ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

ASSESSMENT OF NGOs ACCOUNTABILITY TO THEIR STAKEHOLDERS IN ETHIOPIA: A CASE OF INGOS OPERATING IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

By
WOGEN ACHENAFI AMBAW
ID.NO.SGS/0070/2005

JUNE 2016
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ASSESSMENT OF NGOs ACCOUNTABILITY TO THEIR STAKEHOLDERS IN ETHIOPIA: A CASE OF INGOs IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

By

WOGEN ACHENAFI AMBAW

ID.NO.SGS/0070/2005

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF GRADUATES STUDIES, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

THESIS ADVISOR:
MESFIN LEMMA (PhD)

JUNE 2016

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF GRADUATES STUDIES,
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

ASSESSMENT OF NGOs ACCOUNTABILITY TO THEIR STAKEHOLDERS IN ETHIOPIA: A CASE OF INGOs IN THE HEALTH SECTOR

By
WOGEN ACHENAFI AMBAW
ID.NO.SGS/0070/2005

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Dean, Graduate Studies	**Signature & Date**
Advisor	**Signature & Date**
External Examiner	**Signature & Date**
Internal Examiner	**Signature & Date**

ACKNOLODGMENT

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this Project entitled "**Assessment of NGOs Accountability to their Stakeholders in Ethiopia: A Case of INGOs operating in the health Sector"** is my original work. I have carried out the research work with the proper guidance and support of my research advisor, Dr. Mesfin Lemma. I further confirm that all sources of materials used for this research work have been duly acknowledged and that this thesis has not been submitted either in part or in full to any other higher learning institution for the purpose of earning any degree.

_____   _____

Name   Signature & Date

St. Mary's University, Addis Ababa   **June 2016**

ENDORSEMENT

This thesis has been submitted to St. Mary's University, School of Graduate Studies for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

_____   _____

Advisor   Signature & Date

St. Mary's University, Addis Ababa   **June 2016**

Acronyms

ChSA: Charities and Societies Agency

INGOs: International Non-Governmental Organizations

NGOs: Non-Governmental Organizations

ABSTRACT

Concerns about NGOs accountability to their stakeholders have increased in the last two decades as a result of the increase in their prominence and influence around the whole world. The main objective of the study is to assess NGOs accountability to their stakeholders with particular emphasis on INGOs operating in the health sector in Ethiopia and suggest ways of improving their accountability in all dimensions. Thus, the research explores INGOs' accountability practices; how they make themselves accountable to their stakeholders; to whom they are accountable in their day to day operation and finds out the challenges and problems faced by INGOs to promote accountability in their overall operations. The study employs an explorative approach and uses non-probability method and a purposive sampling strategy. The research used structured questionnaire along with semi-structured interviews with open and closed ended questions to collect quantitative and qualitative data in an attempt to answer the research questions. Accordingly, Fifteen INGOs are selected representing One hundred twenty two INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia and their experience regarding accountability is explored. The findings show that there is higher tendency of accountability of INGOs to their donors and the government and a lower tendency of accountability to their other stakeholders. The study has also shown that Disclosure statements & reports and evaluation of performance are relatively strong mechanisms of accountability and basically serve upward accountability. The study has also identified the challenges and Problems faced by the INGOs in promoting and ensuring accountability in their day to day operations. The study suggests a number of recommendations including designing an accountability policy framework, building the capacity of INGOs, improving partnership between INGOs and their stakeholders and enforcing self-regulation mechanisms through external assessment and certification.

Key words:- accountability, NGOs, reporting, evaluation, self-regulation

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This introductory chapter addresses the introductory part of the research. It basically includes the background of the study, a statement of the problem, objectives of the study, the significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study and organization of the paper.

1.1 Back ground of the study

International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) have emerged as important actors in two important, interconnected realms. First, at the *national* level, INGO's have taken on significant roles in promoting the social, economic, and political development of the particular countries in which they are operating. Their enlarged efforts provide disaster relief, deliver on-going social services, build local capacities for self-help, promote self-governance, and enhance the political and policy influence of marginalized populations (Fisher, 1993; Clark, 1991; Edwards and Hulme, 1996). Second, at the *international* level, INGOs have been increasingly important in creating a kind of international civil society, animating informal but powerful normative regimes, and influencing the practices and policies of international institutions (Boli and Thomas 1999; Fox and Brown, 1998; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink, 2000; Florini, 2000).

INGOs started to evolve in Ethiopia as a result of the 1973 and 1984 Famine where they were involved in relief operations. However, later due to increased financial and material support from foreign donors and with an improvement of the situation in the country, they shifted and moved their focus into Long term programs that deal with the provision of basic social services with a main objective of helping the poor in building their capacity to meet their own needs using the resource they control.

Like in all other countries, the number of INGOs working in the different parts of Ethiopia has also increased in the last two decades. This growth in number has been fueled by a strong belief among donors that INGOs are more cost-effective than governments in providing basic social services; are better able to reach the poor at the grass root level; and are key players in the development process.

With this increase in their prominence and rise in their influence around the whole country, concerns about their accountability and transparency to a multitude of their stakeholders such as Donors, Beneficiaries, staffs and Partners including the government have increased over the last ten years. . *Donors* demand that the INGOs be accountable for the integrity, efficiency, and impact of programs that they have funded. *Beneficiaries* press INGOs to live up to their rhetoric about fostering locally-determined development rather than impose their own priorities. *Staffs* expect INGOs to live up to the high purposes that drew their commitment to the enterprise. *Partners* (such as other NGOs, community-based organizations, government agencies, businesses) whom INGO's have recruited in their efforts to achieve their national and international goals expect the INGOs to live up to the promises they made in forging their partnerships.

This Concern for accountability can be attributed partly to the burgeoning presence of INGOs in the development scene in areas which tend to be neglected by both the private and public sector, often replacing the state's welfare and right based activities and partly due to a series of highly publicized scandals that have eroded public confidence in nonprofit organizations despite a lack of sufficient empirical evidence to support these accounts.

The Research is thus conducted with an overall aim of assessing the different accountability practices in INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia and suggesting varies ways/mechanisms of improving their accountability in all dimensions that will help them to cope with the existing challenges they are facing.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The increasing involvement of INGOs in the country in important economic, social and political issues has created tensions with the government and some segments of the private sector. It is now a daily argument that INGOs act as intermediaries between donors and intended beneficiaries thereby cutting out the role of the government in welfare and right based activities that were traditionally under its jurisdiction. This is because INGOs are considered by donor agencies as more cost effective and efficient in their provision of services to the poor as compared to the government institutions. Moreover, the private sector in the country also sees them as Market rivals and fill uncomfortable particularly by those INGOs that are increasingly investing large sums of money in low cost production activities.

Hence bitterness has developed amongst local political institutions that see themselves neglected as parallel power centers, like these INGOs, develop due to the change in the political landscape and amongst the private sector that see INGOs as competitors in their market.

However, there is also a widely spread misconception and scandal made to INGOs that there exists a fraudulent and highly corrupted financial management system in them that causes the incurrence of huge administrative costs in the implementation of actual programs or projects and that they are involved in antigovernment activities like by supporting opposition parties and by working with terrorist groups. And moreover there is also a major belief among the INGOs stakeholders that except to donors, who are the primary sources of funds for their operations, they do not practice accountability to all the other stakeholders. Hence, all these accusations have been made to the INGOs sector in Ethiopia although there is no significant study made to proof that allegation.

Generally speaking, the rise in the visibility and stakes of INGOs has significantly challenged the work of governments and the private sector, which in turn has elicited counter attacks by questioning their accountability and legitimacy.

In line with this, the government of Ethiopia has enacted and introduced very stringent proclamations and regulations with the main objective of promoting transparency and accountability in the systems and operations of all forms of NGOs working in the country.

However, in spite of this fact, there is still a strong belief among the NGOs community that the recently introduced government's proclamation and regulation for promoting accountability in all forms of NGOs is very ambiguous and lacks clarity and does not go in alignment with Globally generally accepted principles of accountability. And this has consequently created a number of problems. Some of which include the following:

➢ A number of local and International NGOs could not cope with the pressure and have ceased to operate in the country. This in turn has its own effect on the lives of many needy beneficiaries that reside in the difficult to reach remote rural areas in particular who benefit from the projects and on the overall country's development endeavors in general.

➢ Multi Million dollars that would have been brought and invested to the country's economy as a foreign assistance by existing and new INGOs to alleviate the country's

major problems has been subsequently withdrawn because of the frustration created in the minds of donors

The study thus assesses the various practices of accountability in INGOs operating in the health sector in Ethiopia and suggests possible ways or mechanisms to improve their accountability that will somehow ultimately contribute its part in solving the above mentioned problem.

1.3 Basic Research Questions

The study tries to answer the following research questions in order to accomplish the general and specific objectives:-

1) What are the accountability practices that exist in INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia?
2) To whom are these INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia mostly accountable for?
3) How do they make themselves accountable to their stakeholders? I.e. what accountability mechanisms do they exercise towards their stakeholders?
4) What are the challenges they face while trying to improve their accountability in their operations?
5) What kind of Accountability problems are observed in such organizations most of the time?
6) What goals of accountability are these developmental INGOs exhibiting in their day to day operations? I.e. what is their goal of organizational accountability?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 General Objective of the study

The general objective of the study is to assess the different accountability practices that exist in INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia by undertaking an in-depth study of sample INGOs.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

The following are the specific objectives of the study:-

➢ To assess the existing accountability practices in INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia.

➢ To identify to whom they are mostly accountable for in their day to day operation and suggest possible ways to improve their accountability to others for which they are least accountable for.

➢ To pinpoint how, the ways/ mechanisms, they are making themselves accountable for their own actions and suggest other possible alternative mechanisms.

➢ To recognize challenges faced by INGOs Operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia in terms of improving their accountability and suggest possible ways of overcoming them.

➢ To find out accountability problems observed by INGOs Operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia most of the time and suggest possible solutions for them.

➢ To identify the main goals of accountability in INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia.

1.5 Significance of the study

The study is very important to assess the main practices of accountability in INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia; to reveal the challenges they are facing towards maintaining accountability to their stakeholders and to pinpoint/suggest possible recommendations that are helpful to enhance their accountability mechanisms for ensuring their dynamic participation in the country's overall development.

Undertaking the study does have a significant importance for INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia in Particular and for the government and people of Ethiopia in general for the following reasons.

➢ The study will benefit INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia to help them see the gaps on their accountability practices and make subsequent reforms on their accountability that are in alignment with their existing organizational mission and strategy.

➢ It can also give a useful insight to the concerned government body, Charities & Societies Agency, by clearly showing them ways for designing/establishing ethical

accountability frameworks or mechanisms through which INGOs could be monitored and evaluated.

➤ The findings of the study can also serve as a reference for other researchers to initiate and conduct further study on related issues.

1.6 Scope of the study

The scope of the study is to assess the different accountability practices in international NGOs (INGOs) operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia and with their Head office located at Addis Ababa. And it also considers only those Health Sector INGOs which have been operational in Ethiopia for at least seven years because this will give us enough period to assess their accountability practices before and after the enactment of the new proclamation by the Government on Year 2009 for the improvement of accountability of all forms of NGOs operating in the country.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

The following are limitations of the Study:
➤ The study is done using the views of employees of the sample INGOs operating in the health sector in Ethiopia. The views of their stakeholders including the government oversight agency, the public media, project beneficiaries and peer and/or partner organizations working with them are not included because of time and cost constraint issues. Incorporating the views of all their stakeholders on the study would have brought a better result.
➤ There was some difficulty in accessing or getting sample documents for a physical review because some of the documents are confidential in nature and there was busyness among staffs in some organization handling the current emergency situation in the country.
➤ The study is conducted in Limited number of sample organizations due to scarcity of time and resources allotted for the study.

1.8 Definition of Key terms

The following are some of the definitions for some of the key words/terms that are frequently used in the study paper:

"Accountability" is defined as ''the means by which individuals and organizations report to a recognized authority (or authorities) and are held responsible for their actions.'' Edwards and Hulme (1996b, p. 967)

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.

"Asymmetrical relationship" refers to the relationship among two or more individuals or organizations where there is power imbalance between them. One is more powerful than the other because of ownership of resources or some sort of formal authority.

"Board of Directors" Wikipedia the free encyclopedia defines it as a body of elected or appointed members who jointly oversee the activities of an organization. Its members are external individuals outside the organization.

"Code of Conduct" Wikipedia the free encyclopedia defines it as a set of rules outlining the social norms and rules and responsibilities of, or proper practices for, an individual, party or organization.

"Charities and Societies Agency" is an agency established by Proclamation 621/2009 in July 2009 with an objective of overseeing and monitoring the activities of Charities and Societies. The Agency is given broad powers in the administration of charities and societies. It has the authority, among others, to license, register and supervise legal compliance, determine the public benefit status of CSOs, provide education and training to ensure compliance, and impose sanction in case of any violation of the law. In addition, the Agency has the responsibility to facilitate consultative forums with Charities and Societies.

"Complaint" refers to a specific grievance of anyone who has been negatively affected by an organization's action or who believes that an organization has failed to meet a stated commitment.

"Complaints procedure" refers to a specified series of actions through which an organization deals with complaints and ensures that complaints are reviewed and acted upon.

"**Conflict of interest**" Wikipedia the free encyclopedia defines it as a situation in which a person or organization is involved in multiple interests, financial interest, or otherwise, one of which could possibly corrupt the motivation of the individual or organization. In short, conflict of interest arises whenever the personal or professional interests of those individuals are potentially at odds with the best interests of the organization.

"NGOs" NGOs are formal (professionalized) independent societal organizations whose primary aim is to promote common goals at the national or the international level. (Martens, 2002, p.282). NGOs differ in size, nature and scope and are heterogeneous set of institutions.

Value for money' (VFM) is a term used to assess whether or not an organization has obtained the maximum benefit from the goods and services it both acquires and provides, within the resources available to it.

"Whistleblowing" the free dictionary defines it as the disclosure by a person, usually an employee in a government agency or private enterprise, to the public or those in authority, of mismanagement, corruption, illegal, or some other wrong doing. Whistleblowers can be employees, suppliers, contractors, clients or any individual who somehow becomes aware of illegal activities taking place in a business either through witnessing the behavior or being told about it.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This Research study has five chapters. The first chapter is an introductory chapter and contains topics like, Background of the Study, Statement of the problem, Basic research questions, General and Specific Objectives of the Study, Scope & Significance of the Study, and limitations of the study and definition of key terms.

The second chapter focuses on the review of literatures in relation to NGO accountability issues. Different concepts written by Scholars on enhancing NGO's accountability and

recently written publications on public/private and media opinion on NGO's accountability, Journals and Articles on current NGOs accountability debates are reviewed and included in this literature review.

The third chapter emphasizes on the research design of the study and the methodologies used in data analysis. Here the sample used for the data collection, tools used for data collection and methods used for data analysis are discussed in detail.

The fourth chapter deals with data presentation, analysis and interpretation. It tries to organize and analyze both the primary and secondary data collected using different qualitative and quantitative methods in a way that gives meaning and Clues for recommendations.

The fifth chapter is the final chapter of the research paper and it is used to highlight the summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations provided based on the summary of findings presented.

CHAPTER TWO

RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, relevant literatures related to the study topic are reviewed. This also includes discussion of related theories and empirical reviews that are used as an input for the study.

2.1 Overview of NGO Accountability

NGOs fulfill a number of functions in areas which tend to be neglected by the private and public sectors. Due to the decline in the provision of services by the public sector/ government in many countries, NGOs have played an increasingly influential role in a variety of activities which impact upon the lives of many people.

However, despite their prominence in the whole world, cases of NGO misconduct in advocacy, fund use, management, and governance, have come as a scandal in the sector to light in the past two decades.

All these trends have put NGOs themselves in the spotlight, questioning their very roles & legitimacy with social values and expectations; and their accountability to key stakeholders and the constituency that they work with.

Ultimately, as NGOs role in problem-solving be it human rights, poverty reduction, environment protection, peace building, global governance etc. is increasing, there is a need for a greater and enhanced NGOs accountability that needs to be grounded within the moral and value driven criteria that influence their work.

2.2 Related theories

2.2.1 Principal-Agent Theory

The concept of accountability within the economic literature often focuses on the asymmetrical relationship between a principal and an agent (Speckbacher, 2003; Bogart, 1995).

Principal – Agent theory focuses on how principals can hold agents accountable for performance that meets the principal's expectations (Brown and Moore, 2001). The principal is trying to get the agent to act in the principal's best interest. However, in many situations,

the interests of the agent do not correspond with the interests of the principal and the principal might be uncertain as to whether the agent adequately implements its wishes (Ebrahim, 2003). The general solutions to principal-agent problems are to align the interests of the two parties or to monitor the activities of the agent. The alignment of interests can be obtained by devising incentive schemes, for example performance-based compensation/contracts of managers. Monitoring the activities of the agent is another solution. The disadvantages of monitoring are that it requires expenditure of valuable resources by the principal and may negatively influence the incentives and motivation of the agent (Ebrahim, 2003; Bogart, 1995). Difficulties in creating effective incentive schemes and monitoring causes risk for the principal. It can lead to underinvestment or to avoid altogether a situation in which a principal-agent relationship comes into existence (Bogart, 1995).

From this perspective accountability may be defined as the principals' right to require an account from the agent and the right to impose sanctions if the account or the actions accounted for is inadequate (Ebrahim, 2003; Leat, 1996). Describing NGOs' accountability in terms of principal-agent theory is more complex than in case of for-profit organizations. Because in the principal-agent theory it is generally assumed that only two parties are involved. However, in nonprofit organizations because of the involvement of a number of stakeholders, there are much more principal-agent relationships that can be distinguished and need to be navigated, making the accountability framework increasingly difficult (Benjamin, 2008).

Moreover, monitoring systems and incentive contracts are not easily applied within the context of NGOs. A conventional argument is that the non-distribution constraint of NGOs removes part of the incentive for efficiency. Considering that nonprofit managers cannot claim a part of the residual earnings, they will be inclined to use their managerial skills less efficient (Galaskiewicz and Bielefeld, 2003). Moreover, Incentive contracts require clearly definable and enforceable tasks and the results of these tasks need to be captured by the incentive schemes, which cause difficulties in the situation of nonprofit organizations (Speckbacher, 2003). And monitoring systems might be difficult to transfer to nonprofit organizations though because they lack owners it is not clear who should invest in monitoring activities. Besides this, defining tasks and learning whether these tasks were performed properly or not is more difficult to predict within a nonprofit organization (Speckbacher, 2003).

On the other hand, it can be argued that managers of nonprofit organizations need less monitoring and external incentives because they are more committed to their organizations missions and do not have the tendency to behave opportunistically (Benjamin, 2008). In practice it seems that this line of thought cannot be said true as various scandals within the sector seem to prove the opposite.

Generally speaking the definition of accountability using the traditional principal-agent model is very limiting, as it only affords those with formal authority over an organization the right to hold it to account. And within the context of the non-profit sector, such an understanding leads NGOs to focus on their accountability relationships with donors, governments and their board of governors, to the neglect of other stakeholders such as their beneficiaries. Moreover, it propagates the minimalist view that NGO accountability is principally about how money is spent and what the fund-raising/administration ratio is (Slim 2002).

