Improvement Analysis
MIO-ECSDE

October 2018

Key strategic indicators for success (A2)

MIO-ECSDE's impact is measured based on output and outcomes. Output measures performance; qualitative aspects are included together with measurable indicators and are set at global and activity levels. These are said to be easy to monitor. The Panel requests a link to the indicators in the next report, as well as a strategic framework/policy if MIO-ECSDE has one.

At the outcome level, impact is measured based on whether MIO-ECSDE activities have contributed to a cleaner and more sustainable Mediterranean region. Three objectives for the coming biennium are listed, though these relate to MIO-ECSDE's internal workings (improving efficiency and sustainability, enhancing a collective vision across the Federation, and strengthening the sense of community in the network) rather than external effects.

The report states that some donor agencies have indicated that MIO-ECSDE could establish a more comprehensive approach to measuring impact and directly linking to strategic indicators of success. Does MIO-ECSDE plan to move in this direction and if so what steps will be taken, and what is the timeline for this? An example to refer to could be CARE International's set of 25 global outcome and change indicators.

Lessons learned in the reporting period (B2)

The report doesn't address this point specifically, though the concluding remarks state that the compilation of the report was a learning experience to assess MIO-ECSDE's procedures and performance, identify gaps and weaknesses, and propose steps for improvement in the future. The Panel commends MIO-ECSDE on its inclusion of action points for 2018-2019 throughout the report, marked in blue, and looks forward to updates on progress in future reports.

In future reports, the Panel would also be interested in hearing about any particular takeaways from successes, failures, or feedback received, as well as the process used

for learning (discussion/exchange amongst members or third-party evaluations?). While an ambitious approach, the Panel points to CARE's efforts around learning (see page 14 of their accountability report) as possible ideas to explore. These include producing top learning reports which drive improvement and dialogue with stakeholders, a Learning and Needs Analysis report, and a learning pilot programme to support country offices in reflecting on their impact.

Inclusivity, human rights, women's rights and gender equality (C2)

The report states that MIO-ECSDE considers gender mainstreaming states at all levels of the engagement process by aiming for gender-balanced project teams and decision-making bodies, facilitating women's meaningful engagement in activities, ensuring the participation of gender experts in projects, and applying participatory methodologies which consider gender. Is there a gender policy/strategy guiding this approach?

Beyond gender, how does MIO-ECSDE work in an inclusive way and protect human rights? Is there a safeguarding policy, or a broader inclusion policy covering diversity factors such as age, nationality, ethnicity, disability, etc.? Are there systems in place to identify stakeholders that risk being excluded from MIO-ECSDE's work?

Minimising negative impacts on stakeholders (C3)

Here we would be looking for information about policies or practices guiding the minimisation of negative impacts on MIO-ECSDE's stakeholders, such as a code of conduct, safeguarding/protection policy, a process to assess and mitigate unintended impacts of projects, or efforts to support rather than compete with local organisations.

An example is CARE's advocacy handbook, which includes a section on risk management, outlining how they understand and mitigate unintended negative impacts on the people they work with, including partners.

Stakeholder feedback (E1)

The report mentions client performance questionnaires under its section on complaints. Who are these for (members? partners?), how often are they circulated, and what do they cover? A link to the questions and a summary of key findings would be welcome in the next report.

The Panel notes positively that in 2018-2019 MIO-ECSDE plans to survey member organisations on its performance, to identify areas for improvement. We look forward to seeing the outcomes in future reports.

In general, more information on this section would be appreciated. The report includes a section on how MIO-ECSDE communicated about its work through its website and social media networks – what do stakeholders say in response to the information shared? Is feedback actively sought from governments, members of the fora MIO-ECSDE is part of, or from the local communities in which it operates?

Overall, the Panel would be looking for a description of how feedback is sought, e.g. through satisfaction surveys, consultation processes, community visits, as well as any evidence of stakeholders being satisfied with these and with MIO-ECSDE's response to feedback received. A good practice example is Terre des Hommes' approach – see their report here, pg. 14

As for engagement of staff, the report outlines internal communication methods including internal emails providing progress updates on key issues, online calendars and project management tools, and staff meetings. It is stated that annual team building opportunities will be explored when resources are available. Are there any specific channels or opportunities whereby staff can provide feedback on the organisation's work and operations, such as a staff survey?

Stakeholder engagement (E2)

Here we would like to see how MIO-ECSDE engages its stakeholders in various aspects of its work, such as programme planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, decision-making etc. Are there policies or processes guiding this? Are there examples of how stakeholder input has impacted decisions and shaped organisational programmes or policies? How adaptive/flexible is programming, to respond to changing needs and contexts?

For an example of good practice, MIO-ECSDE could refer to how Terre des Hommes reframed its campaign on "children on the move" after stakeholder consultation and engages youth in decision-making processes on its Destination Unknown campaign (report here, page 15).

Main likes/dislikes from stakeholders and organisation's response (E3)

Here the Panel would like to see a summary of key feedback from stakeholders (eg. from the performance questionnaires mentioned) as well as information about how

MIO-ECSDE is responding to this feedback. See how CBM presents this information in their report, pg. 26.

Availability of key policies and information on your website (G1)

MIO-ECSDE's website includes information about the organisation's structure and key activities. An accountability section has links to annual reports, financial statements, and Accountable Now membership together with our 12 Commitments. The organisation's privacy policy is available online, but no other policy documents are.

The report had mentioned that a dedicated complaints form would be on the website in 2018, and the Panel requests that this be accompanied by a complaints policy.

The Panel also encourages MIO-ECSDE to make further documents publicly available, including its strategy document if it has one, environmental policy, and any other policies it has. The Panel believes that MIO-ECSDE's own members as well as other CSOs would find the documents give useful pointers for their own approaches.

The Panel highlights as an exemplary practice Restless Development's provision of links to almost all relevant information and policies, including governance, programmes, finances and performance, in one place on their website (see their page on Open Information Policy, with information and policies linked in the Appendix at the bottom of the page).

Complaints handling mechanisms and overview of complaints (internal and external (J3)

The report states that employees should report unacceptable conduct relating to corruption, harassment or abuse, discrimination, or acts that do not comply with MIO-ECSDE's values and principles. Reports are made to the Chairperson, who is responsible for investigating and following up on incidents. Does MIO-ECSDE provide guidance around reporting if the incident involves the Chairperson? It is stated that a more detailed Anti-Fraud policy will be developed in 2018 and signed annually by staff. Is there a broader internal complaints or whistleblowing policy?

The report refers to a specific procedure defining how complaints are identified, documented, and evaluated. The Panel requests a link to this in the next report and encourages MIO-ECSDE to make the document publicly available online. Client complaints currently can be submitted through oral or written communication or via performance questionnaires, and are collected by the Quality Assurance Officer (who in the Secretariat has this role?), logged in a Quality Management System, and shared with the Chairman.

The report states that an online complaints form will be available on the website in 2018. The Panel appreciates this (as a publicly accessible complaints mechanism is a key requirement of Accountable Now membership) and encourages MIO-ECSDE to communicate the online complaints form widely to stakeholders and the public.

While it is stated that statistical processing of complaints takes place, an overview was not provided. In the next report the Panel would like to see information about the number of complaints received, their broad nature (e.g. relating to fundraising, programmes, communications, etc.) and whether they were resolved. This can also provide insight into whether the mechanism seems to be well known and being used.