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This framework uses a draft ‘relationship cycle’ (rather than the project cycle). It covers five dimensions of Constituency Voice:

- Commitments to constituency voice
- Constituency involvement in defining and planning for success
- Feedback from constituents throughout implementation, monitoring and evaluation
- Constituency involvement in reviewing, learning and re-planning
- Related organisational policies

It covers two different levels of activity: the organisational level and programme specific levels. (NB we need to explain why.)

Definition: ‘Constituency Voice’ is the practice of ensuring that the views of all relevant constituents are seriously taken into account in planning, monitoring, assessing, reporting and learning from an organisation’s work. For INGOs this particularly includes ‘primary constituents’ – the people ultimately meant to benefit.

1. Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Rating (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 The INGO makes a public commitment to Constituency Voice in its core values. | Public documents state core commitment to empowerment, downward accountability, participation, being member-led & other related concepts | 1: No commitment.  
4: Some commitment made.  
7: Unequivocal commitment.  
In between:  
- the range of constituents to which the commitment is made.  
NB the number of commitments made is not important. |
| 1.2 The INGO makes a public commitment to Constituency Voice in charters / standards / principles etc. | Public documents state commitments to internal or external standards/codes e.g., IANGO charter, the HAP standard, Sphere, Red Cross Code & other relevant codes. | As above |
## 2. Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Rating (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 The INGO determines its 3 - 5 year overall organisational strategy in dialogue with constituents. | Review strategic planning process & strategic plan. Are all “key constituents” identified? Are opportunities created for them to contribute, to the substance of the discussion?  
NB ‘Partners’ may be a key constituent for many INGOs.  
If constituents are represented on the board, then they may be involved here, to some extent.  
Democratic processes with members would be a great example.  
This may not be relevant for all organisations. | 1: No input from constituents.  
4: Some input from some constituents.  
7: All constituents get a chance to contribute to the substance of the strategy.  
In between:  
- % of relevant constituents involved  
- Size of contribution they make (e.g. making final decisions, contributing original analysis/ideas, commenting on existing drafts) |
| 2.2 The INGO determines indicators and performance targets, to monitor progress compared to its organisational strategy, in dialogue with constituents. | As above                                                                                                                                                                                                   | As above                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 2.3 The INGO determines specific programme strategies in dialogue with constituents. | Review programme planning policies and practices. Are key constituents systematically identified, and involved in planning?  
NB This depends on practice within different field programmes, which may be hard to gauge.  
- policies & commitments are a good start  
- does the organisation systematically monitor practice, compared to the policies?  
- does the organisation report practice, systematically across all programmes? | 1: No input from constituents  
4: Some evidence that there is some input from some constituents in some programmes  
7: There is evidence that all relevant constituents contribute to the substance of strategies in all programmes.  
In between:  
- % of programmes which invite input from constituents  
- % of relevant constituents involved  
- Size of contribution they make (as in 2.1)  
- Is there a policy about this? Is performance measured compared to the policy? |
| 2.4 The INGO determines indicators and performance targets, to monitor progress compared to programme strategies, in | As above                                                                                                                                                                                                   | As above                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
3. Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The INGO invites feedback on its work from constituents, across all of its programmes.</td>
<td>Review programme policies and practice. Review public documents. Feedback may be invited during implementation (i.e. during monitoring) and/or at the end of implementation (i.e. during evaluation). We are particularly interested in 'primary constituents'. But 'constituents' may also include members, influential organisations and other key actors who play a critical role in achieving the INGO’s goals.</td>
<td>1: No feedback is invited 4: Some feedback is collected in some programmes 7: Feedback is systematically collected in all programmes; the amount of feedback is monitored. In between: - % of programmes inviting feedback - % of constituents giving feedback (particularly primary constituents) - commitment is made to collect feedback - system exists to monitor whether programmes collect feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 The INGO publishes feedback from constituents about its work, for the organisation as a whole.</td>
<td>Review public documents This could be comments on drafts of annual reports; or comments received during open meetings; or democratic processes; or other ways. Linked to 4.1</td>
<td>1: No feedback published 4: Some feedback from some constituents published 7: Feedback collected &amp; published from all major constituents (including primary constituents) In between: - % of constituents providing feedback which is published - % of feedback which is published - feedback is invited on a draft version of the annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The INGO reports key information back to constituents, for the organisation as a whole.</td>
<td>Review public documents Key information includes: - financial performance (income &amp; expenditure) - programme performance - plans / strategies - achievements - lessons learned - constituency feedback Also linked to 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The INGO publishes feedback from constituents about its work, for each programme.</td>
<td>Review public documents &amp; evaluation reports. Review programme policies &amp; practice (Is there evidence that this happens for all programmes?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 The INGO reports key information back to constituents, for each programme.