2.2.2 Stakeholder Theory

The theory proclaims that organizations need to be responsible for the interests of all constituents that are affected by their actions. Operating in complex nature, nonprofit organizations need to deal with multiple stakeholders such as shareholders, government, investors, donors, beneficiaries, communities, staff, Partner organizations and others.

Clarkson (1995) also differentiates stakeholder based on two categories: Primary and Secondary stakeholders. Primary stakeholders refer to those who are actively involved in organizational activities or are directly being influenced by or affected by the organization activities whereas Secondary stakeholders are influenced or affected by organization activities but they are not involved in relation to organizational activities.

NGO accountability is better understood through the stakeholder approach because it transfers the right to accountability from exclusively those that have authority over an organization to anyone that has been affected by the organization's policies. This makes accountability a far more inclusive and open concept. The stakeholder view also recognizes that accountability is more than an end-stage activity. To ensure that an NGO is responsible for its actions all stakeholders need to be involved at every stage of the decision-making

process. Passing judgement after a decision is made limits the extent to which an NGO can be held to account. Accountability needs to be an ongoing process.

Understanding accountability on these terms also extends the limits of the concept beyond its role as a disciplinary mechanism and towards its use as a transformative power (Young, 2000). An NGO that is accountable to multiple stakeholders not only ensures that decisions are effective in meeting the needs of those interests, but also forces decision to be made in a more equitable and fair manner.

In addition, this more open and participative approach of accountability also unlocks the potential of NGOs as an agent for organizational change. Accountability that is pursued on an ongoing basis opens up space for those affected by an NGO's policies to input into the decision-making process. This in turn creates positive feedback loops that enable organizations to learn from what is working and what is not. When understood on these terms accountability is no longer simply a mechanism for disciplining power, but also a force for social change.

2.2.2.1 Balancing the demands of multiple stakeholders:

According to the stakeholder approach, NGOs are accountable to multiple actors. The lines of accountability run in four different directions. Firstly, NGOs are upwardly accountable to donors, government and foundations- those that provide them with their financial and legal base (Edwards and Hulme 1996). Secondly, NGOs are downwardly accountable to their beneficiaries, those that they provide services to or speak on behalf of in policy forums (ibid). Thirdly, NGOs are inwardly accountability to themselves for their organizational mission, values and staff. And fourthly, NGOs are horizontally accountable to their peers.

The strength and clarity of these different accountability relationships is not equal. They vary greatly in relation to the relative power a stakeholders has over an NGO. The responsibilities between donors and NGOs for example, are generally clear and the mechanisms for ensuring accountability strong. Focused on the "spending of designated moneys for designated purposes" (Najam 1996, p967) a donor can ensure accountability through their financial leverage. Similarly, governments create the legal and regulatory environment within which NGOs function, so they too have significant leverage to guarantee accountability

Beneficiaries on the other hand, generally lack the power to make demands of NGOs. As a result the accountability relationship with them is often weak. Rather than grounded in contract or law, NGOs accountability to their beneficiaries is shaped by moral and ethical imperatives. Because they claim to speak on their behalf, NGOs have a moral obligation to be accountable to their beneficiaries. This moral obligation is also supported by NGOs accountability to their values and mission which frequently reflect a strong belief in the virtues of inclusive and participatory decision-making. However a moral obligation provides significant scope for choice and interpretation. As a result, how NGOs are accountable to their beneficiaries is largely determined by the individual organization. The quality and embeddedness of beneficiary accountability therefore varies considerably across and within NGO sectors.

The responsibility that NGOs owe to their peers also lacks clarity. Although there should be an accountability relationship between peers to uphold the standards and reputation of the sector, the reality in most sectors, is that norms around what constitutes good practice are often absent (Brown et al2004) and as a result NGOs frequently lack a common standard or accepted behavior to hold each other accountable. It is within this context that self-regulatory initiatives are emerging.

Therefore, NGOs cannot be equally accountable to all stakeholder groups at all times because it would lead to accountability paralysis and the challenge for leadership and management is to prioritize among competing accountability demands. Hence key stakeholder groups need to be prioritized taking into account the following factors: influence, responsibility and representation.

Influence: influence is about more than how much power stakeholders have to bring about change within an organization (those that can affect). It is also about the degree to which the needs and interests of stakeholders who do not have the power to influence the organization should be taken into account because they are integral to the specific project or key to the organization's success. Failure to view influence in this way have adverse effect by reinforcing accountability systems already skewed towards those stakeholders with power, at the expense of those less powerful but affected by an organization.

Responsibility: an organization has different levels and types of responsibility to different stakeholders.

➢ Regulatory responsibility to the state to comply with certain regulations

➢ Contractual or legal responsibility to other organizations or partners

➢ Financial responsibility to donors or shareholders, to ensure their money is used in the agreed way.

➢ Ethical or moral responsibility to stakeholders, either because they are directly or indirectly dependent on the organization and affected by it; or because they are integral to the organization's mission, vision and values.

Representation: this encompasses the legitimacy of a representative (i.e. the extent to which a stakeholder truly represents its constituents'' need and interests), and the number of constituents that it represents. (Pathways to Accountability: The GAP Framework by Monica Blagescu, Lucy de Las Casas and Robert Lloyd, One World Trust, London (UK), 2005.)

2.2.3 Legitimacy Theory

It is a theory applied in social and environmental accounting that is a plausible explanation for NGO accountability. Legitimacy theory (Lindblom, 1994; Suchman, 1995) is a value system centered that states that a dichotomy exists between the value system of organizations and those of the society.

Legitimacy refers to perceptions by key stakeholders that the existence, activities and impacts of NGOs are justifiable and appropriate in terms of central social values and institutions. It is grounded in the perceptions of stakeholders in the larger environment in which the organization is embedded (Brown and Jagadanada, 2007). It is the right to be and to do something in a society- a sense that an organization is lawful, admissible, and justified in its chosen course of action (Edwards, 2000). It is about an organization fulfilling its social contract with the society.

2.2.4 Institutional Theory

Institutional theory unlike legitimacy theory specifies how society expectations are met and gained by institutionalizing norms and rules. It attends to the deeper and more resilient aspects of social structure. It considers the processes by which structures, including Schemas,

rules, norms, and routines, become established as authoritative guidelines for social behavior. It inquiries into how these elements are created, diffused, adopted, and adapted over space and time; how they fall into decline and disuse. Although the ostensible subject is stability and order in social life, students of institutions must perforce attention not just to consensus and conformity but to conflict and change in social structures (Scott, 2004). This theory Provides some code of behavior to earn, nurture and maintain societal expectations; and thus create a positive organization-society interface with good accountability.

2.3 Related Literature

2.3.1 NGOs Accountability dimensions

Although the core concept of accountability is about trust, it is a complex notion regardless of the actor or entity to which it is applied. The notion of accountability is particularly complex in relation to NGOs, however, because of the multiplicity of actors with whom NGOs engage and to whom they are therefore accountable. We can speak of "Upward" accountability to funders, donors, governments or other external actors, often in the context of accounting for resources or the fulfillment of particular service targets and "Downward" accountability to constituents such as community groups, activists, or other beneficiaries receiving NGO services, although it may also include communities or regions indirectly impacted by nonprofit programs. Some also speak of "Horizontal" accountability to refer to the relationship that exists between NGOs themselves, who see themselves as part of a public process than part of a competitive culture. (Najam, 1996, p.342)

Accountability has a certain reflexive quality: we can think of NGO accountability in terms of its "External" dimension that deals with striving to meet certain established standards of conduct and in terms of its "Internal" dimension that deals with self-motivated efforts centering on organization's responsibility to its mission and staffs to attain prescribed goals.

NGO accountability can also be thought of in both "functional and strategic" terms, where functional accountability is concerned with concrete requirements, such as accounting for expended resources and registering immediate accomplishments, and where as strategic accountability focuses upon measuring the long-term impact of an organization's work up on the other organizations and the larger environment. (Najam, 1996, P. 351). Najam suggests also that while functional accountability to patrons is typically high in practice, functional accountability to clients and NGOs themselves is low.

2.3.2 NGO Accountability: to whom, for what and How?

2.3.2.1 NGO Accountability to Whom?

Accountability relationships are complicated by the fact that NGOs are expected to be accountable to multiple actors: upwards to their funders or patrons, downwards to clients, and internally to themselves and their missions [(Edwards and Hulme, 1996a; Kearns, 1996; Lindenberg and Bryant, 2001; Najam, 1996) "Upwards" accountability usually refers to relationships with donors, foundations, and governments and is often focused on the use of funds. Accountability to clients refers primarily to "downward" relationships with groups receiving services, although it may also include communities or regions indirectly impacted by nonprofit programs. The third category of accountability concerns NGOs themselves. This internal (or horizontal) accountability centers on an organization's responsibility to its mission and staff, which includes decision makers as well as field-level implementers.

At a minimum, to whom one organization is accountable to others, varies with organization type, be it a membership organization or a service-delivery nonprofit. While these two "types" of NGOs do not capture the diversity in the sector, they illustrate critical differences:

Membership organizations: are largely oriented towards serving the interests of their members, and are often run by and for their members. The mechanisms of accountability available to members include the exercise of "voice" by voting for the organization's leaders, "exit" by revoking membership and dues or joining another organization and "loyalty by attempting to reform the organization either by influencing leaders or by running for a leadership position. Because the members/clients are internal to the organization, membership organizations combine internal accountability (to members of the organizations) with downward accountability (to clients, who are members). In short, there is a structural equality between principals and agents, and thus a significant potential for the use of exit, voice, and loyalty options.

Service delivery organizations: typically provide a range of services to their clients or beneficiaries, ranging from health and education to housing and rural development. Their clients are usually not involved in creating the nonprofit in the way that members are; they are external actors to the organization and therefore have less voice in shaping its activities and direction. For many, the demands of funders or patrons (i.e., upward accountability) tend

to be the most formalized, for example, through grant contracts, reporting requirements, and formal evaluations. This imbalance is reproduced in their relations with clients, who are often in a "take it or leave it" relationship with respect to services offered (Uphoff, 1996: 25), except in highly competitive contexts where clients have multiple service-providers from which to choose. A key accountability challenge lies in increasing "downward" accountability from funders to the nonprofit, and from the nonprofit to clients.

In short, the demands of accountability "to whom" are multifold and can seldom be reduced to simple terms. Accountability is a relational concept; it varies according to the relationships among actors, and it also varies across different types of organizations. Furthermore, asymmetric relationships among stakeholders are likely to result in a skewing towards accountability mechanisms that satisfy the interests of the most powerful actors. In other words, accountability is also about power, in that asymmetries in resources become important in influencing who is able to hold whom to account.

2.2.3.2 NGO Accountability for What?

Given that nonprofit organizations face demands for accountability from multiple actors, it follows that they are expected to be accountable for different things by different people. These expectations may be broken down into four broad, but far from comprehensive, categories: accountability for finances, governance, performance, and mission (Behn, 2001; Ebrahim, 2009).

Finances: Questions about finances have received considerable attention in the wake of various accounting scandals and crises not only in the nonprofit world but also in the private sector. Public policy responses, particularly to firm-level failures, typically call for greater disclosure of financial transactions, transparency in the use and oversight of funds by executives and trustees, as well as protections for whistleblowers who reveal information about mismanagement. Accountability, in this context, is constituted as coercive or punitive, with an emphasis on disclosure, a reliance on legislative or regulatory oversight, and backed up by threats of sanctions for non-compliance, such as fines and imprisonment.(The Many Faces of Nonprofit Accountability by Alnoor S. Ebrahim; 2010)

Governance: The second type of expectation focuses on organizational governance which has often centered on the role of the board of directors. The board is the nexus of standards of

care, loyalty and obedience: board members are responsible for seeking and considering adequate information on which to base decisions (care), for disclosing conflicts of interest and placing the organization's interests over personal ones (loyalty), and for acting within the organization's mission while also adhering to internal organizational protocols for decision making (obedience). The board's fiduciary responsibilities typically focus on its financial oversight role, about how the organization raises and spends money, follows donor intent, and whether it is in compliance with the law. The basic premise is that boards are responsible for oversight of internal controls and legal compliance, such that failures within an organization are reflective of failures of guidance and oversight at the board level. But boards are increasingly also expected to be accountable for the broader purposes of the organization: for its performance in achieving results, for identifying an effective strategy, and for focusing on a mission that creates the greatest social value. These functions require much more than fiduciary oversight, demanding that boards play a more "generative" role (Chait, et al., 2005), particularly in the development and maintenance of mission (McFarlan and Epstein, 2009).

Performance: The third broad stream of accountability centers on performance, built on the premise that organizations should be held to account for what they deliver. The purpose of such accountability is to demonstrate "results." Performance-based accountability often uses tools such as logic models (called logical framework analysis in the international development world), in which a project's objectives and expected results are identified in a matrix with a list of indicators used in measuring and verifying progress. This kind of accountability relies on a range of technical and professional skills related to performance measurement, indicator development, evaluation and impact assessment, all of which converge towards metrics that link goals to outcomes. This type of accountability is encouraged by funder reporting requirements that reward clear outputs and outcomes. Some critical observers have cautioned, however, that an overemphasis on measurable outcomes can lead to a push for quick fixes, potentially conflicting with or even undermining the work of NGOs engaged in relationship building and empowerment-related work, and whose efforts may take time to bear fruit (Benjamin, 2008; Lindenberg and Bryant, 2001).

Mission: This fourth and more emergent type of accountability that focuses on the very core of nonprofit activity is organizational mission. If NGOs exist for purposes of public good, why not ask them to demonstrate progress towards achieving that mission? One might describe this as a mission-centered variant of performance-based accountability, which

indicates that for nonprofit organizations should internalize their mission by regularly monitoring performance against it, and periodically reviewing it in light of changing external conditions (McFarlan and Epstein, 2009).

These four "what's" of accountability — for finances, governance, performance, and mission — are not mutually exclusive, but are instead integrative. For example, boards have not only fiduciary responsibility but also serve the mission and oversee performance. Donors consider mission in selecting which organizations to fund and many provide considerable flexibility with respect to performance assessment. And chief executives are expected to work with boards and staff to align mission, strategy and performance.

2.2.3.3 NGO Accountability How? MECHANISMS OF ACCOUNTABILITY

If NGOs are expected to be accountable to multiple actors (accountability to whom) and for multiple purposes (accountability for what), what then are the mechanisms of accountability actually available to them (accountability how)?

The discussion below explores five broad (but far from comprehensive) categories of accountability mechanisms used by NGOs in practice: reports and disclosure statements; performance assessments and evaluations; participation; self-regulation and social audits. (Ebrahim, 2003)

Before discussing the mechanisms, it is helpful to differentiate between those that are **''tools''** and those that are **''processes''.** In basic terms, accountability tools refer to discrete devices or techniques used to achieve accountability. They are often applied over a limited period of time, can be tangibly documented, and can be repeated. For example, financial reports and disclosures are tools that are applied and repeated quarterly or annually, and are documented as financial statements, ledgers or reports. Performance evaluations are also often carried out at specific points in time, usually at the end of a specific project, and result in an evaluation report.

On the other hand, **process mechanisms** such as participation and self-regulation are generally more broad and multifaceted than tools; and they are also being less tangible and time-bound although each may utilize a set of tools for achieving accountability. Process mechanisms thus emphasize on a course of action rather than on a distinct end-result, in which the means are important in themselves. There are also some mechanisms, such as

social auditing, that straddle the tool- process boundary. These distinctions are discussed in greater detail below.

1. Disclosure statements and reports

Disclosure statements and reports are among the most widely used tools of accountability and are frequently required by federal or state laws in many countries. For example, nonprofit organizations must provide quite detailed information on finances, organizational structure, and programs through an annual work plan to a controlling body assigned by states. Furthermore, state law provisions also often include registration and reporting statutes that involve annual financial reporting. Such legal disclosures enable some degree of accountability to donors, clients and members who wish to access these reports.

Apart from legally mandated reports, donors also require regular reports from organizations that they fund. The nature of these reports varies considerably among funders and projects, and it is subject to some degree of negotiation. Such reports and legal disclosures are significant tools of accountability in that they make available (either to the public or to oversight bodies) basic data on NGO operations. Their distinct and tangible nature makes them easily accessible. Yet, the bulk of this reporting emphasizes upward reporting of financial data, with only limited indication of the quality of NGO work and almost no attention to downward accountability to stakeholders.

2. Performance assessment and evaluation

Another widely used set of tools for facilitating accountability includes various kinds of evaluation, including performance and impact assessments. It is useful to distinguish between external and internal evaluations. Donors commonly conduct **external evaluations** of NGO work near the end of a grant or program phase and increasingly employ mid-term assessments as well. Such evaluations typically aim to assess whether and to what extent program goals and objectives have been achieved and are pivotal in determining future funding to NGOs.

These appraisals may focus on short-term results of NGO intervention (i.e. 'outputs'' or ''activities'') or medium and long-term results (i.e., ''impacts'' or ''outcomes'') (Levy, Meltsner, & Wildavsky, 1974; Roche, 1999, p. 22). Internal evaluations are also common, in

which NGO staff gauge their own progress, either toward the objectives of externally funded programs or toward internal goals and missions. Hybrid internal and external evaluations are not uncommon, with NGO staff working jointly with external evaluators.

Both external and internal evaluations run into a series of problems concerning measurement and relevance. First, there are conflicts among NGOs and funders over whether they should be assessing processes such as ''participation'' and ''empowerment'' or whether they should measure more tangible products such as the numbers of schools built, trees planted, and land area irrigated. For the most part, donor appraisals tend to focus on products—they are short-term and emphasize on easily measurable and quantifiable results over more ambiguous and less tangible change in social and political processes. An appraisal tool increasingly used by bilateral donor agencies is **logical framework analysis** (LFA). The logical framework is a matrix in which a projects objectives and expected results are clearly identified, along with a list of indicators that are to be used in measuring and verifying progress toward achieving those objectives and results. Edwards and Hulme (1996a, p. 968) suggest that the wide use of logical frameworks and their derivatives may ''distort accountability by overemphasizing short-term quantitative targets and favoring hierarchical management Structures.

A second set of problems that concerns is NGOs perspectives on the relevance of evaluation. On one side, NGO culture tends to emphasize action over analysis. NGO staff are, by and large, ''doers'' that gain legitimacy by helping the poor than by conducting time consuming and costly evaluations. An additional crucial concern raised by small NGOs is that their limited staff and resources are stretched too thin by evaluation and reporting requests of funders. Donors sometimes fail to recognize that complex evaluation requirements can overwhelm small organizations (and even large ones at times), and that NGO size and capacity should be key factors in determining the scale of an appraisal.

A third, and more fundamental, skepticism centers on the purpose of evaluation. There is a tendency to equate evaluation with assessment of performance. While it makes sense to conduct evaluations in order to assess progress toward objectives, should this be the sole, or even the primary, purpose of evaluation? Performance assessments tend to focus attention on projects or programs, while overlooking the NGO or organization itself (Fowler, 1996).

Evaluations have the potential for facilitating broader organizational change, particularly through capacity building and organizational learning.

3. Participation

As an accountability mechanism, participation is quite distinct from evaluations and reports because it is a process rather than a tool, and it is thus part of ongoing routines in an organization. In examining participation, it is helpful to distinguish between different levels or kinds of participation.

