Tool #1.4: Humanitarian Accountability & Ethics Checklist

What is it?	Why use it?	When to use it?
This self-administered checklist will help you identify gaps and potential risks in your engagement with direct users and the communities taking part in your project project.	To ensure that both your innovation, your project, and your innovation journey as a whole are ethical, safe, contextualized, do not create nor exacerbate harm, are sustainable (i.e. do not create nor exacerbate aid/external dependency), and are environmentally sustainable.	Across the project (before, during, after). To be used at all times (as a "guiding star").

About this tool

This six-question checklist will help refine your project design and help ensure you're following the Core Humanitarian Standards and Principles for Digital Development.

You should use this checklist before, during and after the project. This checklist doesn't replace your organization's existing ethical and safeguarding policies and tools, it should be considered complementary.

Task: Score your project using the questions below. Add notes that explain why you gave the score.

Note: *The questions are written in the past tense (e.g., were, did), when you use this before and during your project, adjust the tense in the question as you read it. For example, before the project read "were" as "will" and during the project read "were" as "are".*

#	Question	Scoring options	Score (0-5)	Explanation
1	**Were the users of the (innovation) consulted in the design and implementation of the project?** **<u>Refers to:</u>** • **Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) 4:** Communities and people affected by crisis know their rights and entitlements, have access to information and participate in decisions that affect them • **Digital Development Principle (DIAL) 1:** User-centered design starts with getting to know the people you are designing for through conversation, observation and co-creation.	**0 = No consultation** – Users were told to implement the innovation or system as is and had no opportunity to alter the innovation or how it is implemented. **1= Minimal or passive consultation** – User feedback was not actively solicited but feedback, when received (e.g. informally), was considered. **2 = Limited consultation** – User feedback was solicited on an ad hoc basis such as during a single event or via a small sample of stakeholder consultation. Feedback was not consistently sought during both design and implementation phases of the project but was used to make decisions. **3 = Active consultation** – There were multiple opportunities for users to share feedback with the project team (such as through several group discussions or interviews) and the input was routinely used to make adjustments. **4 = Meaningful engagement** – There were extensive structured consultations featuring all stakeholders in a representative manner (i.e. fully considering gender, age, diversity, disability, circumstances and other key demographic and socio-economic parameters), and feedback was systematically incorporated into the design and implementation of the solution or otherwise addressed. **5** - **From engagement to decision-making** - In addition to extensive structured consultation		

		mechanisms, the project included channels enabling users/stakeholders to lead processes that concern them/their communities (e.g. community-led project committee, or community focal points).		
2	**Was information on the project shared with all relevant stakeholders?** **<u>Refers to:</u>** • **CHS 4:** Communities and people affected by crisis know their rights and entitlements, have access to information and participate in decisions that affect them. • **DIAL 9:** Being collaborative means sharing information, insights, strategies and resources across projects, organizations and sectors, leading to increased efficiency and impact.	Assess the project against the criteria below: **1. Information was prepared and adapted with full consideration of the diverse needs of various population groups** (e.g. people who cannot read, people with disabilities)**.** **2. Diverse channels of information** dissemination were established to ensure that all members of the community (regardless of language, age, social group, gender, physical condition or economic situation) have access to basic information on the project. The information is channeled in diverse ways that are accessible by all and does not isolate certain groups. **3.** Information provided was **complete** and included details on the design of the innovation, the planning of the project, the expected outcomes, the risks and benefits to the users, beneficiaries and community at large and the next steps after the project's end. **4.** Information was provided to the community at **multiple stages** in the project, including the beginning, mid-point and end. **5.** Information was shared through **active means** (such as community steering committee / users' group, or engagement		

		with existing civic structures) and with opportunities for dialogue. If 0 criteria are met, score is 0 If 1 criterium is met, score is 1 If 2-criteria are met, score is 2 If 3 criteria are met, score is 3 If4 criteria are met, score is 4 If all 5 criteria are met, score is 5		
3	**Did the project exacerbate inequalities or vulnerabilities in the area of implementation?** **<u>Refers to:</u>** • **CHS 1:** Communities and people affected by crisis receive assistance appropriate and relevant to their needs. • **CHS 3:** Communities and people affected by crisis are not negatively affected and are more prepared, resilient and less at-risk as a result of humanitarian action.	**0 =** The project was aware of potential risks to the participants and/or the wider community (such as possibility of abuse and exploitation, exposure to dangerous materials or equipment, increased stigmatization, etc.) and went ahead without any monitoring or mitigation measures OR the project did not take risks into considerations at all during the design and implementation. **1 =** Risks were informally considered during the project design but not actively monitored or mitigated in the implementation. **2 =** The project design included a basic risk analysis and limited measures were put in place to monitor possible negative impacts to vulnerable populations during the implementation. **3 =** In addition to a basic risk analysis, another type of assessment was conducted (e.g. gender analysis, environmental assessment, market assessment). **4 =** A thorough multi-layered risk analysis was conducted during the design phase (including gender analysis, do-no-harm analysis, environmental assessment, and if relevant market		