| Review public documents & evaluation reports. Review programme policies & practice (Is there evidence that this happens for any or all programmes?) |
| Key information includes:  
  - financial performance (income & expenditure)  
  - programme performance  
  - plans / strategies  
  - achievements  
  - lessons learned  
  - constituency feedback |
| 1: No information reported back  
4: Some information reported back, to some constituents, for some programmes  
7: All information reported back to all constituents for all programmes  
In between:  
- % of programmes reporting information  
- % of constituents with access to information  
- commitments made to report information back to constituents  
- system put in place to monitor whether information is reported |

4. Deliberation & learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1 The INGO regularly invites constituents to discuss progress and identify improvements for its work as a whole organisation. | Review public documents. Review policies and practice. | 1: No review by constituents  
4: Review of some areas by some constituents  
7: Review of all areas by representatives of all relevant constituents – and learning is published  
In between:  
- % of constituents involved in review  
- % of work reviewed  
- % of reviews that are published  
- regularity of reviews  
- do reviews include identifying improvements?  
- are suggested improvements acted on? |
| 4.2 The INGO regularly invites constituents to discuss progress and identify improvements for each programme. | Review public documents.  
Review policies and practice.  
NB This depends on practice within different field programmes, which may be hard to gauge. | 1: No reviews by constituents  
4: Some programmes are partly reviewed by some constituents  
7: All programmes are regularly reviewed by all relevant constituents (including primary constituents) – and learning is published  
In between:  
- % of programme that hold reviews  
- % of constituents involved in reviews  
- % of reviews that are published  
- regularity of reviews  
- do reviews include identifying improvements?  
- are suggested improvements acted on? |
|---|---|---|
| 4.3 The INGO publishes what it learns from deliberations with constituents. | Review public documents.  
NB to score top marks, an INGO would have to publish negative lessons, where constituents have criticised current practice and suggested improvements. | 1: No lessons are published  
4: Some lessons from deliberation with some constituents are published  
7: All lessons from all deliberations with constituents are published.  
In between:  
- % of lessons that are published  
- % of deliberations from which lessons are published  
- detail of lessons published |
## 5. Related management systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The INGO has an open information policy, based on the presumption of</td>
<td>Review published policies.</td>
<td>1: No information policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disclosure.</td>
<td>NB This is not about whether the policy is actually put into practice, which is covered in section 5 above.</td>
<td>4: Policy discloses some information disclosed, some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This can also be compared to the One World Trust’s Global Accountability Report (where relevant).</td>
<td>7: Full open information policy, based on presumption of disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In between:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- % of information covered by the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- % of organisation covered by the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 The INGO has an effective, accessible complaints system that constituents use.</td>
<td>Review published policies and practice.</td>
<td>1: No complaints systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This can also be compared to the One World Trust’s Global Accountability Report (where relevant).</td>
<td>4: Complaints system available to some constituents, for some issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7: Complaints systems are available for all constituents (in HQ &amp; field offices), and constituents use them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In between:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- % of programme with complaints systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- % of constituents with access to a complaints system (e.g. in the right language, media)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- how respectful and effective is the complaints system?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB 5.1 and 5.2 could be wrapped up in other indicators (e.g. ‘complaints’ is part of inviting feedback – cf indicator 3.1; and an open information policy is part of transparency & reporting back – cf indicators 3.3 and 3.5). But including them here separately may allow comparison with the One World Trust’s Global Accountability Report (where these INGOs are included there); and hopefully they should be pretty easy to check.