Drawing from Adnan (1992 as cited in Gardner & Lewis, 1996, p.111) and Arnstein (1969), we can make four general distinctions between types of participation. At one level, participation refers to information about a planned project being made available to the public, and can include public meetings or hearings, surveys, or a formal dialogue on project options. In this form, participation involves consultation with community leaders and members but decision-making power remains with the project planners. A second level of participation includes public involvement in actual project-related activities, and it may be in the form of community contribution in the form of labor and funds needed for project implementation, and possibly in the maintenance of services or facilities. At a third level, citizens are able to negotiate and bargain over decisions with NGOs or state agencies, or even hold veto power over decisions. At this level, citizens are able to exercise greater control over local resources and development activities. Finally, at a fourth tier of participation, are people's own initiatives which occur independently of NGO and state sponsored projects.

The first two forms of participation are commonly espoused by state agencies, donors, and NGOs, and are based on an assumption that poverty can be eliminated by increasing local access to resources and services. At both of these levels, very little decision-making authority is vested in communities or clients, with actual project objectives being determined by NGOs and funders long before any ''participation'' occurs.

4. Self-regulation

The term ''self-regulation,'' as used here, refers specifically to efforts by NGO or nonprofit networks to develop standards or codes of behavior and performance.

Partly in an effort to redeem the image of the sector (as a result of public scandals or exaggerated claims of performance), and partly to forestall potentially restrictive government regulation, nonprofits have begun to turn to various forms of self- regulation (Schweitz, 2001).

While some degree of external intervention may be appropriate in dealing with this problem of public trust (e.g., government oversight, especially through reporting and disclosure requirements), self-regulation presents a complementary path that allows nonprofits to address directly their own sector wide problems while retaining some integrity.

The process of developing a code involves some degree of participatory negotiation, frequently lasting over two years, with most codes also including some form of compliance assessment or certification.

While the content of these codes varies from place to place, they essentially agree on key principles and ethics of development (e.g., participatory and people centered development), and they also provide guidelines on NGO management (Schweitz, 2001, pp. 8–9):

In sum, self-regulation presents numerous opportunities for NGOs not only to better their public image, but also to enhance performance. Self-regulation through codes of conduct, ombudsmen, and other avenues not discussed here (such as accreditations), provide important mechanisms through which NGOs can improve accountability to funders, communities, and to themselves.

5. Social auditing

Social auditing refers to a process through which an organization assesses, reports, and improves upon its social performance and ethical behavior, especially through stakeholder dialogue (Gonella, Pilling, & Zadek, 1998, p. 21; Volunteer Vancouver, 1999, p. 1).

Social auditing is not simply a kind of evaluation but is a complex process that integrates elements of many of the accountability mechanisms discussed above, including disclosure statements, evaluations, participation, and codes of conduct. While social auditing has not

been widely adopted by NGOs, it is a distinct accountability mechanism because of its conceptual integration of the accountability tools and processes already discussed.

Despite the apparent advantages of social audits, a number of factors have constrained their adoption by nonprofit organizations. Perhaps the most important factor is cost. The social auditing process can impose significant burdens of time and money, especially on small organizations, particularly if external certification is desired. Another concern about social audits is the uncertainty associated with its impact on donors. What if an audit turns up serious problems in the organization or, more likely, what if it shows that the organization falls short of its rhetoric on participation and poverty alleviation? Are not such findings more likely to deter than attract donors?

For NGOs more generally, the use of social auditing implies a shift from highly circumscribed evaluations of individual projects or programs to a broader assessment of the organization as a whole (Raynard, 1998).

2.4 Empirical Review

This section tries to give an Empirical Review on some of the researches done on the practices of NGO accountability and proclamations/regulations enacted to promote NGOs accountability by some sub-Saharan countries.

1. **"NGO Accountability and Sustainable Development in Nigeria"** by Akintola
   A. OWOLABI, Lagos Business School, Pan-African University, Lagos, Nigeria.

This paper empirically investigates NGO accountability practices in Nigeria with a view to enhancing sustainable development in the country using a Case study method approach to carry out the study. Two NGOs (One indigenous and the other with foreign affiliation) were selected for the study representing respectively development and education thematic areas. The available data on NGO accountability for the selected case studies were elicited from the managers and accountants through interview process. And the information obtained from the interview was corroborated with content review of annual account and reports, and also the websites of the NGOs.

The paper set out to find out the mechanisms of accountability being practiced by the NGOs: reports & disclosure statements, performance assessment and evaluations, participation, self-regulation, and social audits. It also sets out to reveal for whom the accountability is

designed: donors (Upward) or beneficiaries (downward), NGO staff (Internal) or outside stakeholders (external), and whether it has a short term financial (functional) or long term impact (Strategic) objective.

It was observed, as in many other jurisdictions and NGOs that the NGOs studied are accountable essentially to the owners or those stakeholders with economic power over their organizations. And not much of the accountability is focused on the stakeholders upon whom the organizations have impacts. Moreover, accountability is essentially financial but not on the extent of the attainment of the purposes and objectives for which they were set up.

2. **NGO accountability: findings from South Sudan** by Karyn Beattie; November 199

This article focuses on NGO accountability to the people humanitarians aim to assist. The results of the study shows that although NGO accountability has been a popular debate topic over the last two decades in South Sudan, there are still a lack of clarity on how to put it all into practice or implementation because of the following reasons:

➢ It is difficult for NGOs in South Sudan to identify recipients of aid as a primary stakeholder .They are often trumped by other stakeholders like the government and donors.

➢ There is lack of clarity around the concept of accountability among the NGOs staffs and it is particularly elusive word because it's meaning changes dramatically depending on the context. This lack of clarity around the concept resulted in junior staff having a disproportionately negative view of the accountability mechanisms established.

➢ There is a challenge of viewing accountability mechanisms, such as complaints boxes, sharing detailed project plans in community meetings and appointing an accountability officer, as policing mechanisms by the staff.

➢ The field staffs are less familiar with the mechanisms implemented to ensure accountability to other stakeholders. And they usually interpret the imposition of accountability measures as implying a lack of trust by the organization in them.

➢ Time constraints in NGOs in delivering their activities have led to giving less attention to their accountability issues..

- Individual/personal relationships are fundamental in their culture and are given higher weight than organizations relationship and as a result, they usually fail to become accountable to in their day to day.

- To deal with some of their accountability problems, they have developed guidelines with a set of tasks to ensure accountability and have posted them using notice boards in the community. But this has its own setbacks as the majority of the community is illiterate to read and understand them.

This and other reasons have made the achievement of NGOs accountability more difficult in Southern Sudan.

3. **NGO Accountability in Kenya: a dream to big?** By NGOBUZZ.NET; exxima.wordpress.com; on February 20, 2015.

This article starts its discussion by defining what accountability means and conceptualizing NGOs accountability as having three levels: First, NGO accountability to patrons (government & donors); Second, NGO accountability to clients and third, NGO accountability to themselves.

As per the article, it is the first level that is latent with many problems with an area troubled with various deliberate abuses of accountability, financial misdeeds and fraud as well as the mismanagement of resources and funds channeled for personal gain among other issues. Lack of accountability arises from internal governance processes that are either weak, or poor, or governance systems that are out of good form in monitoring fund usage by NGOs for the purposes for which the money was donated for.

The Kenyan government response to the NGOs lack of accountability that had been festering for a long time was to crack the whip. And on the 16th of December 2014, in one fell swoop, it had deregistered a total of 501 NGOs that are found guilty of non-compliance with financial regulations and had frozen their bank accounts & repossessed their assets. The government duly justified its actions by stating that these deregistered 501 NGO's had received Sh7.3 billion in donations between 2010 and 2013 but had not filed audited statement of accounts for the three successive years. This failure to account for money spent by the NGOs themselves is gross lack of accountability to donor money.

In all these respects, the onus is on the national government to tighten the screws of regulation in order to ensure that NGOs comply with their accountability obligations. With this regard, the NGOs Coordination Board, the government regulator for NGOs in Kenya, is currently engaged in an ambitious program to improve the legislative and enabling framework for NGOs, with a view to not only strengthening compliance but enhancing public trust as well.

4. Accountability of non-governmental organizations in Tanzania: a case study of Dar es Salaam by Glynn, Jessica A

The aim of the study was to investigate how the accountability techniques and processes used in Tanzanian Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) differ from the ideal situation, to explore how NGOs in Tanzania are accountable to their stakeholders, and to identify the impact (if any) of the 2002 NGO Act had in Tanzanian NGOs accountability.

The case study was conducted between March and June of 2007 with a total of 14 organizations that are involved with the NGO sector. It showed that same accountability problems, which include mismanagement, greed, unmet goals, and backdoor deals, which the government had faced years before were also seen in the NGOs. This was partially attributed to the increase in the number of briefcase NGOs, which has made the playing ground more difficult to the legitimate NGOs to get funding and focus on their constituencies. Because the legitimate ones were stuck writing time consuming reports and budget statements to prove that they really exist and to satisfy increasing donor demands as opposed to briefcase NGOs.

According to the results of the study, the type of monitoring and evaluation procedures put by donors tends to distort accountability because many of their donors had the tendency to focus on accountancy rather than accountability; and on audit rather than learning. This insistence by the donors demanded that these NGOs measure their progress by donor standards only. Accountability to other NGO constituency was ignored.

Moreover, the results of the study show that Donors, government, and NGOs had an adversarial relationship in many ways; Monitoring and evaluation procedures were not uniformed across the different NGOs; and the NGO Act of 2002 has not had a significant impact on accountability of Tanzanian NGOs and it was found rather limiting the coordination between the organizations of the NGO sector.

5. NGO accountability in Ethiopia

So far no significant study has been made in assessing the NGO accountability practices in Ethiopia. However, due to the opening up of a relatively democratic space in the country as opposed to the previous dictatorial regime and the increase in aid funds from donors to ensure the success of the newly established democratic environment, the rapid rise in the number of NGOs came into existence within a relatively short period of time.

The increase in the number of NGOs accompanied by their low exercise of accountability and their higher involvement in restricted government areas have led to the establishment of a new government regulatory agency and the enactment of various proclamations and regulations that have an ultimate goal of holding NGOs accountable for their actions.

Some of the accountability provisions indicated in the enacted proclamation (Proclamation no. 621/2009: proclamation to provide for registration & regulation of charities & Societies) include the following:

a) Article 4 & 5 of the proclamation declares the establishment of Charities and Societies Agency as a legal institution with an objective of creating a situation in which the operation of charities and Societies is transparent & accountable.

b) Article 19 &23 of the proclamations allows Charity endowments to have a governing board that will direct and administer their work as per their rules with detailed duties and responsibilities.

c) Article 70 of the proclamation forbids appointing persons as officers in NGOs if they are convicted before as a result of involvement in fraud or dishonest acts.

d) Article 77 of the proclamation directs all officers of NGOs to keep accounting records for all transaction and to preserve them for at least 5 years from the end date of the fiscal year

e) Article 78-80; 82 of the proclamation orders all officers of NGOs to submit annual statement of accounts that are audited by external auditors; to prepare & submit annual activity report on the major accomplished activities; and to make available the books of accounts, annual reports & audit reports to anyone who wants to refer them.

f) Article 84 of the proclamation allows to make periodic or any unexpected supervision of NGO's activities by the agency and instructs them to make ready anything needed for the evaluation.

g) Article 88 of the proclamation also declares that any charity or society shall allocate not less than 70% of the expenses in the budget year for the implementation of its purpose and an amount not exceeding 30% to its administrative activities.

In addition to the provisions stipulated above, NGOs through consortiums like the CCRDA have introduced a code of conduct, self-regulatory initiative, which not only reflects its own core values and ensures the observance of its norms, but also leads to effective and efficient co-ordination and collaboration with beneficiaries, the government, the general public and other partners. But these codes of conduct could not be enforced by members of the different consortiums because of the government's insistence to mostly use and follow the provisions articulated in its proclamations and subsequent regulations and because they lack legal power to enforce the codes of conduct among their members.

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

The main objective of the study is assessing the practices of NGOs accountability to their stakeholders: a case of INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia. To this effect, this chapter clarifies the research design and method employed. To get a reliable answer for each question of the research: various sources of data were used; various methods of sampling, tools of data gathering and analysis were also employed.

3.1 Research Design

The researcher used exploratory research design method to conduct the study. Along the way, both quantitative and qualitative data have been used. Relevant data have been collected from employees of organizations under study and have been analyzed for presentation of findings and for conclusion and recommendation inference purposes.

Primary data has been collected using questionnaires filled and interviews answered by selected personnel of the organizations .Sources of secondary data include inputs like organizational policies and procedures, financial and activity reports, staff Human resource files, grant/contract agreements, government proclamations & regulations and articles on the internet which have some link with the issues of accountability. Those data have been analyzed and tabulated in such a way that the outputs can be understood easily by direct and indirect users of this paper.

3.2 Population and Sample Size

3.2.1 Target Population

Target population is defined as the entire group a researcher is interested in. According to Zikmund (2003), the definition of population is identifiable total set of elements of interest being investigated by a researcher. Based on the HR database of the fifteen Health Sector INGOs studied, there were a total of 532 permanent employees in them until April 15, 2016. Hence the target population for this research was 532 permanent employees in 15 Health sector INGOs.

3.2.2 Sample Design and Size

As it was indicated on the scope of the study in chapter one, the organizations under study were those INGOs that are operating in the Health sector in Ethiopia that have their head

offices in Addis Ababa and that have been operational in Ethiopia for at least 7 Years. According to the information obtained from ChSA, there were a total of one hundred twenty two (122) INGOs in Ethiopia which have been operational in the health sector in Ethiopia for more than seven years with their head office located at Addis Ababa. And out of these 122 INGOs, 15 (more than 10%) of them were randomly selected for the study. To make the sample more representative, the selection of INGOs was made by considering the Head quarter offices of the INGOs where most of the funding to Ethiopia comes from i.e. from the USA, Canada and European States as they have different cultures and country specific policies and regulations. Using the permanent employee/ staff size of these INGOs, which is totaling 532, the sample size of the study was determined.

The sample size was determined using the following simplified formula for proportions as it is stated by Yamane (1967) with 95% confidence level and 5% level of precision cited in Israel (1992).

Sample size is calculated as:

n = __N__ = _532_ = 228 employees
1 + N (e) 2   1 + 532(0.05)2

Where, n – designates the sample size for the study.
N - Designates the total number of head office staffs in INGOs selected for the study.
e – Designates maximum variability (level of precision) or margin of error 5% (0.05).

3.3 Sampling Techniques

First, simple random sampling technique has been used to select fifteen INGOs out of the total number of 122 INGOs which are operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia based on the following Criteria.

➢ INGOs which have been operational in Ethiopia for more than 7 years because this helps to explore their accountability practices before and after the enactment of the more stringent proclamation for charities and Societies (Proclamation No.621/2009) and its subsequent directives.

➢ The INGO should have a Health Component in their Program implementation for achieving its established organizational goals.

> ➢ The INGO must be registered again as Charities and Societies with respective to the newly enacted proclamation for registration.

Second, purposive sampling method has been used to select employees/staffs from the already selected sample INGOs using four line structures Top management, Middle management, First line Management and Non managerial positions to have a representative sample so that the result of the study could not biased.

3.5 Data Source and Collection Technique

Both primary and secondary data relevant to the study was collected. Semi structured Interview and questionnaire methods were used as primary data gathering tool. Key staff and senior management team members of selected INGOs were asked through Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires to explore their knowledge and understanding about accountability issues in their organizations.

Proclamations & regulations, NGOs Code of conduct, Organizational policies and Procedures, Audit reports, Human resources files, related articles written by different scholars and the internet were used as secondary data gathering method for my research paper.

3.6 Validity and reliability

3.6.1 Validity

According to R. Kothari, (2004), Validity is the most critical criterion and indicates the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. The validity of the content of the survey questionnaire and the interview questions was validated because they had been designed using a model questionnaire that has been used in previous studies. (Accountability self –Assessment for staffed Private Foundations; Version 1.1 (Nov. 2006), used by Southeastern Council of Foundations). In addition to this, it was also validated by the research advisor and other research professionals. And the results have led to make some minor changes on the instrument, which were made prior to administering the study.

3.6.2 Reliability

This study used Cronbach's alpha, that is used to measure the reliability for a set of two or more constructs where the alpha coefficient values are ranging between 0 and 1 with higher values indicating higher reliability among the variables. A measuring instrument is reliable if it provides consistent results (Kothari, 2004).

Thus, the reliability of the questionnaire has been tested using Cronbach Alpha and the SPSS result, as indicated in table 2, shows that the questionnaire's reliability is 0.931 Cronbach's Alpha indicating an acceptable overall reliability.

Table 1 SPSS Reliability test

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.931	71

3.7 Methods of Analysis

Data was collected and analyzed through the use of qualitative and quantitative analysis methods. The qualitative data analysis focused on grouping similar issues of NGO accountability practices obtained through semi structured interviews and physical observations made across different organizations and the quantitative data analysis focused on the analysis of the responses for each statement of accountability by taking the sum of percentage of Always true & Mostly true responses obtained through the use of descriptive statistics. In both cases, tables with appropriate explanations supporting them are used.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The researcher has first obtained written and oral approval from the organization where the study is made for collecting the research data and he has treated all the information obtained from organization's employees through questionnaire and interview tools and information obtained from secondary sources with great confidentiality by not disclosing the respondent' and organization's identity. He has used codes to represent them.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter focuses on the results of data presentation, analysis and interpretation of the study. The first section of this chapter provides the demographic profiles of the final survey respondents and the second part of the chapter deals with the analysis of the different statements in the questionnaire that are useful to finally answer the basic research questions.

4.1. General Information about Respondents

The background information of the respondents as indicated in Table 2 below deals with the presentation of the general characteristics of the respondents who have filled the questionnaire for the study. It gives general information about the respondents like their gender, age group, educational status, Experience on the job and Job status/position.

As per table number 1 below, out of the total respondents, 68 % of them are male and the rest 32 % of them are females. And the majority of the respondents are in the age group of 30-39 Years (40%) and 40-49 Years (48%) while the remaining respondents i.e. about (3%) are in the age group of 18-29 Years and (9%) are in the age group of above 50 Years. And when we see from the age group, the majority of them are in the age of maturity and this has its own positive effect in getting good results from the study.

Considering their educational status, the majority of them (65%) are Second degree and above holders and the rest 32 % and 3% are first degree & college diploma holders respectively. And when we see their job experience, the majority of the respondents have job experience in the range of 16-20 Years (37%) and 11-15 Years (30%) and while the rest of them have job experiences of more than 20 Years (16%), 6-10 Years (14%) and below 5 Years (3%). And as the majorities of them are second degree holders and have a job experience of more than 10 Years, they have a good understanding of the subject matter studied and this has its own positive contribution in getting good results from the study.

Finally, when we see the job status/position of the respondents, they have relatively proportional percentages with top management (27%), middle management (25%), First level management (26%), and non-managerial status (22%). This was the result of the evenly distribution of the questionnaires to the staffs of the four positions for having the general opinion of all staffs in the INGOs.

