



# Assessment, Compliance and Certification

Dale Rose, Ph.D.  
Program Specialist  
Fritz Institute

**Disaster Resilience Standard and Continuity of Operations Workshop for Community and  
Faith-Based Organizations**

**February 18 & 19, 2009 – San Francisco, CA**

# Assessment

---

---

- Evaluation of standard compliance
  - Formal or informal
  - Document review: ALWAYS
  - Site visit, audit: DEPENDS
  - 1<sup>st</sup>-, 2<sup>nd</sup>-, 3<sup>rd</sup>- party evaluation

# Certification

---

---

- Declaration of compliance
- Marker of trust, credibility, capability
  - Institutional recognition
- Degrees of compliance: full, partial, conditional

# Accreditation

---

- (Unfortunately) synonymous with certification in some sectors
- Conferring ability to certify
- Accredited organizations must also meet standards
- Marker of trust, credibility, capability

# First-party assessment

---

- Self-assessment part of all compliance evaluations (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>)
- ***Review of own documentation***
- Baseline/benchmark capacity, capability, or performance
- Depending on outcome, declaration of compliance (“self-certification”)

# Second-party assessment

---

- Evaluation by purchaser, customer (org)
- Secures supply chain
- In this context: purchaser is *funder*, securing “service” and “funding” chains
  - Philanthropy or government
- ***Self-assessment + funder review of documentation (+ possible site visit)***

# Second-party assessment (cont'd)

---

---

- One (or more) philanthropies/gov't agencies could take certification role; others accept their certification
- *Pro*: CBOs/FBOs have a “seal of approval” to show funders, communities and others
- *Pro*: More effective than self-assessment
- *Con*: More burdensome than self-assessment

# Third-party assessment

---

- Evaluation by independent, external entity
- ***Self-assessment + outside audit of documentation***
- Third-party organization often comprised of sector members
  - EMAP, Joint Commission

# Third-party assessment (cont'd)

---

- *Pro*: Viewed as most credible and comprehensive (“Gold Standard”)
- *Con*: Implementation burdensome, especially in current economy
- *Con*: Currently no framework / apparatus to implement – Build from scratch

# Maturity model

---

---

- Stages, tiers, levels of compliance
- Replaces Pass/Fail model
- Pre-determined thresholds
  - Percentage of standard/elements met
  - “Key” elements met
- Interventions can be built into model to move from one stage to next