		analysis), leading to the development of concrete mitigation measures and the inclusion of warning indicators in the MEAL system. **5 =** The project established an independent mechanism to identify and evaluate potential and actual harm to the communities throughout all phases of design and implementation. Concrete mitigation measures are in place, leveraging local resources (e.g. strong partnerships with local NGOs). Project staff were empowered to pause or cancel activities based on risks encountered.		
4	**If personal information was collected, was it kept safe and secure?** ***(Leave blank if not relevant)*** **<u>Refers to:</u>** • **DIAL 8:** Addressing privacy and security in digital development involves careful consideration of which data are collected and how data are acquired, used, stored and shared.	**0 =** Serious breaches of data security were observed leading to sensitive personal information being made easily available to unauthorized persons. **1 =** No serious data breaches were observed but private information about users and/or beneficiaries was not kept secure from unauthorized access (e.g. it was kept on personal and/or unprotected computers or on note books). **2 =** Private and sensitive information was kept safe through basic measures (e.g. password protection, removal of documents from public places) from the general public but could be obtained by certain individuals who should not be authorized. **3 =** Access to personal and private information was restricted to selected personnel through effective means (e.g. secured computer systems, password, and other measures). Project staff were trained on data security. **4 =** Effective data security measures (data access rights, encryption, file storage) were detailed in a		

		Standard Operating Procedure and were routinely tested to ensure inaccessibility to any non-authorized individual, including criminals. **5 =** The organizations/startups leading the projects underwent a formal organizational process (e.g. hired a consultant to verify everything and address gaps) to comply with official data protection policies such as for example General Data Protection Regulation.		
5	**Did the project include the necessary accountability mechanisms to ensure that it would receive constructive criticism, complaints, feedback, and suggestions from users and other stakeholders without fear of negative consequences?** **<u>Refers to:</u>** • **CHS 5:** Communities and people affected by crisis have access to safe and responsive mechanisms to handle complaints.	Assess the project against the criteria below: 1. **All beneficiaries** regardless of language spoken, age, social group, gender, physical condition or economic situation are **aware** of the existence of accountability mechanisms (i.e. the project staff informed the beneficiaries about the mechanisms and how/where/when to use them). 2. **All beneficiaries** regardless of language spoken, age, social group, gender, physical condition or economic situation had the ability to **access and use** the accountability mechanisms/communication channels, e.g. communicate with the project team, or designated community focal points during all phases of the project 3. It was possible to provide feedback in an **anonymous** manner. 4. The project team **communicated** on the feedback received.		

		5. The project staff **used the feedback received** to manage the project, and adapted course of action if/when needed. If 0 criteria are met, score is 0 If 1 criterium is met, score is 1 If 2-criteria are met, score is2 If 3 criteria are met, score is3 If 4 criteria are met, score is 4 If all criteria are met, score is 5		
6	**Did the project treat all those who took part in its design and implementation fairly and equitably and with no discrimination?** **<u>Refers to:</u>** • **CHS 8:** Communities and people affected by crisis receive the assistance they require from competent and well-managed staff and volunteers.	0= Staff from implementing agencies and/or volunteers from the community were obligated to work overtime and beyond their scope of work for no additional pay and/or organizations were forced to cover additional costs budgeted for other activities. 1= The pilot required existing staff to take on additional work during regular working hours with no direct incentive provided. Community volunteers were asked to perform the work at the level of paid personnel with no compensation. 2= Existing staff were required to take on additional work but were compensated fairly for the extra duties or responsibilities. Unpaid volunteers were not asked to perform work equivalent to paid positions. 3= Participation from existing staff was either not required or performed on a voluntary basis with fair compensation for the extra work. Community volunteers were provided fair monetary or non-monetary compensation. 4= All costs (monetary, time, effort, etc.) related to the pilot were covered through the funding available in a comprehensive, fair, transparent and		

		timely manner. Opportunities to participate in the pilot were made available to all qualified individuals. **5** - In addition to the above, the pilot allows for specific mechanisms to provide proactive support to the staff (e.g. mental health support, complaint mechanisms, and other HR modalities to further accompany staff).		