Table 2: General information of Respondents

S/N	Characteristics of respondents	Category	Total	
			In number	in Percentage
1	Gender	Male	118	68
		Female	56	32
2	Age Group	18-29 Years	6	3
		30-39 Years	70	40
		40-49 Years	83	48
		Above 50 Years	15	9
3	Educational Status	College Diploma	6	3
		First Degree	55	32
		Second Degree & Above	113	65
4	Experience on the Job	Below 5 Years	5	3
		6-10 Years	25	14
		11-15 Years	52	30
		16-20	64	37
		More than 20 Years	28	16
5	Job Status/Position	Top Management	47	27
		Middle Management	44	25
		First level Management	45	26
		Non Managerial Position	38	22

4.2. Data Analysis Pertaining to the Study

For each statement an Ordinal Scale with four sections (Always true, mostly true, sometimes true and never true) was used. It is noted also that each of the statements had the option of "Do not Know (DK)" in case the respondents don't want to answer a particular question due to lack of knowledge of the subject matter. The responses received for each statement of the questionnaire are systematically presented in tabular forms. For each topic or statement, each of the five responses are calculated as a percentage of the total number of responses made to the statement and the result is interpreted using the summation of the percentages of always true and mostly true responses as a percentage of the total number of responses made for each statement using the following scale:

Table 3: Scale for evaluating accountability practices

91-100%	Achieving Accountability	Celebrate your strong position and follow up your good practices
76-90%	Approaching Accountability	Continue to focus on continuous improvement and learning in this area
50-75%	Requires Exploration	Follow up action is required to improve accountability by looking at statements with sometimes true, never true & DK responses
Less than 50%	Requires Attention	A plan of action should be created to improve the accountability practices in this area

The scale has been adopted from a model previously used for the self-assessment of Organizational accountability. (Accountability self –Assessment for staffed Private Foundations; Version 1.1 (Nov. 2006), used by Southeastern Council of Foundations)

Out of the 228 questionnaires distributed to respondents, 174 (76%) were filled and returned by them. And this response rate is acceptable because 50% is regarded as an acceptable response rate in social science surveys according to citation by Richardson (2005) on Babbie (1973) and Kidder (1981). Therefore, the total of the maximum 'frequency' column cannot exceed 174 and the total of the maximum 'valid percent' column cannot exceed 100%. And the legends on the tables are well defined for easy interpretation.

4.2.1 Extent of existence of current accountability practices and the Mechanisms deployed to ensure accountability

This section analyzes and interprets data obtained from responses made by respondents on the various accountability practices using nine key topic areas, which in turn represent mechanisms deployed by them to ensure accountability in their operations.

Table 4: Accountability practices in relation to governance

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
1	We have clearly defined Criteria & procedures to select & appoint board members and to replace existing ones	Frequency	32	13	8	1	120	174
		Valid Percent	18.4%	7.50%	4.6%	.5%	69.0%	100%
2	We have clearly defined the composition (mix of profession) of the governing board to deal with various aspects of our organization	Frequency	32	8	15	0	119	174
		Valid Percent	18.4%	4.6%	8.62%	0.0%	68.4%	100%
3	We have an independent board of directors or trustees that is responsible for governing our organization's affairs.	Frequency	36	8	9	1	120	174
		Valid Percent	20.7%	4.6%	5.2%	0.6%	69.0%	100%
4	Our board members understand & articulate our mission & strategy and ensure that the goals of each program are consistent with them.	Frequency	42	13	4	0	115	174
		Valid Percent	24.1%	7.5%	2.3%	0.0%	66.1%	100%
5	Our board members review our mission and strategy periodically and revise them as needed.	Frequency	28	18	11	0	117	174
		Valid Percent	16.1%	10.3%	6.3%	0.0%	67.2%	100%
6	We have clearly defined and documented the responsibilities, and expected time commitment & compensation of our board members.	Frequency	33	11	7	1	122	174
		Valid Percent	19.0%	6.3%	4.0%	.6%	70.1%	100%
7	Our board of directors is responsible for the hiring, regular review of performance and termination of the chief executive officer	Frequency	35	9	7	5	118	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	5.2%	4.0%	2.9%	67.8%	100%
8	Our board members have access to organizational records and get professional advice & training whenever they need.	Frequency	18	26	11	1	118	174
		Valid Percent	10.3%	14.9%	6.3%	.6%	67.8%	100%

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
9	Our Board members meet regularly to discuss all relevant issues, keep minutes for all meetings & securely file them.	Frequency	35	17	4	0	118	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	9.8%	2.3%	0.0%	67.8%	100%
10	Our Board approves: a realistic work plan; policies and procedures prepared by the CEO or management of our organization.	Frequency	35	18	4	0	117	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	10.3%	2.3%	0.0%	67.2%	100%
11	Our Board periodically monitors our work progress and regularly follow up the operational and financial reports of our organization	Frequency	34	11	9	4	116	174
		Valid Percent	19.5%	6.3%	5.2%	2.3%	66.7%	100%
12	Our board assures that annual statements of accounts are prepared by our finance section and they are audited by external auditors.	Frequency	44	10	3	0	117	174
		Valid Percent	25.3%	5.7%	1.7%	0.0%	67.2%	100%
13	Our board ensures that our plan of operation; progress & final reports and audited annual accounts are made available to various stakeholders on time.	Frequency	33	16	7	1	117	174
		Valid Percent	19.0%	9.2%	4.0%	0.6%	67.2%	100%
14	Our board has assessed the major risks faced by our organization and has taken appropriate action to reduce these risks	Frequency	22	19	14	1	118	174
		Valid Percent	12.6%	10.9%	8.0%	0.6%	67.8%	100%

As it can be seen from table 4, which shows the accountability practices of the governance structure in the organizations studied, most of the respondents (more than 66% of them) have responded Don't Know to all the fourteen accountability practices requested in relation to the governance (Board of directors) of their organization. Further discussions with key informants has pinpointed that although they know that there is a governance structure at their remote Head quarter office level, they have never interacted with them in their actual day to day operations and hence could not give their genuine opinion about their duties and responsibilities. However, most of them have confirmed that there exists a senior management team that is established with the voluntary decision of their Country directors

that play a supervisory role in the organization although its responsibility is relatively different from the organization's appointed board of directors.

Hence, we can say that governance (using external board of directors) is not usually practiced to ensure accountability in INGOs working in the health sector in Ethiopia although the structure exists at their remote head quarter office level.

Table 5: Accountability practices in relation to Finance and Human Resource operations

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
15	We have an annual budget or work plan and we regularly monitor Program and finance performance in relation to this approved budget.	Frequency	142	29	3	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	81.6%	16.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
16	We have developed and adhered to written financial management policies and procedures in our day to day finance operations	Frequency	135	36	3	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	77.6%	20.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
17	We ensure that our annual spending policy for program and administration costs is in compliance with the government rules/regulations	Frequency	118	51	5	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	67.8%	29.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
18	We take measures to ensure that our administrative expenses are in proportion to amounts spent by organizations of similar size and funding strategies.	Frequency	107	17	25	25	0	174
		Valid Percent	61.5%	9.8%	14.4%	14.4%	0.0%	100%
19	We respect the privacy concerns of individual donors I.e. All the information about their donations is handled with respect and confidentiality	frequency	131	41	2	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	75.3%	23.6%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
20	We conduct an independent audit or financial review periodically using independent auditors	Frequency	148	25	0	1	0	174
		Valid %t	85.1%	14.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	100%
21	We rotate or switch external auditors examining our records every three years	Frequency	152	20	2	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	87.4%	11.5%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
22	We have an audit committee that is separated from our finance committee and the members are not compensated for their service.	Frequency	4	5	8	149	8	174
		Valid Percent	2.3%	2.9%	4.6%	85.6%	4.6%	100%

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
23	Our organization reviews the audit report comments and meets with the auditor before accepting the audit results	Frequency	133	36	4	1	0	174
		Valid Percent	76.4%	20.7%	2.3%	0.6%	0.0%	100%
24	We actively seek a diverse range of candidates when selecting staffs and other vendors for procurement of goods & services.	Frequency	58	38	67	11	0	174
		Valid Percent	33.3%	21.8%	38.5%	6.3%	0.0%	100%
25	We rely on comparable data from similar organizations prior to making determination of compensation package for our staff	Frequency	17	26	103	28	0	174
		Valid Percent	9.8%	14.9%	59.2%	16.1%	0.0%	100%
26	We have written personnel policies and procedures to govern our employees and volunteers.	Frequency	150	20	3	1	0	174
		Valid Percent	86.2%	11.5%	1.7%	0.6%	0.0%	100%
27	Our employees and volunteers receive a copy of the personnel policy and acknowledge the receipt in writing.	Frequency	46	20	66	42	0	174
		Valid Percent	26.4%	11.5%	37.9%	24.1%	0.0%	100%
28	We have job descriptions for all staff and volunteer positions that clearly describe their specific duties and responsibilities	Frequency	143	28	3	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	82.2%	16.1%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
29	We give orientation for new employees and volunteers on their roles and responsibilities.	Frequency	130	41	3	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	74.7%	23.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
30	We keep accurate record of time worked by employees to calculate their pay and benefits as required by federal law.	Frequency	129	35	2	8	0	174
		Valid Percent	74.1%	20.1%	1.1%	4.6%	0.0%	100%
31	We have made available an updated organization chart to all staff & other stakeholders that shows the authority and reporting relationship in the organization	Frequency	35	30	89	20	0	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	17.2%	51.1%	11.5%	0.0%	100%
32	We have a system in place for the regular review and communication of staff performance.	Frequency	51	35	71	17	0	174
		Valid %	29.3%	20.1%	40.8%	9.8%	0.0%	100%
33	We regularly ensure that we have adequate insurance coverage for our property and staffs taking into account the nature and scope of their activity	Frequency	52	37	84	1	0	174
		Valid Percent	30.5%	20.7%	48.2%	0.6%	0.0%	100%

As it can be seen from table 5, which shows the accountability practices in relation to the finance and human resource management, most of the respondents (more than 95%) have responded that there are good finance and human resource operation practices like the use of the budget to monitor the program & financial performance of projects; compliance with government rules and regulations for annual spending limits; conducting external audits as per the requirements of gov't regulations; providing staffs with personnel manuals, written job descriptions and orientation on their roles & responsibilities; and keeping accurate record of time worked for calculating their monthly pay in their organization. But there are also some exceptions that require exploration and attention by the INGOs themselves to make a follow up action plan for improving their accountability. The exceptions and their reasons for existence according to the information obtained from the key informants and a physical observation made by the researcher include the following:

➢ Strong measurable actions are not taken by the studied INGOs to make sure that their administrative costs are in proportion to other organization with similar size and funding strategy because they mostly rely on the project budget that they have agreed with the donors instead of the existing market situation, which may be higher or lower instead.

➢ The INGOs studied do not have an audit committee that is separated from finance committee as this is not the practice in most NGOs operating in the country. But most of the key informants have also responded that they have a separate finance section, not a finance committee, that handles the various financial issues of the organization due to lack of sufficient number of staffs in the office.

➢ Seeking a diverse range of candidates when selecting staffs for recruitment and vendors for the procurement of goods and services is a moderate fact in the INGOs studied because some of them are doing it better while other INGOs depend on recommendation given by their internal or partner organization staffs for their recruitment of staffs and appointment of vendors.

➢ Studied organizations tend to use their own earmarked budgets obtained from donors as a basis for determining staff compensation and Benefit (like insurance for staff) packages instead of looking for comparable data from other similar organizations.

➢ There is a strong tradition of giving copies of the personnel and other policy manuals of the INGOs to new staffs at the beginning of their tenure of employment. But what is lost in most of the INGOs studied is the acknowledgment in writing that staff have received, read and understood them to be abided in compliance with them.

- A very unusual practice physically observed in the offices of most of the INGOs studied is the unavailability of an updated Organogram of all the organization staffs, even in the office of the director, which clearly describes the accountability relationship among staffs in a place that is visible to all interested stakeholders.

- There is a system put in place for a regular review and communication of staff performance in many of the INGOs but it's function is very minimal because they are usually mandatory provisions that are exercised year after year without being attached to rewards or penalties for strong or weak performance and it does not give opportunities for staff development through the provision of various on the job and classroom trainings.

Hence, we generally see the existence of good accountability practices in the areas of finance and Human resources in the INGOs studied other than the exceptions made.

Table 6: Accountability practices in relation to Compliance to rules and regulations

S/N	Statement		Yes	No	DK	Total
34	We have taken steps to ensure that our board members exercise their duty of care, duty of loyalty and duty of obedience at all times	Frequency	70	4	100	174
		Valid Percent	40.2%	2.3%	57.5%	100.0%
35	We have a written conflict of interest policy when we engage in any contract or transaction with other companies.	Frequency	149	25	0	174
		Valid Percent	85.6%	14.4%	0.0%	100.0%
36	We require every staff members to annually complete and submit a conflict of interest disclosure form	Frequency	71	102	1	174
		Valid Percent	40.8%	58.6%	0.6%	100.0%
37	We have a written, mandatory record retention and destruction policy for a period specified by our attorneys or country laws whichever is higher	Frequency	124	50	0	174
		Valid Percent	71.3%	28.7%	0.0%	100.0%
38	We comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws like on the provision of equal employment opportunity; meeting reporting deadlines	Frequency	172	2	0	174
		Valid Percent	98.9%	1.1%	0.0%	100.0%
39	We have developed and followed a "whistle-blower" protection policy to encourage employees to give information on suspected illegal or unethical practices by staff members.	Frequency	95	77	2	174
		Valid Percent	54.6%	44.3%	1.1%	100.0%
40	Our organization do not use organizational facilities, equipment, personnel or other resources for other purposes it is not established for.	Frequency	171	2	1	174
		Valid Percent	98.3%	1.1%	0.6%	100.0%
41	We regularly accomplish tasks that our state may require from nonprofit organizations like periodically renewing our operation license etc	Frequency	172	2	0	174
		Valid Percent	98.9%	1.1%	0.0%	100.0%

As it can be seen from table 6, which shows the accountability practices in relation to compliance to rules and regulations, most of the respondents (more than 85%) have responded that there are good accountability practices in this area in the organizations studied. This is evidenced by their response on the existence of written conflict of interest policy when they engage themselves in any transaction or contract with other companies; their compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws; their compliance in the use

of organizational facilities, equipment and personnel only for the purpose they are established for and through the timely accomplishments of all tasks required by the government oversight agency in relation to licensing and registration. However, 58.6% of the respondents have responded that staff members do not annually complete and submit a conflict of interest disclosure form to make themselves accountability in their future undertakings and 44.3% of the respondents have responded also that there is no practical use of the "whistle-blower protection policy" in place that encourages employees to give information on suspected illegal or unethical practices in their organization. And moreover only 71% of the respondents have said that there is a written mandatory record retention and destruction policy in their organization.

The availability of the existence of the said conflict of interest, whistle blower protection, and record retention policies and their practical usage; and the compliance of INGOs to some gov't rules & regulations is also checked by a physical observation made in some of the organization studied and it has been found out that there are provisions/articles of conflict of interest, record retention and whistle blowing that are included in their HR, finance and procurement manuals; some staff HR files and vendor contracts also show attachments of conflict of interest disclosure forms that are signed by both internal staffs and outside contractors; Progress and annual audited reports have been submitted periodically to the oversight agency and the registration of almost all has been renewed every three years.

Hence, we generally see the existence of good accountability practices and mechanisms in the areas of compliance to rules and regulations in the INGOs studied other than the exceptions made.

Table 7 :Accountability practices in relation to Disclosure/communication Methods

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
42	We have submitted copy of our annual plan; progress reports; audited financial statement; and other needed information to the government oversight agency	Frequency	162	11	1	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	93.1%	6.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
43	We have a basic communications plan to provide comprehensive and timely information to all other stakeholders	Frequency	31	27	77	39	0	174
		Valid Percent	17.8%	15.5%	44.3%	22.4%	0.0%	100%
44	We give our feedback in a timely manner to any reasonable request of information or complaints from our stakeholders.	Frequency	29	37	106	2	0	174
		Valid Percent	16.7%	21.3%	60.9%	1.1%	0.0%	100%
45	We make readily available information about our organizational governance, mission/strategy, code of ethics and its guiding Values using our website directory or brochures	Frequency	100	60	12	2	0	174
		Valid Percent	57.5%	34.5%	6.9%	1.1%	0.0%	100%
46	We share information to our all stakeholders (including the Beneficiary community) about our programs/services and their impacts, our financial information using annual workshops, on our website as appropriate	Frequency	29	32	106	7	0	174
		Valid Percent	16.7%	18.4%	60.9%	4.0%	0.0%	100%
47	We have properly maintained a documented Grievance/Complaint handling procedure for all our stakeholders including internal staffs.	Frequency	15	31	90	38	0	174
		Valid Percent	8.6%	17.8%	51.7%	21.8%	0.0%	100%
48	We state the donor's intent in our annual reports and other appropriate organizational communications	Frequency	112	49	10	3	0	174
		Valid Percent	64.4%	28.2%	5.7%	1.7%	0.0%	100%
49	We invite donors to share lessons learned in Partner meetings, multi-donor meetings, staff meetings/retreats or other learning exchanges	Frequency	71	70	20	12	1	174
		Valid Percent	40.8%	40.2%	11.5%	6.9%	0.6%	100%

As it can be seen from table 7, which shows the accountability practices in relation to Disclosure/communications Methods, almost 99.4% of the respondents have replied that they have submitted copy of their annual plan, progress reports, and audited financial statements and other needed information to the government oversight agency on time as per the requirement specified on the regulation. And More than 92% of the respondents have also responded that they have made readily available information about their organizational governance, mission/strategy, code of ethics and its guiding values using their website directory or brochures and have stated the donor's intent in their annual reports and other appropriate organizational communications. And 81% of the respondents have also said that they have invited donors to share lessons learned in Partner meetings, multi-donor meetings, staff meetings/retreats or other learning exchanges. However, contrary to this, it is only less than 38% of the respondents who have responded that they have a basic communication plan to provide comprehensive and timely information to all other stakeholders including beneficiaries; that they give feedback in a timely manner to any reasonable request of information or complaints from their stakeholders.; that they share information to their stakeholders (including the Beneficiary community) about their programs/services and their impacts and their financial information using annual workshops or on their website whichever is appropriate and that they have properly maintained a documented Grievance/Complaint handling procedure for all their stakeholders including internal staffs. Hence, the responses made by the respondents indicate that there are good disclosure/communication accountability practices towards the patrons including donors and government oversight agencies and very weak accountability practices of disclosure/communication to the other stakeholders including the beneficiary community.

The least communication practice to the beneficiary community is also validated by the responses of key informants interviewed who have indicated that:

➢ There is a problem of giving adequate information like clarifying project goals, outcomes and outputs to target beneficiaries with a simple language they understand.

➢ Transparency to final beneficiaries (right holders) is very weak in some of the organizations studied.

Further look at the tools that the INGOs use has found out that they are using finance reports, progress and annual reports for sharing information with their stakeholders especially to their donors and the government oversight agency.

And finally, we can infer from the discussions made above that disclosure/ communication mechanisms are being used by the INGOs studied.

