any key remarks you want to add in any of the above questions:					

### III) Promoting Participation (Put “X or ✓”)

S/N	Please rate the following questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Your organization ensures that communities participate in the development of targeting/ beneficiary selection criteria and process.					
2	Your organization identifies community capacities through assessment and planning processes.					
3	Your organization establishes or strengthens community organisations and structures (such as committees) to facilitate improved community participation and consultation.					
4	Your organization builds the capacity of community organisations and structures so they can better participate in the programme					
5	Your organization ensures communities and local stakeholders play a significant decision-making roles in the entire project cycle management (PCM).					
6	Your organization ensures participation is gender balanced and actively includes the vulnerable and marginalised.					
	Any key remarks you want to add in any of the above questions:					

**IV) Collecting and acting on community feedbacks and complaints (Put “X or ✓”)**

S/N	Please rate the following questions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Your organization informs communities about their right to provide feedback and to complain.					
2	Your organization puts feedback and complaints mechanisms in place.					
3	Your organization informs communities of our response to their feedback and complaints.					
4	Your organization gives communities the opportunity to identify their preferred methods for collecting and responding to feedback and complaints.					
5	Your organization have clear feedback and complaints response guidelines that appropriately deal with sensitive complaints and are accessible to communities.					
6	Your organization trains staff and communities on the feedback and complaints handling guidelines.					
7	Your organization integrates collecting and acting on feedback and complaints into overall office system, including consideration at senior management meetings.					
8	Your organization uses programme related feedback and complaints to adapt and improve programme delivery.					
9	Your organization monitors its feedback and complaints mechanisms to ensure they are being used by a range of community members and to understand whether communities (particularly vulnerable children and marginalised groups) are satisfied with the system.					
	Any remarks you want to add in any of the above questions:					

## **II. Major guiding questions used for key informant interview**

The following points were used as a guiding questions for the KIIs:

- How does Concern Worldwide define accountability to affected people?
- What guidelines and documents are in place in the organization to reinforce accountability to affected people?
- Are there regular refresher and staff capacity building trainings in the organization with regards to ensuring accountability to affected people?
- How do you evaluate the strengths and gaps as an organization (Concern Worldwide) in the following four major components of humanitarian project accountability framework for affected population:
  - Information provision
  - Consulting with communities and other key local stakeholders
  - Promoting participation
  - Collecting and acting on community feedback and complaints
- Any remark you want to make regarding accountability to affected people in your organization (Concern Worldwide).

## **III. Guiding questions used for the organizational document review**

The following key questions were used as a guide for the various organizational and project documents review:

- Does the organization, Concern Worldwide, has an approved project accountability guideline in place?
- How does Concern define and understand accountability to affected people (AAP)
- What are the major components and contents of the project accountability guideline of the organization, if any?
- Are various currently available international humanitarian project accountability standards considered in the organizational accountability documents and guidelines?
- How is information sharing reflected in the project documents (In paper as well as practically at the ground)?
- How is consultation of community and relevant local government authorities (In paper as well as practically at the ground)?

- What does the humanitarian projects look like with regards to promoting participation of communities and other local stakeholders (In paper as well as practically at the ground)?
- What is there in place regarding collecting and acting on feedback and complaints (In paper as well as practically at the ground)?
- Any relevant observations in line with project accountability to affected people (AAP)

===== The End =====