Table 8: Accountability practices in relation to Evaluation of Performance

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
50	Our evaluations relate to assessing whether our programs and operations are in alignment with our mission to attain the goals and objectives explicit in it	Frequency	71	31	72	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	40.8%	17.8%	41.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
51	We periodically evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of our operations and procedures to meet organization goals.	Frequency	108	59	7	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	62.1%	33.9%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
52	Our evaluations involve different stakeholders (staffs, donors, government, the community and other partners) to incorporate perspectives/comments from all our constituents.	Frequency	61	72	38	1	2	174
		Valid Percent	35.1%	41.4%	21.8%	0.6%	1.1%	100%
53	We have ingrained evaluation into the day-to-day operations of our organization as an ongoing process of organizational learning	Frequency	35	71	58	10	0	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	40.8%	33.3%	5.7%	0.0%	100%
54	We have written procedures for conducting and documenting monitoring field visits and also for disclosing evaluation results.	Frequency	100	56	18	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	57.5%	32.2%	10.3%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
55	We share successes, failures and lessons learned from our evaluations with stakeholders & incorporate them into future programs	Frequency	43	45	86	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	24.7%	25.9%	49.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100%

As it can be seen from table 8, which shows the accountability practices in relation to evaluation of performance methods, almost 96 % of the respondents have responded that they periodically evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations and procedures to

meet organization goals and 76-90% of the respondents said that their evaluations involve different stakeholders including donors, government, the community and other partners to incorporate perspectives from all their constituents and that they have written procedures for conducting and documenting monitoring field visits and disclosing evaluation results. However, only 50-61% of them have said that their evaluations relate to assessing whether their programs and operations are in alignment with their missions; that they have ingrained evaluation into their day-to-day operations as an ongoing process of learning and that they share successes, failures and lessons learned from their evaluations with other stakeholders & incorporate them into future programs.

Hence we can say that the practices of evaluation of performance in the INGOs studied focus on the short term functional evaluations of the efficiency and effectiveness of organizational operations and procedures through the involvement of various stakeholders not on the long term strategic evaluations that focus aligning their programs & operations with their missions; ingraining evaluation on their day to day operation as an ongoing learning process and sharing lessons learnt with stakeholders and incorporating them in future programs.

Further look at the tools that the INGOs use for evaluation of their performance has found out that they are using Logical frame work Analysis, Baseline and end line Survey, and focus group discussions as a tool for evaluating their performance. And we can also infer from the discussions made above that evaluation of performance mechanisms are being used by the INGOs studied.

Table 9: Accountability practices in relation to Mission and Strategy

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
56	We have a written mission statement that provides a clear expression of our reason for existence	Frequency	144	6	24	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	82.8%	3.4%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
57	We review our mission every 3-5 years to ensure that it remains relevant and responsive, taking into consideration the changing internal and external factors.	Frequency	58	31	75	9	1	174
		Valid Percent	33.3%	17.8%	43.1%	5.2%	0.6%	100%

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
58	We have a clear & coherent written strategic plan for the coming 3-10 years to guide our activities with well defined, measurable and achievable goals	Frequency	113	35	12	14	0	174
		Valid Percent	64.9%	20.1%	6.9%	8.0%	0.0%	100%
59	We continuously assess & compare our Strategic practices against others in the field to learn best practice models to revise our strategy within a reasonable time frame	Frequency	27	43	93	11	0	174
		Valid Percent	15.5%	24.7%	53.4%	6.3%	0.0%	100%
60	We consider strategies beyond our own grant making to advance our mission by collaborating with other donors who fund similar work and providing technical assistance to grantees doing similar works	Frequency	38	45	79	12	0	174
		Valid Percent	21.8%	25.9%	45.4%	6.9%	0.0%	100%

As it can be seen from table 9, which shows the accountability practices in relation to organizational Mission and strategy, almost 85 % of the respondents have said that they have a written mission statement that provides a clear expression of their reason for existence and have also a clear & coherent written strategic plan for the coming 3-10 years to guide their activities with well defined, measurable and achievable goals.

But to the contrary, only 51% of them have responded that they review their organizational mission every 3-5 years to ensure that it remains relevant and responsive, taking into account the changing internal and external factors and only 40% of them said that they continuously assess & compare their Strategic practices against others in the field to learn best practice models and revise their strategy within a reasonable time frame. And finally about 48% of them say that they consider strategies beyond their own grant making to advance their mission like by collaborating with other donors who fund similar works and by providing technical assistance to grantees doing similar works.

From this we can understand that although the studied INGOs have established mission and strategies useful for guiding organizational operations, they are not good at making revisions by taking into account the changing internal and external factors, which has its own effect in ensuring accountability with the dynamically changing environment and their strategies focus on grant making than collaboration & partnership. This is in addition to the unsatisfactory alignment of their mission to their programs and operations seen in the evaluation of performance of the INGOs studied. Hence, accountability practices of the INGOs studied in relation to their mission and strategy are minimal in ensuring accountability in their operations.

Table 10: Accountability practices in relation to Participation

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
61	Our management promotes open, inclusive and respectful behavior within its staff team by making decisions in a transparent and inclusive way, welcoming divergent views and encouraging team working	Frequency	59	67	43	5	0	174
		Valid %	33.9%	38.5%	24.7%	2.9%	0%	100.0%
62	We allow our staffs to participate in partner/ network meetings or forums with other NGOs and local authorities to speak openly and share about our activities	Frequency	35	49	85	5	0	174
		Valid %	20.1%	28.2%	48.8%	2.9%	0.0%	100.0%
63	Our organization has a written record of how it identified interest groups of the community that it aims to help & their representatives who are trusted by the community to speak on their behalf	Frequency	55	78	36	5	0	174
		Valid %	31.6%	44.8%	20.7%	2.9%	0%	100.0%
64	We involve community representatives (Group of People trusted and appointed by Beneficiaries) in the planning, implementation and evaluation phases and in decision making processes of project activities concerning them.	Frequency	32	40	89	13	0	174
		Valid %	18.4%	23.0%	51.1%	7.5%	0%	100.0%

As it can be seen from table 10, which shows the accountability practices in relation to participation, almost 76% of the respondents have said that they have a written record of how they have identified interest groups of the community that their organization aims to help & their representatives who are trusted by the community to speak on their behalf and 72% of the respondents have said that their management promotes open, inclusive and respectful behavior within its staff team by making decisions in a transparent and inclusive way, welcoming divergent views and encouraging team working; However only 48 % of the respondents have said that their staffs are allowed to participate in partner/ network meetings or forums with other organizations to speak openly and share about their organizational activities and 41% of them have responded that they involve community representatives (Group of People trusted and appointed by Beneficiaries) in the planning, implementation and evaluation phases and in decision making processes of project activities concerning them.

Thus, from these we can say that the INGOs studied have a good record of how they have identified interest group that their organization is aiming to support, which are good signs of transparency in the INGOs studied. But on the other hand, there is a moderate participation of staffs in the internal decision making process and a very lower participation of staffs in partner/ network meetings or forums with other organizations coupled with a very weak involvement of community representatives in all the stages of the project cycle and in decision making processes that concern them, which are indications of minimal participation of staffs and the external community in organizational decisions that affect them and restriction imposed on staff not to represent their organization in partner's forum due to lack of transparency.

This is in addition to the moderate (50.6%) practice of sharing successes, failures and lessons learned with various stakeholders & incorporating them into their future programs as already seen in the evaluation of performance practices.

Information obtained from key informants through interview also validates the findings indicated above as they have suggested the following comments:

> Absence of mutual /participatory planning without involving relevant sector organizations sometimes leads to implementation impediments hat has significant draw backs in reaching the service to the final end beneficiaries. Many INGOs, together with their HQ offices, usually plan their work independently on the different health programs in the country without first consulting the local government sector

organization. This sometimes leads to the allocation of additional budgets by INGOs for similar places with a very similar activity, which will finally lead to a duplication of efforts and misuse of budget.

➢ Minimal participation of staffs in some INGOs in making organizational decisions using only a top down management approach.

➢ Most INGOs are usually in hurry to start implementation of projects immediately after they get funds from donors and tend to bypass some of the initial stages of the project cycle like planning without engaging beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders. Usually they are engaged after the project start up instead of participating them earlier than this.

➢ Most INGOs do not invite project beneficiaries in the planning, implementation as well as in the periodic program review meetings instead they are simply represented by political leaders and their real voice about what they actually need is not actually heard in the end.

And we can infer from the discussions made above that accountability practices in relation to participation are moderately used in the INGOs studied. It is also observed that the INGOs studied use review meeting as a process of participating partners and relevant government sector organizations. And thus we can say that Participation mechanism is being used by these studied INGOs.

Table 11: Accountability practices in relation to Partnership:

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
65	Our organization has a partnership policy that clearly shows the joint activities & finances; information to be shared among us; and how the quality of the partnership and each other's performance will be jointly monitored.	Frequency	89	51	23	11	0	174
		Valid Percent	51.1%	29.3%	13.2%	6.3%	0%	100%
66	We respect our accountability commitments and codes of conduct while dealing with our partners by incorporating them in our agreements.	Frequency	84	56	25	9	0	174
		Valid Percent	48.3%	32.2%	14.4%	5.2%	0%	100%

As it can be seen from table 11, which shows the accountability practices in relation to partnership, about 80 % of the respondents have responded that their organization has a partnership policy that clearly shows the joint activities & finances; the information to be shared among the partners; and how the quality of the partnership and each other's performance will be jointly monitored. And a similar proportional size (80%) of the respondents has also responded that they respect their accountability commitments and codes of conduct while dealing with their partners by incorporating them in their agreements.

The above raised points are the ABCs of a good partnership agreement between partnering stakeholders that are helpful in ensuring accountability among themselves and it is an indicator of the existence of good partnership that engages all the stakeholders with the INGOs studied if they are practically applied.

But contrary to the responses given by the respondents above, key informants have provided the following responses at the time of interview:

➢ Weak partnership management especially by those INGOs which are not implementers but are grant givers coupled with the limited capacity of local partners has led to the inefficient utilization of project resources.

➢ In most cases the driver to create partnership by INGOs is on need basis whenever they get a sort of mutual funding from donors for which they are going to operate together otherwise they lack the commitment to partner with each other to leverage their efforts.

➢ Although it seems relatively improving these days, there used to be an adversary or rivalry type of relationship between the NGOs in general and the government oversight agency, ChSA, which was mainly created because of the introduction and enforcement of a stringent proclamation by the government that narrows the working ground for NGOs and partially because the agency does not consider INGOs as close development allies/partners but as traits to the country's overall development and does not listen to their concerns.

Hence, there is a minimal use of existing partnership accountability practices in the INGOs studied in that they have good partnership agreements in place but their actual practice is very minimal in ensuring accountability in the organizations studied.

Table 12: Accountability practices in relation to Self-Regulation:

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
67	We have a written statement of values articulating the principles we are committed to uphold and a code of ethics that we agree to follow.	Frequency	147	18	6	2	1	174
		Valid Percent	84.5%	10.3%	3.4%	1.1%	.6%	100%
68	These statements of values and code of ethics are available to the public on the organization's website.	Frequency	136	20	8	9	1	174
		Valid Percent	78.2%	11.5%	4.6%	5.2%	.6%	100%
69	Both staff members & volunteers are well aware of these statements of values & code of ethics through orientations at the beginning of their tenure	Frequency	78	50	38	8	0	174
		Valid Percent	44.8%	28.7%	21.8%	4.6%	.0%	100%
70	Our organization is a member of an independent sector like the CCRDA which promotes self-regulation by NGOs through the use of self-code of conduct & Stated values	Frequency	85	7	9	72	1	174
		Valid Percent	48.9%	4.0%	5.2%	41.4%	.6%	100%
71	Our organization has got an accreditation for its accountability practices from well know international institutions working for improving nonprofit accountability.	Frequency	25	16	15	115	3	174
		Valid Percent	14.4%	9.2%	8.6%	66.1%	1.7%	100%

As it can be seen from table 12, which shows the accountability practices in relation to self-regulation, about 95 % of the respondents have responded that they have a written statement of values articulating the principles that they are committed to uphold and a code of ethics

that they agree to follow; about 90% of the respondents have responded that these statements of values and code of ethics   are available to the public on the organization's website; about 74% of the respondents have responded that both staff members & volunteers are well aware of these statements of values & code of ethics through orientations at the beginning of their tenure; about 53% of the respondents have responded that their organization is a member of an independent sector organization like the CCRDA which promotes self-regulation by NGOs through the use of self-code of conduct & Stated values and only 23.6% of the respondents have responded that they have got an accreditation for their accountability practices from well know international institutions working for improving nonprofit accountability.

However, information obtained from some key informants at the time of interview shows that although some of the INGOs studied are members of an independent sector organization which promotes self-regulation by NGOs themselves through the use of self-code of conduct & Stated values, it does not help them much in enforcing accountability standards because of the following reasons:

➢ The consortia/networks themselves lack the power to enforce the codes of conduct among member organizations as there is no legal ground to hold them accountable.
➢ The consortia/ networks lack the capacity to regulate the internal and external accomplishments of a number of member organizations as they have very limited finance and Human resources.
➢ Many of the Member NGOs lack the commitment in exhibiting the use of established code of conducts in their day to day operation and they use the network only as a forum of exchanging current issues on NGOs general management.

We can infer from the discussions made above that there are efforts made by the studied INGOs that they have instilled the use of self-code of conduct and stated values in their operations and have become members of an independent sector organization to promote self-regulation by INGOs themselves but the practicality of the mechanism is very minimal because of lack of legal ground to hold members accountable, low capacity of the umbrella organization themselves and lack of commitment by member organization to use the establish code of conducts.

4.2.2 Identifying to whom are the studied INGOs are mostly accountable for in their day to day operation

This section analyzes and interprets data obtained from responses made by respondents on the various accountability practices using six key topic areas that indicate to whom the INGOs studied are accountable in their day to day operations. All the practices have been discussed thoroughly in the previous section, what is done here is just grouping them together in terms of their accountability relation to a particular stakeholder to see the accountability of INGOs to each specific stakeholder.

Table 13: Accountability to Donors

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
18	We take measures to ensure that our administrative expenses are in proportion to amounts spent by organizations of similar size and funding strategies.	Frequency	107	17	25	25	0	174
		Valid Percent	61.5 %	9.8 %	14.4 %	14.4 %	0.0 %	100 %
19	We respect the privacy concerns of individual donors I.e. All the information about their donations is handled with respect and confidentiality	Frequency	131	41	2	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	75.3 %	23.6 %	1.1 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100 %
48	We state the donor's intent in our annual reports and other appropriate organizational communications	Frequency	112	49	10	3	0	174
		Valid Percent	64.4 %	28.2 %	5.7 %	1.7 %	0.0 %	100 %
49	We invite donors to share lessons learned in Partner meetings, multi-donor meetings, staff meetings/retreats or other learning exchanges	Frequency	71	70	20	12	1	174
		Valid Percent	40.8 %	40.2 %	11.5 %	6.9 %	0.6 %	100 %
52	Our evaluations involve different stakeholders (staffs, donors, government, the community and other partners) to incorporate perspectives/comments from all our constituents.	Frequency	61	72	38	1	2	174
		Valid Percent	35.1 %	41.4 %	21.8 %	0.6 %	1.1 %	100 %

As it can be seen from table 13, which shows the accountability practices in relation to donors, more than 92 % of the respondents have responded that they have stated the donor's intent in their annual reports and other important communications and have respected the privacy concerns of individual donors that are working with them. And more than 76% of the respondents have also responded that they involve donors in project evaluations together with other stakeholders to incorporate their perspectives/comments and they also invite donors in various events conducted in their organization to share lessons learnt. In addition to this, 71% of them have responded that they take appropriate measures to make sure that their admin costs are in proportion to other similar organizations. All the above involvements of the donors that are triggered by the INGOs themselves added up with the frequent disclosure and reporting requirement by the donors make their accountability to donors a much strong one. Hence we can infer from this that there is a strong accountability relation that exists between the donors and INGOs studied.

Table 14: Accountability to the Government

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
17	We ensure that our annual spending policy for program and administration costs is in compliance with the government rules/regulations	Frequency	118	51	5	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	67.8%	29.3%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
21	We rotate or switch external auditors examining our records every three years.	Frequency	152	20	2	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	87.4%	11.5%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
26	We have written personnel policies and procedures to govern our employees and volunteers.	Frequency	150	20	3	1	0	174
		Valid Percent	86.2%	11.5%	1.7%	0.6%	0.0%	100%
42	We have submitted copy of our annual plan; progress reports; audited financial statement; and other needed information to the government oversight agency	Frequency	162	11	1	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	93.1%	6.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
52	Our evaluations involve different stakeholders (staffs, donors, government, the community and other partners) to incorporate perspectives/comments from all our constituents.	Frequency	61	72	38	1	2	174
		Valid Percent	35.1%	41.4%	21.8%	0.6%	1.1%	100%

As we can see from table 14, which shows the accountability practices in relation to government, more than 97 % of the respondents have responded that they mostly assure their annual spending policy for program and administration costs in compliance with the government rules/regulations; that they rotate external auditors examining their records every three years as per gov't regulations; that they have written personnel policies and procedures to govern their employees and volunteers per the gov't requirement; and they have submitted copy of their annual plan; progress reports; audited financial statement; and other needed information to the government oversight agency as per the specific submission period required. And more than 76% of the respondents have responded also that their project evaluations involve different stakeholders including the government to incorporate perspectives/comments from all their constituents.

All the above good accountability practices are in addition to their: written mandatory record retention and destruction policy requirements for their documents; compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws like meeting reporting deadlines and regular accomplishment of tasks that the state requires from nonprofit organizations like periodically renewing their operational license that are mentioned in the compliance to rules and regulations practices. Hence, we can say that they are strongly accountable to the government.

Table 15: Accountability to Project Beneficiaries

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
31	We have made available an updated organization chart to all staff & other stakeholders that shows the authority and reporting relationship in the organization	Frequency	35	30	89	20	0	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	17.2%	51.1%	11.5 %	0.0%	100%
43	We have a basic communications plan to provide comprehensive and timely information to all other stakeholders	Frequency	31	27	77	39	0	174
		Valid %	17.8%	15.5%	44.3%	22.4%	0.0%	100%
44	We give our feedback in a timely manner to any reasonable request of information or complaints from our stakeholders.	Frequency	29	37	106	2	0	174
		Valid Percent	16.7%	21.3%	60.9%	1.1%	0.0%	100%

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
46	We share information to our all stakeholders (including the Beneficiary community) about our programs/services and their impacts and about our financial information using annual workshops, on our website as appropriate	Frequency	29	32	106	7	0	174
		Valid Percent	16.7%	18.4%	60.9%	4.0%	0.0%	100%
47	We have properly maintained and documented Grievance/Complaint handling procedure for all our stakeholders including internal staffs.	Frequency	15	31	90	38	0	174
		Valid Percent	8.6%	17.8%	51.7%	21.8%	0.0%	100%
52	Our evaluations involve different stakeholders (staffs, donors, government, the community and other partners) to incorporate perspectives/comments from all our constituents.	Frequency	61	72	38	1	2	174
		Valid Percent	35.1%	41.4%	21.8%	0.6%	1.1%	100%
55	We share successes, failures and lessons learned from our evaluations with stakeholders & incorporate them into future programs	Frequency	43	45	86	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	24.7%	25.9%	49.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
63	Our organization has a written record of how it identified interest groups of the community that it aims to help & their representatives who are trusted by the community to speak on their behalf	Frequency	55	78	36	5	0	174
		Valid Percent	31.6%	44.8%	20.7%	2.9%	0.0%	100%
64	We involve community representatives (Group of People trusted and appointed by Beneficiaries) in the planning, implementation and evaluation phases and in decision making processes of project activities concerning them	Frequency	6	18	137	13	0	174
		Valid Percent	3.4%	10.3%	78.7%	7.5%	0.0%	100%

As we can see from table 15, which shows the accountability practices in relation to project beneficiaries, about 76 % of the respondents have replied that their evaluations involve different stakeholders including the community beneficiary to incorporate different perspectives or comments from all their constituents and they have a written record of how

their organization has identified interest groups of the community that it aims to help & their representatives who are trusted by them to speak on their behalf. And only 51% of the respondents have replied that they share successes, failures and lessons learnt from evaluations with their stakeholders including beneficiaries. However, it is less than 38% of the respondents who have replied that they: give timely feedback to a reasonable request of information or complaints from their stakeholders including beneficiaries; share information to their stakeholders (including the Beneficiary community) about their programs and finances using annual workshops or on their website as may be appropriate; have properly maintained and documented grievance/complaint handling procedures for all their stakeholders including their internal staff; involve community representatives in the planning, implementation and evaluation phases and in decision making processes of project activities concerning them; have a basic communications plan to provide comprehensive and timely information to all their stakeholders and have made available an updated organization chart to all staffs & other stakeholders. These are indications of the existence of weak accountability practices towards project beneficiaries in the studied organizations.

And in addition to the minimal beneficiary participation, observed/indicated on participation methods, the existence of weak accountability practices have been confirmed by the response given by interviewed key informants through the following statement:

> There is a problem of giving adequate information like clarifying project goals, outcomes and outputs as well as information about the related earmarked budget for the program to target beneficiaries with a very simple language they can understand in many INGOs. I.e. to say transparency to final beneficiaries (right holders) is very weak in some of the organizations studied.

From all the above discussion, we can say that accountability towards beneficiaries is very minimal on the studied organizations.

Table 16: Accountability to their staffs

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
24	We actively seek a diverse range of candidates when selecting staffs and other vendors for procurement of goods & services.	Frequency	58	38	67	11	0	174
		Valid Percent	33.3%	21.8%	38.5%	6.3%	0.0%	100%
25	We rely on comparable data from similar organizations prior to making determination of compensation package for our staff	Frequency	17	26	103	28	0	174
		Valid Percent	9.8%	14.9%	59.2%	16.1%	0.0%	100%
27	Our employees and volunteers receive a copy of the personnel policy and acknowledge the receipt in writing.	Frequency	46	20	66	42	0	174
		Valid Percent	26.4%	11.5%	37.9%	24.1%	0.0%	100%
29	We give orientation for new employees and volunteers on their roles and responsibilities.	Frequency	130	41	3	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	74.7%	23.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
31	We have made available an updated organization chart to all staff & other stakeholders that shows the authority and reporting relationship in the organization	Frequency	35	30	89	20	0	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	17.2%	51.1%	11.5%	0.0%	100%
32	We have a system in place for the regular review and communication of staff performance.	Frequency	51	35	71	17	0	174
		Valid Percent	29.3%	20.1%	40.8%	9.8%	0.0%	100%
33	We regularly ensure that we have adequate insurance coverage for our property and staffs taking into account the nature and scope of their activity	Frequency	52	37	84	1	0	174
		Valid Percent	30.5%	20.7%	48.2%	0.6%	0.0%	100%
47	We have properly maintained a documented Grievance/Complaint handling procedure for all our stakeholders including staffs.	Frequency	15	31	90	38	0	174
		Valid Percent	8.6%	17.8%	51.7%	21.8%	0.0%	100%
61	Our management promotes open, inclusive and respectful behavior within its staff team by making decisions in a transparent and inclusive way, welcoming divergent views and encouraging team working	Frequency	59	67	43	5	0	174
		Valid Percent	33.9%	38.5%	24.7%	2.9%	0.0%	100%

As we can see from table 16, which shows the accountability practices in relation to organizational staffs, about 98 % of the respondents have replied that they have given orientation for new employees and volunteers on their roles and responsibilities and 72 % of the respondents have replied that their management promotes open, inclusive and respectful behavior within its staff team by making decisions in a transparent and inclusive way. And only 51 to 55% of the respondents have replied that: they have adequate insurance coverage for their property and staffs taking into account the nature and scope of their activity and seek a diverse range of candidates when selecting staffs for recruitment.

However, less than 49% of the respondents (with actually varying percent) have replied that they: rely on comparable data from similar organizations prior to making determination of compensation package for their staff; their employees have received a copy of the personnel policy and have acknowledged the receipt in writing; they have made available an updated organization chart that shows the authority and reporting relationship in the organization to their staffs; that they have a system in place for the regular review and communication of staff performance; and they have properly maintained a documented Complaint handling procedure for all their internal staffs.

Hence, we can say from the above responses that with some exceptions mentioned above, there is a very weak accountability relationship towards organizational staffs.

Table 17: Accountability to their mission and strategy

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
50	Our evaluations relate to assessing whether our programs and operations are in alignment with our mission to attain the goals and objectives explicit in it	Frequency	71	31	72	0	0	174
		Valid %t	40.8%	17.8%	41.4%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
56	We have a written mission statement that provides a clear expression of our reason for existence	Frequency	144	6	24	0	0	174
		Valid Percent	82.8%	3.4%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0	100%

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
57	We review our mission every 3-5 years to ensure that it remains relevant and responsive, taking into consideration the changing internal and external factors.	Frequency	58	31	75	9	1	174
		Valid Percent	33.3 %	17.8 %	43.2 %	5.2%	0.6 %	100%
58	We have a clear & coherent written strategic plan for the coming 3-10 years to guide our activities with well defined, measurable and achievable goals	Frequency	113	35	12	14	0	174
		Valid Percent	64.9 %	20.1 %	6.9%	8.0%	0.0 %	100%
59	We continuously assess & compare our Strategic practices against others in the field to learn best practice models to revise our strategy within a reasonable time frame	Frequency	27	43	93	11	0	174
		Valid Percent	15.5 %	24.7 %	53.4 %	6.3%	0.0 %	100%
60	We consider strategies beyond our own grant making to advance our mission by collaborating with other donors who fund similar work and providing technical assistance to grantees doing similar works	Frequency	38	45	79	12	0	174
		Valid Percent	21.8 %	25.9 %	45.4 %	6.9%	0.0 %	100%

As we can see from table 17, which shows the accountability practices in relation to organizational mission and strategy, about 85 % of the respondents have replied that they have a written mission statement that provides a clear expression of their reason for existence and a clear & coherent written strategic plan for the coming 3-10 years to guide their activities with well defined, measurable and achievable goals.

And about 59% of them have replied that their evaluations relate to assessing whether their programs and operations are in alignment with their mission to attain the goals and objectives explicit in it and 51% of them have replied that they have reviewed their mission every 3-5 years to ensure that it remains relevant and responsive, taking into consideration the changing internal and external factors respectively; And finally, only 48% of them have responded that they consider strategies beyond grant making to advance their mission by collaborating with other donors and providing technical assistance to grantees doing similar works and 40% of them have replied that they continuously assess & compare their Strategic

Practices against others in the field to learn best practice models to revise their strategy within a reasonable time frame.

From this we can say the INGOs studied are good in terms of designing and putting in place relevant mission statements and strategies that are useful in directing their various operations. But there are very minimal practices of using their missions and strategies to make a check and balance of the attainment of their established goals and objectives and very minimal endeavors of revising the existing strategy or introducing a new one by considering the changing internal and external factors and best practice models learnt from other organizations to ensure their accountability towards their mission and strategy.

Table 18: Accountability to peer organizations

S/N	Statement		Always True	Mostly True	Sometimes True	Never True	Don't Know	Total
31	We have made available an updated organization chart to all staff & other stakeholders that shows the authority and reporting relationship in the organization	Frequency	35	30	89	20	0	174
		Valid Percent	20.1%	17.2%	51.1%	11.5%	0.0%	100%
43	We have a basic communications plan to provide comprehensive and timely information to all other stakeholders	Frequency	31	27	77	39	0	174
		Valid Percent	17.8%	15.5%	44.3%	22.4%	0.0%	100%
44	We give our feedback in a timely manner to any reasonable request of information or complaints from our stakeholders.	Frequency	29	37	106	2	0	174
		Valid Percent	16.7%	21.3%	60.9%	1.1%	0.0%	100%
46	We share information to our all stakeholders (including the Beneficiary community) about our programs/services and their impacts, our financial information using annual workshops, on our website as appropriate	Frequency	29	32	106	7	0	174
		Valid Percent	16.7%	18.4%	60.9%	4.0%	0.0%	100%

As we can see from table 18, which shows the accountability practices in relation to peer organizations, less than 38 % of the respondents have replied that: they have made available

an updated organization chart that shows the authority and reporting relationship in their organization ; they have a basic communications plan to provide comprehensive and timely information ; they share information about their programs/services and their impacts and their financial information using annual workshops, on their website as appropriate to all their stakeholders, including peer organizations and they give their feedback in a timely manner to any reasonable request of information or complaints from their stakeholders including peer organizations. And this is in addition to the lack of commitment to partner with other organizations for leveraging their efforts and the week partnership management practices of the studied INGOs raised in the partnership accountabilities practices mentioned before. Thus we can say from the above discussions that the INGOs studied have very week accountability towards their peer organizations.

Moreover, in addition to the results of the quantitative data analysis and interpretation presented above, the key informants interviewed have also replied on the extent of the existing accountability practices to their different stakeholders including donors, government, staff members, peer organizations and project beneficiaries. Their responses are classified into two major areas, which are presented as follows.

- ➢ The majority of key informants have said that INGOs operating in the health Sector in Ethiopia are more accountable to their donors, the hosting government and are relatively less accountable for their staff members, peer organizations and program beneficiaries because of the following reasons.

1. The existing procedures and practices in the country focus on accountability to government and donors. For example, there is no policy framework for INGOs to work on improving their accountability practices to project beneficiaries

2. The international donors have power on the INGOs as they provide their finances and the local hosting government have also power on the INGOs as they give their license to operate in the country But the other stakeholders have less power on the INGOs because they are recipients of their services and they are thus more accountable to those having more power.

3. The accountability of INGOs to donors and government is based on legally binding agreements and noncompliance means suicidal for the INGOs because it directly impacts their survival. On the other hand accountability to other entities is based on norms that promote moral accountability which are not articulated using legally binding agreements that serve as a stick to enforce accountability.

4. Most INGO leaders are much worried on the sustainability of the program than on their real purpose of existence and they work to please their donors and the hosting government not to satisfy the community they claim to serve. I.e. they are not taking beneficiaries very seriously and are not very much committed to address accountability towards them.

➤ Some of the key informants also said that INGOs like their organizations are more accountable to the donors than other stakeholders because of the following reasons.

1. Donors require submitting periodic reports more frequently and have the upper hand to terminate the agreement if the INGOs are not complying with their agreement terms as compared to other stakeholders. For example, when we see the existing government structure, although there is a system put in place to control the activities of each INGO, it is not as such strong enough in implementing it.

2. Most donors have ingrained details of accountability practices in the terms and conditions of their contract agreements with INGOs while providing them funds to their operations, which they have to adhere to it. However, accountability to the other stakeholders can be restricted as implementation obstacles/constraints limit them.

3. The primary driver of accountability of most INGOs in the country is the direct incentive of getting continuous funding from donors whenever they accomplish the project assignments given to them very well. Accountability to government, staff members, peer organizations, and project beneficiaries is secondary and very complex to them as it requires huge efforts of monitoring and evaluation (with associated costs) to ensure the organization is meeting its commitments.

Generally, from all the above quantitative and qualitative data analysis and interpretations made with regards to the accountability of the studied INGOs to their different stakeholders, we can say that there is a relatively stronger accountability tendency of the INGOs studied towards their donors and the government but very minimal accountability tendency towards their staffs, mission & strategy, their beneficiaries and peer organizations.

4.2.3 Identifying the challenges faced by the studied INGOs with regard to improving their accountability practices in their day to day operation

As per interview session held in the studied INGOs, this section describes and summarizes the points raised by the key informants on the challenges they face while they are working to improve their accountability practices in their day to day operations. It   categories them into Six broad sections based on where they arise from.

1. **Challenges from the INGOs themselves**
➢ Resource limitation due to the current economic crisis in the whole world and fierce competition amongst INGOs to get a working fund makes most INGOs to be closed (not transparent) to their partners or peer organizations.(NGO 2, Operation director)
➢ Lack of clear policy and guideline on discharging accountability and lack of commitment or willingness by organizational leadership to maintain and enforce accountability practices. (INGO 2, Finance officer)
➢ Absence of strong internal control systems and procedures in some INGOs has created an open loop for misuse of organizational resources which in turn challenges the accountability framework of the organization.(INGO5 Accountant)
➢ Misplaced priority on accountability i.e. some INGOs are more interested on finding additional funding opportunities than dealing with other issues like transparency and accountability.(INGO 9 Program manager)
➢ Lack of Knowledge or awareness of staff on the overall aim and use of accountability practices and lack of resources by INGOs to bring accountability in their day to day work.(INGO 4, Project coordinator)
➢ Lack of clear accountability structures with written policies and procedures on the issues of accountability and absence of assigned responsible person to monitor and ensure that. (INGO 11, HR officer)
➢ As in the rest of the world, INGOs in Ethiopia are also working with a large number of stakeholders starting from donors up to grass root beneficiaries for which they are accountable for. Dealing with a number of daily routine project activities and handling all the accountability requirement of all the stakeholders at the same time has an effect of stretching out most of their staffs and finance which ultimately leads to negligence on bigger issues like accountability.(INGOs 7, operation Head)

2. **Challenges from the government side:**

➢ Absence of participation of various stakeholders in designing and enforcing new policies and regulations by the government has resulted in a very restrictive and abusive working environment which has negatively affected INGOs capacity in discharging their accountability practices in particular and their development efforts in general. (INGOs 8, Grant manager)

➢ Absence of effective regulations by the government to enforce accountability. For example the new proclamation enacted by the government on the regulation of administrative and operational costs (70:30 guideline) for all forms of NGOs uses wrong cost categorization for program and admin cost and this has created a challenge for many INGOs to meet their accountability demands. (INGOs 14, Finance & operation Head)

➢ Low Capacity and commitment of the government oversight agency in enforcing the policies that the government has put in paper so as to periodically monitor and check the INGOs in ensuring their accountability and responsibility. For example sometimes different INGOs work on similar types of projects at same geographical areas and this will open the door for inefficient utilization of resources or misuse of resources which is against the general accountability framework. .(INGOs 10, Program manager)

➢ Projects are usually started up lately, usually six or more months late, because of the delay created by the bureaucratic, long time taking process of getting the necessary cooperation from relevant government line offices for signing operational and project agreements, giving a very limited time to engage relevant stakeholders from the beginning. (INGO 3, Finance and compliance officer)

➢ Mostly mid-term evaluation that should be undertaken through the involvement of government line office experts are not conducted on time and this has created challenges in the timely review of our performance for taking corrective actions on time. (INGO 7, M&E officer)

➢ Knowledge limitation or lack of conceptual understanding of the concept of accountability by the government oversight agency staffs has seriously affected INGOs commitment towards to accountability. (INGO 15, Accounting officer)

3. **Challenges from the donors' side:**

➢ Significant donor influence with very tight controls and inflexible schedule for submitting periodic reports has stretched out their staffs and has somehow challenged

most INGOs from performing other activities like that of accountability issues because of limited staff and resources they have. (INGO 4, SBCC advisor)

➢ Programs/projects are originally designed by donors and there is usually little or no room for flexibility to make necessary adjustments based on feedback received from various stakeholders existing in the actual areas of project implementation. (INGO 6, Director of operations)

➢ Lack of strong commitment by back donors to continue funding programs as per the contractual agreement entered whenever some sort of problem in performance is observed in an INGO during performance evaluation is somehow negatively affecting their operations and it has its own effect on the enforcement of accountability practices. (INGO 11, M&E advisor)

4. Challenges from the Beneficiary side:

➢ Beneficiaries consider themselves as recipients of donation and do not see themselves as right holders, which they do not claim it, and hence they are not usually willing to comment on the support they receive and on the work of the implementing INGOs. That is very challenging in INGOs part to ensure accountability in their performance at the grass root level. (INGO 12, Advocacy officer)

➢ Project beneficiaries at the grass roots level are not empowered enough to hold the implementing agency accountable for not meeting what it has put on paper. (INGO 1, Grant officer)

➢ Lack of knowledge and skills by the recipient or final end user beneficiaries on how to benefit from project activities and demand or claim for what a project is supposed to deliver. (INGO 13, M&E officer)

5. Challenges from implementing Partners:

➢ Sluggishness in accomplishing project activities by implementing partners due to low capacity is also creating a gap in ensuring accountability in the use of resources. (INGO 1, M&E officer)

➢ Lack of strong commitment on the partnership they have entered with INGOs to enforce accountability practices. (INGO 8, M&E officer)

6. General overall Challenges:

➢ INGOs do not get timely feedback from all their stakeholders. For instance, INGOs usually share their report to stakeholders like donors & sector government offices but in the actual practice, the stakeholders do not review their repots and give their feedback on time but rather they put it in their shelves and hence this is one discouraging factor on improving their project implementation at various stages of the project. .(INGOs 7, communication advisor)

➢ Due to the existing global economic crisis, there is uncertainty by the INGO community in getting funding from donors to sustain project activities. This has somehow created a high dependency syndrome towards donors which in turn has its own effect on their organizational performance.(INGOs 2, Operation Head)

➢ Projects implemented by INGOs by their very nature have a limited span of life that is usually less than or equal to five years and this has led many NGOs to focus on activities with short term effects than those with long term impacts. This has led to the high prevalence of short term functional accountability instead of long term strategic accountability in many INGOs operating in Ethiopia (INGO 15 Senior Program Officer)

4.2.4 Identifying accountability problems observed in the studied INGOs in their day to day operation

As per the interview sessions conducted in the studied INGOs, this section describes and summarizes the points raised by the key informants on the accountability problems they encounter in their day to day operations. It is classified based on the nature of the problem and is presented as follows:

1. Participation problems:

➢ Most INGOs are usually in hurry to start implementation of projects immediately after they get funds from donors and tend to bypass some of the initial stages of the project cycle like planning without engaging all relevant stakeholders. This absence of mutual /participatory planning without involving relevant sector organizations sometimes leads to implementation impediments hat has significant draw backs in reaching the service to the final end beneficiaries. For example, many INGOs, together with their HQ offices, usually plan their work independently on the different aspects of the health programs in

the country without first consulting the local government sector organization. This sometimes leads to the allocation of additional budgets by INGOs for similar places with a very similar activity, which will finally lead to a duplication of efforts and misuse of budget.(INGO 7, Senior Program officer)

➢ There is usually a minimal participation of staffs in INGOs in making organizational decisions. It usually rests to be the sole responsibility of the director or his/her designate in the organization using only a top down management approach. This is one accountability problem that is mostly observed in many INGOs. (INGO 2, HR Director)

➢ In Most INGOs, the project beneficiaries are usually represented by political leaders and their real voice about what they actually need is not heard in the end. This is usually because most of the INGOs health project interventions are geared towards supporting the health system rather than directly helping the project beneficiaries' and as a result accountability problems in relation to beneficiaries will arise. (INGO 6, Program officer)

2. Partnership problems:

➢ Weak partnership management especially by those INGOs which are not implementers but are grant givers coupled with the limited capacity of local partners has led to the inefficient utilization of project resources. (INGO 5, Operations Manager)

➢ In most cases the driver to create partnership by INGOs is on need basis whenever they get a sort of mutual funding from donors for which they are going to operate together otherwise they lack the commitment to partner with each other to leverage their efforts. (INGO 11,communication officer)

3. Staff Role Problems:

➢ Many INGOs have Head offices, Regional Coordination offices and Country level offices with their own respective staffs and sometimes there is a role and responsibility confusion amongst each other that creates a loop in discharging their accountability issues. (INGO 15, HR Officer)

➢ In some INGOs especially those that are small in size , there is a confusion sometimes to know who the actual responsible person is to ensure accountability on the different projects that the organization undertakes as there is no assigned person to work on that specific role. And this has its own effect on pursuing accountability practices in the organization. (INGO 9, Livelihood officer)

4. Lack of capacity, strong commitment and motivation by INGOs and their staffs on issues of accountability:

➤ Most of the international NGOs have the tools and the procedures that make them accountable to the stakeholders that are working with them but they lack strong commitment in properly following the procedures they have and also using the tools they have developed.(INGO 12, Deputy Chief of Party)

➤ In some INGOs, accountability related procedures are fulfilled if they are only required by the government law or if it is an activity that has to be accomplished or otherwise will have some negative repercussions if it not fulfilled. So they lack the accountability commitment in their day to day works. (INGO 6, Finance & admin officer)

➤ Knowledge gap in understanding the concepts of accountability by staffs and minimal or limited staff motivation towards accountability due to lack of staff professional development opportunities; inequality in staff compensation payments that does not consider other similar partner organizations payment structures in many INGOs operating in Ethiopia has created a loop in achieving operational objectives with a good sense of accountability. (INGO 8, Senior Program Assistant)

5. Lack of proper communication or transparency:

➤ Some INGOs have a Problem of giving adequate information like clarifying project goals, outcomes and outputs to target beneficiaries with a simple language they understand. I.e. Transparency to final beneficiaries (right holders) is very weak in some of the organizations and it affects their problems. (INGO 13, Program Manager)

4.2.5 Identifying the main goals of accountability in the INGOs operating in the Health Sector in Ethiopia

As per interview sessions conducted in the studied INGOs to know whether they try to become accountable in every aspect of their work or not and what their main goal of accountability is, this section describes the main goals of accountability given by the key informants of the studied INGOs. Almost all of the key informants have declared that their organization always tries to become accountable in every aspect of its operations and have stated the main goals of accountabilities in their organization using the following statements:

➤ Building organizational thrust & transparency with all the different stakeholders at all levels and avoiding duplication of resources. (INGO 1, Operations Manager)

- Value for money for the projects that they implement and compliance to local as well as international rules and regulations. (INGO 3, Finance Head)

- Reach and serve the poorest segment of the society by demonstrating effectiveness in their interventions through low cost operations.(INGO5, Chief of Party)

- Enhance the delivery of products & services in an efficient and effective way and create reputation and credibility for their organization with all its stakeholders. (INGO 12 Deputy chief of party)

- Share information with Beneficiaries regarding program performance and solicit feedback from them to improve the quality of their programs. (INGO 12, M&IE advisor)

- Ensure active engagement of all the stakeholders in all program management cycle from need assessment to planning and from implementation to evaluation of programs and ensure transparency in fund utilization, resource mobilization and share successes and challenges. (INGO 4 Finance & Admin officer)

- Protect and build our organizational image through the use of well-established accountability frameworks and become a center of attention by donors to get funding for their projects. (INGO 8, INGO 14, M&IE officers)

- Respect and foster strong partnership among stakeholders to create synergy in operations and benefit from the leverage. (INGO 9, Grant officer)

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of data analysis and interpretation in the previous chapter, the following summary of major findings, conclusions and recommendations are given.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The major findings of the study are:

a) Most of the INGOs studied have a strong use of accountability practices in the area of finance & operations; compliance to rules and regulations; disclosure/communication and evaluation of performance; moderate use of accountability practices in the areas of participation; very minimal use of accountability practice in relation to mission & strategy, partnership and self-regulation and almost no use of the accountability practices in relation to governance.

b) Out of the most commonly used accountability tools and processes; there is a strong use of financial reports, annual and progress reports, audit reports, logical framework analysis, focus group discussions and survey as tools and process in most INGOs studied.

c) The study also shows that there are ingrained policies like the conflict of interest policy; personnel and finance management policies and procedures; document retention and destruction policy, and whistle blower protection policies in the INGOs studied that promote accountability to Donors and Government oversight agency . But there is generally lack of basic communication plan, information sharing, beneficiary involvement, feedback mechanisms, and grievance/complaint handling procedures that could have an inhibiting factor on accountability of INGOs studied to their other stakeholders.

d) There is lack of strong knowledge and commitment among the staffs of the INGOs studied and the government oversight agency to ensure accountability among their respective stakeholders.

e) The regulation enacted by the government to improve accountability of NGOs lacks clarity and is ineffective in terms of enforcing accountability practices.in the day to

day operations of NGOs in general. It's becoming a stumbling block in all the NGOs efforts to work in the country for bringing development.

f) Absence of Participation of various stakeholders while designing new policies and regulations in relation to NGOs by the government has resulted in a very restrictive working environment which has negatively affected INGOs capacity in discharging their accountability practices in particular and their development efforts in general

g) Significant donor and government influence with very tight controls and inflexible schedule for submitting periodic reports coupled with the limited human and finance resource they have has stretched out the staffs of the INGOs studied and has challenged them from performing other activities like that of ensuring accountability.

h) There is Lack of empowered or skillful beneficiary community at the grass root level that is capable of holding the implementing INGOs accountable for not meeting what they have put on paper by demanding what a project is supposed to deliver in the INGOs studied.

i) There is lack of capacity and strong commitment by partners engaged through partnership with INGOs studied that lead to the sluggish accomplishment of project activities to the final end beneficiaries.

j) There is lack of getting timely feedback by the INGOs studied from their stakeholders, especially from the government and their donors for the future improvement of the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations.

k) There is a minimal participation of different stakeholders including beneficiaries at the different cycles of the project especially at the planning stage by the INGOs studied because of the rashness to start implementing projects immediately after they get funds from donors.

l) There is a mostly observed minimal participation of staffs of the studied INGOs in making organizational decisions. It usually rests to be the sole responsibility of the director or his/her designate in the organization. This inhibits staff participation as a means of ensuring accountability in organizations.

m) In Most INGOs studied, project beneficiaries are usually represented by political leaders and their real voice about what they actually need is not heard in the end. This is because most of the INGOs health project interventions are geared towards supporting the health system rather than directly helping the project beneficiaries' and as a result accountability problems in relation to beneficiaries have arisen.

n) Many of the INGOs studied have Head offices, Regional Coordination offices and Country level offices with their own respective staffs and sometimes there is a role and responsibility confusion amongst each other that creates a loop in discharging their accountability responsibilities.

o) There is a very loose partnership relationship among INGOs studied, the government oversight agency and other partners for different reasons like the enactment of stringent regulations by the government without considering the current practices of accounting and accountability and due to the competition created among the NGOs themselves for financial resources that will prolong their existence.

p) The INGOs studied have started a self-regulation initiative that presents a complementary path allowing themselves to address directly their own sector wide problems while retaining some integrity through the use of established code of conducts. But the enforcement is minimal because of lack of legal ground to hold members accountable, low capacity of the umbrella organization itself and lack of commitment by member organization to use the established code of conducts.

q) Building organizational trust and image; value for money in all their operations by improving the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations; active participation of various stakeholders and strong partnership among partners are the main goals of accountability in the INGOs studied.

5.2 Conclusions

The following conclusions are made based on the summary of findings:

a) The existence of relatively stronger and viable accountability practices in the areas of; disclosure/communication; compliance to rules and regulation; and evaluation of performance and very low accountability practices in the areas of mission & strategy; participation, and self-regulation indicate that there is a higher tendency to upward accountability to their external donors and government oversight agency but a lower tendency to downward accountability to beneficiaries and internal accountability to their staffs, mission and strategy in the INGOs studied.

b) Lack of knowledge, commitment and motivation by staffs of the government oversight agency; lack of clear and strong policy and guideline to enforce accountability; absence of participation of different stakeholders by the government in policy making in relation to NGOs; Significant donor influence with very tight

controls and inflexible schedule for submitting periodic reports challenge INGOs from discharging their responsibilities in relation to accountability.

c) Lack of empowerment and participation of the project beneficiaries, week partnership management practices; staff role conflict problems; lack of capacity, strong commitment and motivation of staffs of the INGOs studied are the main problems of accountability.

d) There exist a self-regulation mechanism that is initiated in the INGOs studied through becoming members of various consortia but its importance to bring accountability is very minimal due to the lack of enforcement tools and lack of capacity of the consortia themselves to make it practical.

e) The regulation introduced by the government to bring accountability to INGOs through the minimization of administration cost has a problem of classification and it is hindering the operation of many NGOs and also spoiling the relation between NGOs and the government oversight agency with a burgeoning effect of diminishing the foreign investment by external donors.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the analysis and interpretation of gathered data and the summary of findings the following recommendations are made:

From INGO side

a) The INGOs studied should set up a strategy that will help them to involve all the stakeholders by prioritizing their accountability responsibility with the resources they have. This can be done by participating all relevant stakeholders in all the stages of the project cycle; by inviting them in project review meetings and putting in place complaint handling procedures in their systems.

b) The studied INGOs should arrange awareness creation training programs among all their staffs including the leadership about their accountability requirements to increase their commitment and motivation for archiving organizational goals and objectives.

c) A platform, like quarterly review meetings, should be created in organization where there is minimal emphasis on accountability to staff members to listen to their voices and to make participatory decisions that are helpful in creating ownership of organizational programs and to develop accountability to their staffs in the end.

d) Complaint and Feedback mechanisms, with very clear procedures, should be put in place in INGOs where there is very low involvement of project beneficiaries due to lack of sufficient knowledge and true representation to demand or claim for what a project is supposed to deliver for them.

e) Organizational restructuring process that clearly identifies clear roles and responsibilities for all staffs at all levels should be initiated by those INGOs who have staff role confusions to avoid accountability problems in their staffs that have happened due to overlapping duties amongst themselves.

f) Although all employees of the organizations are responsible to be accountable in all their aspects of work, it is good to assign someone or may be to have a separate section in large sized INGOs that is responsible to serve as a watchdog to oversee and ensure the issues of accountability in the INGOs studied.

g) In those INGOs that have partnership problems with their partner organizations, conducting an initial capacity assessment of partners before entering into partnership agreement; putting in place strong and clear sub agreements that will enable them to enforce the timely submission of project deliverables; and arranging regular partnership review meetings with agreed strategic agendas will strengthen the existing loose partnership between themselves and trigger the deliverance of their accountability responsibilities effectively.

h) Self-regulation mechanisms introduced by various NGOs in Ethiopia through their consortia should include compliance assessment or certification mechanisms to enforce the codes of conduct among member organizations. One suggested way to have a sort of an independent organization to oversee the self-regulatory schemes of NGOs that makes an assessment and gives a quality mark based on specific criteria related to accountability.

i) INGOs should also advocate their work through the use of local radios or by making documentaries films of exemplary success stories through the involvement of project beneficiaries in the making of those documentaries. This will help them to create awareness among the community and other stakeholders about the real responsibilities being played by them thereby finally easing the pressure created on them due to various misconception said about them without supportive evidence.

From the Government Side

a) There has to be a policy framework that is put in place by the government for the establishment of the governance structure for INGOs locally in Ethiopia through the use of professionals who know the local country context very well to fill the void created by the minimal involvement of their very remote board of directors.

b) The government needs to strongly act in making use of all its existing control mechanisms that it has enacted to NGOs in general by enhancing its human resource capacity and strengthening it system to help them to be accountable in every aspect of their work.

c) The government through its relevant sector organization has to play its coordination role among all INGOs operating in the health sector in the country to jointly pull and systematically use the resource for the Overall country's development.

d) The government has also to play a facilitator role by initiating series of communication forums with all the NGOs to create national dialogue for reaching into consensus on dealing with common agendas that will help to harmonize the use of resources in an efficient and effective manner to support the countries overall development.

e) There should be a policy framework set by the government with clear procedures for INGOs to work on improving their accountability practices towards project beneficiaries as they are the final end users of their interventions.

f) The government should conduct a mini research study to see how the stringent proclamation it has enacted is affecting the INGOs work and has to revise the existing guideline in terms of its package because it listed down apparent program costs into the 30% Administration cost category that has forced many INGOs to search for other coping mechanisms that are against the rules of accountability.

g) The government oversight agency should change its view to hold a more accommodative stance towards INGOs and has to create a good partnership relation with them to work together by identifying the major health priorities of the country. This will in turn create a working ground that will have a great potential to attract numerous INGOs to the country.

h) A kind of an independent advisory board composed of various professionals, interest groups, community leaders, right activists and other important community figures

could be established to advise the government on different pertinent issues related to NGOs if the partnership fails to materialize between them.

From the donor's Side

a) Donors have to do their part to improve INGOs accountability (Both upward and downward) by building NGOs capacity to conduct self-evaluation and by taking failures by NGOs as a means of learning for them rather than as a way of punishment.

b) Donors should automatically provide feedback to INGOs working in the field as a source of idea for improving the effectiveness of their future performance.

c) Donors have to use a more flexible reporting mechanism that will allow them to have a feedback from project beneficiaries on a range of possibly unforeseen issues in the areas of operations that affect the performance of projects.

d) Donors must require the INGOs to exercise a broader accountability towards project beneficiaries and other stakeholders when they give grants to them.

Joint efforts from the INGOs, Donors and the Government oversight Agency

a) The legally binding agreements that INGOs enter with Government & donors must include articles that are useful for enforcing accountability to other relevant stakeholders especially to the beneficiaries.

b) Proper human resource management system should be in place and necessary awareness creation trainings should be conducted in the studied INGOs and also in the government oversight agency where there are staffs that has a capacity problem coupled with very minimal motivation and commitment towards accountability.

c) Real reporting time frame should be negotiated with donors and the responsible government office at the time of signing agreements, if it is believed to be unrealistic to avoid work pressures that comes as a result of inflexible schedule of reporting with specific deadlines from donors and the respective government sector organizations.

REFERENCES

Accountability of non-governmental organizations in Tanzania: a case study of Dar es Salaam by Glynn, Jessica A

Arnstein, S.R. (1969). A ladder of Citzen Participation. American Institute of Planning Journal, 35(4), 216-224

"A Strategic Model for INGO Accountability Systems" by Sarah Elizabeth Wardwell.

Babbie, E.R. 1973. Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Behn, R.D.(2001). Rethinking democratic accountability. Washing, DC: Brookings Institution Press

Bendell, J. (2006). *Debating NGO accountability*; Development Dossier; UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service. New York and Geneva.

Benjamin, L.M. (2008) "Account space: How accountability requirements shape nonprofit Practice", Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 37(2), 201-23

Bogart, W.T. (1995), 'Accountability and nonprofit organizations: An economic perspective', Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 6: 157-170

Boli, J. and Thomas, G.M. (1999). Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations since 1875. Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press.

Brown, L. D., M. H. Moore and J. Honan (2004) "Building Strategic Accountability Systems for International NGOs", *Accountability Forum* (2 (Summer)), 31-43.

Brown D. and Jagadananda, "Civil Society Legitimacy and Accountability: Issues and Challenges", The Hauser Center for Non-profit Organizations, Harvard University and CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation and Center for Youth and Social Development (CYSD), 2007.

Chait, R. P., W. P. Ryan and B. E. Taylor (2005) *Governance as Leadership: Reframing the Work of Nonprofit Boards*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons

Chisolm, L. B. (1995) "Accountability of Nonprofit Organizations and those Who Control them: The Legal Framework", *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 6(2), 141-56

Clark, John, Democratizing Development: The Role of Voluntary Organizations (West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press, 1991).

Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. Academy of Management Review, 20(1), 92–117

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.

Ebrahim, A. (2009) "Placing the Normative Logics of accountability in 'thick' Perspective",American Behavioral Scientist 52(6), 885-904.

Ebrahim, Alnoor, "Accountability in Practice: Mechanisms for NGOs," in world development, vol.31, no.5, 2003. P.813-829

Ebrahim, A. and E. Weisband (eds) (2007) Global Accountabilities: Participation, Pluralism, and Public Ethics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (1995). Non-governmental organizations: performance and Accountability. Earthscan Publications Ltd., London UK.

Edwards, M., and Hulme, D., (1996a), "Beyond the Magic Bullet? Lessons and Conclusions", In Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (Eds.), Beyond the Magic Bullet. NGO Performance and Accountability in the Post-Cold War World, Connecticut, Kumarian Press.

Edwards, M., and Hulme, D., (1996b), "Introduction. NGO Performance and Accountability", In Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (Eds.), Beyond the Magic Bullet. NGO Performance and Accountability in the Post-Cold War World, Connecticut, Kumarian Press.

Fisher, Julie, the Road from Rio: Sustainable Development and the Nongovernmental Movement in the Third World (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993).

Florini, A. (2000). The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society. Tokyo and Washington: Japan Center for International Exchange and Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Fowler, A. (1996). Assessing NGO performance: difficulties, dilemmas, and a way ahead. In M. Edwards, & D. Hulme (Eds.), Beyond the Magic Bullet: NGO performance and accountability in the Post-Cold War World (pp. 169–186). West Hartford, CT: Kumarian.

Fry, R. E. (1995). Accountability in organizational life: problem or opportunity for nonprofits? Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 6(2), 181–195.

Fox, J. A., & Brown, L. D. (Eds.). (1998). The struggle for accountability: The World Bank, NGOs, and Grassroots movements. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Gardner, K. and D. Lewis (1996) *Anthropology, Development and the Post-Modern Challenge*, London: Pluto Press.

Galaskiewicz, J., and Bielefeld, W. (2003), 'The behavior of organizations', in: Anheier, H.K. and Ber-Ner, A. (Eds.), the study of nonprofit enterprise: Theories and approaches, New York: Kluwer Academics, 205-237

Gonella, C., Pilling, A., & Zadek, S. (1998). Making values count: contemporary experience in social and ethical accounting, auditing, and reporting. London: The Association of Chartered Certified Accountants.

Kearns, K. P. (1996) *Managing for Accountability: Preserving the Public Trust in Nonprofit Organizations*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kerstin Martens, "Mission Impossible? Defining Non-governmental Organizations", Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations 13 (September 2002), PP.271-85

Khagram, S., Riker, J., and Sikkink, K. (2002). Restructuring World Politics, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kidder, L.H. 1981. Research methods in social relations. New York, Holt: Rinehart & Winston

Leat, D., 'Are voluntary organizations accountable?' In: Nillis, D., and Harris, M. (1996), Voluntary agencies; challenges of organizations and management, London: MacMillan, 61-79

Lindenberg, M. and C.Bryant (2001) Going Global: Transforming Relief and Development NGOs, Bllomfield, CT:Kumarian Press

Levy, F., Meltsner, A. J., &Wildavsky, A. (1974). Urban outcomes: schools, streets, and libraries. Berkeley: University of California

Lindblom, C. K. (1994), "The Implications of Organizational Legitimacy for Corporate Social Performance and Disclosure", Critical Perspectives on Accounting Conference, New York.

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

"NGO Accountability and Sustainable Development in Nigeria" by Akintola A. OWOLABI, Lagos Business School, Pan-African University, Lagos, Nigeria.

NGO Accountability in Kenya: a dream to big? By NGOBUZZ.NET; exxima.wordpress.com; on February 20, 2015.

NGO accountability: findings from South Sudan by Karyn Beattie; November 199

McFarlan, F. W. and M. J. Epstein (2009) "Non-Profit Boards: It's Different: A Businessman's Perspective " Draft book manuscript (cited with permission).

Pathways to Accountability: The GAP Framework by Monica Blagescu, Lucy de Las Casas and Robert Lloyd, One World Trust, London (UK), 2005.

Raynard, P. (1998). Coming together: a review of contemporary approaches to social accounting, auditing and reporting in non-profit organizations. Journal of Business Ethics, 17(13), 1471–1479

Richardson, J.T.E. 2005. Instruments for obtaining student feedback: a review of the literature. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 30, no. 4: 387–415

Roche, C. (1999). Impact assessment for development agencies: learning to value change. Oxford: Oxfam GB.

Schweitz, M. L. (2001). NGO network codes of conduct: accountability, principles, and voice. Paper presented to the International Studies Association Annual Convention, Chicago, Illinois, February 2001.

Scott, W. Richard 2004b. "Institutional theory." Pp. 408-14 in Encyclopedia of Social Theory, George Ritzer, ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Slim, H. (2002) "By what authority? The legitimacy and accountability of non-governmental organizations", presented at the International Council on Human Rights Policy International Meeting on Global Trends and Human Rights

Speckbacher, G. (2003), 'The economics of performance management in nonprofit organizations', Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 13: 267-281

Suchman, M. C. (1995) "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 571 -610

Uphoff, N. (1996) "Why NGOs are Not a Third Sector: A Sectoral Analysis with Some Thoughts on Accountability, Sustainability, and Evaluation", in M. Edwards and D. Hulme (eds).

Volunteer Vancouver (1999). What social auditing can do for voluntary organizations. Volunteer Vancouver, Vancouver.

Young, I.M. (2000) "Inclusion and Democracy", Oxford University Press, Oxford.

The Many Faces of Nonprofit Accountability bu Alnoor S. Ebrahim; 2010

The Role of NGO Self-Regulation in Increasing Stakeholder Accountability by Robert Lloyd; 2005

ANNEX

Annex I: Characteristics of Accountability Mechanisms

Accountability How? (tool or process)	Accountability to Whom? (upward,	Accountability for What? (finances, governance,	Inducement (internal or	Organizational Response (compliance or strategic)
Disclosures / Reports (tool)	• Upwards to funders and oversight agencies • Downwards (to a lesser degree) to clients or members who read the reports	• finances and performance, depending on what is being reported	• Legal requirement • Tax status • Funding requirement (external threat of loss of funding or tax status)	• Primarily compliance, with a focus on letter of law and short-term results
Evaluation and Performance Assessment (tool)	• Upwards to funders • Significant potential for downwards from nonprofits to communities and from funders to nonprofits	• performance, often short-term outputs but with increasing emphasis on impacts	• Funding requirement (external) • Potential to become a learning tool (internal)	• Primarily compliance at present, with possibilities for longer-term strategic assessment
Self-Regulation (tool and process)	• To nonprofits themselves, as a sector • To donors as a seal of good housekeeping	• finances and governance, depending on what the codes or standards emphasize	• Erosion of public confidence due to scandals and exaggeration of accomplishments (external loss of funds; internal loss of	• Strategic if it raises industry standards and enables policy voice • Compliance if standards are weak and adopted pro-forma
Participation (process)	• Downwards from nonprofits to clients and communities • Internally to nonprofits themselves • Significant potential downwards from funders to nonprofits.	• depends on the purpose of participation, e.g., whether it is seek input on implementation (performance) or to influence agendas (governance)	• Organizational values (internal) • Funding requirement (external)	• Primarily compliance if participation is limited to consultation and implementation • Strategic if it increases power of clients in influencing nonprofit agendas, or increases power of nonprofits in influencing funders
Adaptive Learning (process)	• To nonprofits themselves • Downwards and upwards to stakeholders	• mission and performance	• Improve performance in order to achieve mission (internal)	• Strategic if it focuses attention and resources on how to solve social problems

Annex II: Characteristics of Respondent Organizations, Health Sector INGOs in Ethiopia

S/N	Staff Size for the Study	Geographic Location/Scope	Year of Operation in Ethiopia	Funding Priorities
INGO 1	32	Addis Ababa	44 years	Education; Emergencies; Health; Livelihoods; HIV&AIDS and Combined programs
INGO 2	35	Addis Ababa	17 Years	Reproductive health services to improve women's access and right to safe, high-quality abortion care with ultimate purpose ending unintended pregnancy
INGO 3	82	Addis Ababa	More than 20 Years	Protecting children from Violence;education;emergency response and Health
INGO 4	16	Addis Ababa	More than 10 years	Water, health, education, and microfinance
INGO 5	33	Addis Ababa	More than 25 Years	Advancing family planning & reproductive health ;Maternal health; HIV,AIDS & STIs; improving clinical quality etc.
INGO 6	76	Addis Ababa	46 Years	Education, food security, health, HIV and AIDS, water, sanitation, child protection and hygiene, as well as sponsorship management.
INGO 7	23	Addis Ababa	40 Years	Emergency Assistance; long term development through education, health provision etc.
INGO 8	29	Addis Ababa	12 Years	Focuses on environmental and natural resources management, education, agriculture & food security, international health, housing & communities etc.
INGO 9	25	Addis Ababa	14 Years	Reduction of conflict related to natural resources and helping vulnerable children in areas most affected by HIV and AIDS by supporting their families
INGO 10	22	Addis Ababa	29 Years	Health and nutrition; education; water, sanitation and hygiene; sustainable economic growth; and strengthening community organizations.
INGO 11	45	Addis Ababa	26 Years	Family planning; Comprehensive abortion care; Maternal & child Health; Counseling & referal;HIV/STI voluntary counseling & testing etc.
INGO 12	19	Addis Ababa	More than 7 Years	Advocacy & policy; Diarrheal disease & pneumonia; HIV/AIDS; Malaria and Non communicable diseases
INGO 13	34	Addis Ababa	22 Years	Primarily designed to support the health extension program (HEP) of the country to improve reproductive, maternal, newborn, and child health (RMNCH) care behavior and practices and contribute towards achieving the country's maternal and child mortality reduction targets.
INGO 14	14	Addis Ababa	12 Years	Health System Strengthening; advocacy work on malaria prevention and control ; Operational research for evidence-based DM and policy change around malaria control and Behavioral change and communication
INGO 15	47	Addis Ababa	44 Years	Nutrition, Health & Safety; education; Income Generation; child protection and emergency

St. MARY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

MBA PROGRAM

Dear Respondents,

My name is **Wogen Achenafi** and I am a student at St. Mary University on the MBA Program. And I am currently conducting a study on a title **"Assessment of NGOs Accountability to their stakeholders in Ethiopia: a case of INGOs operating in the Health sector"** as a partial fulfillment of the program.

I have developed the following tool to help me assess how well INGOs operating in the health sector in Ethiopia are exercising generally recommended practices of accountability to their stakeholders. It provides me a solid framework to assess how far your organization has travelled to achieve its goal of becoming an ethical and accountable organization.

This assessment tool should be completed by at least ten of your staff members who have an in-depth understanding of the governance, resource management and operational practices of your organization. Out of these least ten staffs four of them should be in top management positions and the rest will be divided equally for the other three positions indicated in this questionnaire.

To give your response on the questionnaire, it is possible to use the Print out of the assessment questionnaire for hand filling or it is also possible to put an "X" mark on the option you choose on the soft copy of the Word document.

Please choose one of the following responses after carefully reading & understanding each one of the queries:

- ☐ **Always True:** if the statement is true about your Organization all of the time.
- ☐ **Mostly True:** if the statement is true about your Organization most of the time.
- ☐ **Sometimes True:** if the statement is true about your Organization some of the time/occasionally.
- ☐ **Never True:** if the statement is never true about your Organization.
- ☐ **DK:** if you don't know anything about the statement.

I confirm that this study is to be made for academic purposes only and all of the information obtained through this assessment will be kept confidential. And Hence, I hereby request all the respondents to feel free while responding to any of the queries and to provide honest and accurate responses for getting legitimate results from the study.

I would like to thank you in advance for your willingness to fill the questionnaire by taking your precious time.

Please contact me through my mobile phone number 0911810250 or e-mail: wogena2000@gmail.com if you need any clarification or if you do have any comment.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE FILLED BY RESPONDENTS

PART I: Respondent's profile

1. **Gender:** Female [ ], Male[ ],

2. **Age Group**: 18 to 29 [ ], 30 to 39 [ ], 40 to 49 [ ], 50 and above [ ]

3. **Educational Status:** High school completion and below [ ], college diploma [ ], first degree [ ], second degree and above [   ], Other (please specify) _____

4. **Experience on the Job (**in Health Sector INGOs**)**: Below 5 years [ ], 6-10 years [ ], 11-15 years [ ], 16-20 years [ ], More than 20 years [ ]

5. **Job Status/Position**: Top Management [ ], Middle Management[ ], First level[ ], None Managerial [ ]

PART II: Queries Specific to the Study being conducted

This Questionnaire part is broadly classified into ten major topic areas which include the following:

1. Governance 2. Finance & Operations 3. Compliance 4. Communication/disclosure 5. Evaluation of performance 6. Mission Statement 7. Organization's Strategy 8. Participation 9. Partnership 10. Self-regulation

1. Governance
This section focuses on the work of Organization's board of directors/trustees regarding their responsibilities under the law; how they are selected, trained and compensated; and how they oversee the Organization's charitable purpose.

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
1	We have clearly defined Criteria & procedures to select & appoint board members and to replace existing ones					
2	We have clearly defined the composition (mix of profession) of the governing board to deal with various aspects of our organization					

S/N	Statement					
3	We have an independent board of directors or trustees that is responsible for governing our organization's affairs.					
4	Our board members understand & articulate our mission & strategy and ensure that the goals of each program are consistent with them.					
5	Our board members review our mission and strategy periodically and revise them as needed.					
6	We have clearly defined and documented the responsibilities, and expected time commitment & compensation of our board members.					
7	Our board of directors is responsible for the hiring, regular review of performance and termination of the chief executive officer					
8	Our board members have access to organizational records and get professional advice & training whenever they need.					
9	Our Board members meet regularly to discuss all relevant issues, keep minutes for all meetings & securely file them.					
10	Our Board approves: a realistic work plan; policies and procedures prepared by the CEO or management of our organization.					
11	Our Board periodically monitors our work progress and regularly follow up the operational and financial reports of our organization					
12	Our board assures that annual statements of accounts are prepared by our finance section and they are audited by external auditors.					
13	Our board ensures that our plan of operation; progress & final reports and audited annual accounts are made available to various stakeholders on time.					
14	Our board has assessed the major risks faced by our organization and has taken appropriate action to reduce these risks					

2. Finance and Operations

This section focuses on the assessment of Organization's Human & financial resource management, its internal operation, and administration of its records.

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
15	We have an annual budget or work plan and we regularly monitor Program and finance performance in relation to this approved budget.					
16	We have developed and adhered to written financial management policies and procedures in our day to day finance operations					
17	We ensure that our annual spending policy for program and administration costs is in compliance with the government rules/regulations					

S/N	Statement	Yes	No	DK	Remarks
18	We take measures to ensure that our administrative expenses are in proportion to amounts spent by organizations of similar size and funding strategies.				
19	We respect the privacy concerns of individual donors I.e. All the information about their donations is handled with respect and confidentiality				
20	We conduct an independent audit or financial review periodically using independent auditors				
21	We rotate or switch external auditors examining our records every three years				
22	We have an audit committee that is separated from our finance committee and the members are not compensated for their service.				
23	Our organization reviews the audit report comments and meets with the auditor before accepting the audit results				
24	We actively seek a diverse range of candidates when selecting staffs and other vendors for procurement of goods & services.				
25	We rely on comparable data from similar organizations prior to making determination of compensation package for our staff				
26	We have written personnel policies and procedures to govern our employees and volunteers.				
27	Our employees and volunteers receive a copy of the personnel policy and acknowledge the receipt in writing.				
28	We have job descriptions for all staff and volunteer positions that clearly describe their specific duties and responsibilities				
29	We give orientation for new employees and volunteers on their roles and responsibilities.				
30	We keep accurate record of time worked by employees to calculate their pay and benefits as required by federal law.				
31	We have made available an updated organization chart to all staff & other stakeholders that shows the authority and reporting relationship in the organization				
32	We have a system in place for the regular review and communication of staff performance.				
33	We regularly ensure that we have adequate insurance coverage for our property and staffs taking into account the nature and scope of their activity				

3. Compliance to laws & Regulations

This section focuses on an Organization's compliance to national and international laws and regulations.

S/N	Statement	Responses			
		Yes	No	DK	Remarks
34	We have taken steps to ensure that our board members exercise their duty of care, duty of loyalty and duty of obedience at all times				

S/N	Statement					
35	We have a written conflict of interest policy when we engage in any contract or transaction with other companies.					
36	We require every staff members to annually complete and submit a conflict of interest disclosure form					
37	We have a written, mandatory record retention and destruction policy for a period specified by our attorneys or country laws whichever is higher					
38	We comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws like on the provision of equal employment opportunity; meeting reporting deadlines					
39	We have developed and followed a "whistle-blower" protection policy to encourage employees to give information on suspected illegal or unethical practices by staff members.					
40	Our organization do not use organizational facilities, equipment, personnel or other resources for other purposes it is not established for.					
41	We regularly accomplish tasks that our state may require from nonprofit organizations like periodically renewing our operation license etc					

4. Communications/Disclosure

This section focuses on an Organization's openness and transparency in communicating and disclosing key information about the organization to its constituents and the broader public.

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
42	We have submitted copy of our annual plan; progress reports; audited financial statement; and other needed information to the government oversight agency					
43	We have a basic communications plan to provide comprehensive and timely information to all other stakeholders including beneficiaries					
44	We give our feedback in a timely manner to any reasonable request of information or complaints from our stakeholders.					
45	We make readily available information about our organizational governance, mission/strategy, code of ethics and its guiding Values using our website directory or brochures					
46	We share information to our all stakeholders (including the Beneficiary community) about our programs/services and their impacts, our financial information using annual workshops, on our website as appropriate					
47	We have properly maintained a documented Grievance/Complaint handling procedure for all our stakeholders including internal staffs.					
48	We state the donor's intent in our annual reports and other appropriate organizational communications					

S/N	Statement	Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
49	We invite donors to share lessons learned in Partner meetings, multi-donor meetings, staff meetings/retreats or other learning exchanges					

5. <u>Evaluation of Performance</u>

This section focuses on an Organization's work to evaluate and assess the effectiveness and/or efficiency of its internal operations to meet organizational goals and objectives.

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
50	Our evaluations relate to assessing whether our programs and operations are in alignment with our mission to attain the goals and objectives explicit in it					
51	We periodically evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of our operations and procedures to meet organization goals.					
52	Our evaluations involve different stakeholders (staffs, donors, government, the community and other partners) to incorporate perspectives/comments from all our constituents.					
53	We have ingrained evaluation into the day-to-day operations of our organization as an ongoing process of organizational learning					
54	We have written procedures for conducting and documenting monitoring field visits and also for disclosing evaluation results.					
55	We share successes, failures and lessons learned from our evaluations with stakeholders & incorporate them into future programs					

6. <u>Organization's Mission and strategy</u>

This section focuses on an Organization's mission & strategies to ensure that it achieves the best possible results from its grant making and its operations.

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
56	We have a written mission statement that provides a clear expression of our reason for existence					
57	We review our mission every 3-5 years to ensure that it remains relevant and responsive, taking into consideration the changing internal and external factors.					
58	We have a clear & coherent written strategic plan for the coming 3-10 years to guide our activities with well defined, measurable and achievable goals					

S/N	Statement					
59	We continuously assess & compare our Strategic practices against others in the field to learn best practice models to revise our strategy within a reasonable time frame					
60	We consider strategies beyond our own grant making to advance our mission by collaborating with other donors who fund similar work and providing technical assistance to grantees doing similar works					

8. Participation

This section focuses on an Organization's participation of stakeholders to promote its accountability.

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
61	Our management promotes open, inclusive and respectful behavior within its staff team by making decisions in a transparent and inclusive way, welcoming divergent views and encouraging team working					
62	We allow our staffs to participate in partner/ network meetings or forums with other NGOs and local authorities to speak openly and share about our activities					
63	Our organization has a written record of how it identified interest groups of the community that it aims to help & their representatives who are trusted by the community to speak on their behalf					
64	We involve community representatives (Group of People trusted and appointed by Beneficiaries) in the planning, implementation and evaluation phases and in decision making processes of project activities concerning them.					

9. Partnership

This section focuses on an Organization's partnership with other organizations to promote its accountability

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
65	Our organization has a partnership policy that clearly shows the joint activities & finances; information to be shared among us; and how the quality of the partnership and each other's performance will be jointly monitored.					

S/N	Statement				
66	We respect our accountability commitments and codes of conduct while dealing with our partners by incorporating them in our agreements.				

8. <u>Self-Regulation</u>

This section focuses on an Organization's efforts in regulating itself by institutionalizing values and code of conduct within its employees and board members.

S/N	Statement	Responses				
		Always True	Mostly true	Sometimes true	Never true	DK
67	We have a written statement of values articulating the principles we are committed to uphold and a code of ethics that we agree to follow.					
68	These statements of values and code of ethics are available to the public on the organization's website.					
69	Both staff members & volunteers are well aware of these statements of values & code of ethics through orientations at the beginning of their tenure					
70	Our organization is a member of an independent sector like the CCRDA which promotes self-regulation by NGOs through the use of self-code of conduct & Stated values					
71	Our organization has got an accreditation for its accountability practices from well know international institutions working for improving nonprofit accountability.					

Interview Questions

These interview Questions are designed to gather information on the practices and issues of accountability of International NGOs (INGOs) operating in the health sector in Ethiopia.

1. Do you think they are equally accountable to all their stakeholders, including the donors, government, staff members, peer organizations and the project beneficiaries they serve? If the answer is no, please explain why? And how could they improve on that?

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

2. What do you think are the main practical challenges faced by such INGOs in fulling their accountability responsibility to a number of their stakeholders?

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

3. What kind of accountability problems do you observe in your organization most of the time and what kind of mechanisms do you think could be deployed by your organization to minimize or completely avoid this accountability problem?

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

4. Does INGO like your organization always tries to be become accountable in every aspect of its activities? If yes, what are the main goals of accountability in your organization?

   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

5. Is your organization a member of an independent nonprofit sector association, consortium, like the CCRDA that works on NGOs self-regulation as a mechanism of ensuring their accountability to their stakeholders? If yes, how do you think is that membership helping you in improving your accountability?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

6. Do you think that the recent proclamations and regulations introduced by the government for the administration of charities and societies including the 70:30 guideline for administering program and Administrative costs (Directive 02/2011) by NGOs will somehow help INGOs to achieve their accountability to their stakeholders?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

7. How do you think is the relationship between INGOs and the government is going on in ensuring accountability? Do you think they have an adversary or a partnership relation? If you think they have an adversary relationship, what do you think should be done to change that into a mutual partnership relationship?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____