

Strategy
2010
Strategy
2009
Strategy
2008
Strategy
2007
Strategy
2006
Strategy
2005
Strategy
2004
Strategy
2003
Strategy
2002
Strategy
2001
Strategy
2000



◀ Mid-Term Review
Strategy 2010



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

© International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Any part of this report may be cited, copied, translated into other languages or adapted to meet local needs without prior permission from the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, provided that the source is clearly stated.

2005

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

PO Box 372

CH-1211 Geneva 19

Switzerland

Telephone: +41 22 730 4222

Telefax: +41 22 733 0395

E-mail: secretariat@ifrc.org

Web site: www.ifrc.org

Contents

Executive summary	2
-------------------	---

Part one

Report of the review team

1 Introduction	5
2 Objectives	5
3 Methodology	5
4 The findings	7
5 The changing context	8
6 Our place in the world	9
7 Vision, mission and values	10
8 The three strategic directions	12
9 Strategic direction 1: “Responsive to local vulnerability”	13
10 Strategic direction 1: “Focused on the areas where they can have greatest impact”	13
11 Core area 1: Promotion of the Movement’s fundamental principles and humanitarian values	15
12 Core area 2: Disaster Preparedness	15
13 Core area 3: Disaster Response	17
14 Core area 4: Health and care in the community	19
15 Strategic direction 2: Well-functioning National Societies	21
16 Strategic direction 3: Working together effectively	23

Part two

Performance framework

1 Implementing <i>Strategy 2010</i>	25
2 Establishing a framework for achieving our goals	25
3 Describing the framework	25
4 Assumptions	26
5 The framework	26

Part three

Case studies	29
--------------	----

Appendix

1 Participants in the review	41
2 Contributors to the review	42
3 List of documents consulted	47

Review team

Sir Nicholas Young - British Red Cross
Mrs Kristiina Kumpula - Finnish Red Cross
Mrs Geri Lau - Singapore Red Cross
Mr Alphonse Kalinganire - Rwanda Red Cross

28th April 2005

Executive summary

- 1 The mid-term review of *Strategy 2010* was carried out pursuant to a resolution of the General Assembly in 2003. The Review was conducted through a full process of research and consultation.
- 2 The Review found a very substantial degree of support for the main strategic directions of the strategy, and for the focus on four core areas of activity.
- 3 The Review Team found that external actors had high expectations of the Federation as an advocate and unifying force, but that the Federation did not always live up to those expectations in terms of its participation in policy debates. It was felt that we should be communicating more proactively and effectively.
- 4 Whilst the Federation's mission to "improve the lives of vulnerable people by mobilising the power of humanity" was seen as inspiring and motivating, it was felt that there needed to be greater clarity about the Federation's vision, and its organisational values.
- 5 The Team found that there had been progress in focusing on vulnerability, and in promoting the Fundamental Principles and humanitarian values, but that this needed to be maintained and strengthened.
- 6 Weaknesses were noted in the Federation's management of disasters, which led the review team to suggest various corrective actions, including the development of a new integrated Disaster Management strategy.
- 7 The section on health care in *Strategy 2010* was found to be the weakest in clarity, and a new focus on health emergencies, and health in disasters is recommended.
- 8 Although the Team found a general perception that governance and management within National Societies was improving, there was no real evidence to support this, and suggestions for improving capacity-building, governance, volunteer recruitment and retention, resource-mobilisation, communication, and the functioning of the Secretariat are made.
- 9 The Team makes various comments and suggestions about the way National Societies, the Secretariat and the ICRC work together.
- 10 The Review Team found that throughout the Movement and beyond, it is clear that *Strategy 2010* has had enormous influence, and that it has been the foundation stone upon which National Societies and their Secretariat have developed their own strategies and planned their activities. In five short years, this is a very significant achievement indeed.
- 11 Finally, the Review Team proposes a new performance management framework to enhance progress towards implementing *Strategy 2010*, and improve accountability.

Part one

Report of the review team

1. Introduction

- 1.1 In 1999, the International Federation of Red Cross and Crescent Societies agreed at its General Assembly to adopt a new strategic plan to guide the activities of its members worldwide. The plan was called “*Strategy 2010*”. The Strategy was produced following months of research and consultation, and was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly.
- 1.2 At the General Assembly in 2003, it was agreed that there should be a mid-term review of *Strategy 2010*, and a Steering Committee was appointed to oversee the work. At the same Assembly, a wider review process called “Our Federation of the Future” was established, and it was subsequently agreed that the 2010 Review would feed into it.

2. Objectives

The objectives of the mid-term review were agreed by the Federation’s Governing Board in November 2003, as follows:

- Assess how the *Strategy 2010* is implemented by National Societies, the Federation’s governance and the Secretariat.
- Identify factors which facilitated or hindered implementation of the core areas and strategic directions.
- Promote learning from National Societies where *Strategy 2010* has been implemented.
- Encourage discussion among National Societies on the converging and diverging issues of the Strategy from practical experience.
- Prepare proposals for the Governing Board for updating the Strategy.

3. Methodology

- 3.1 The Steering Committee commissioned an Approach Paper, which guided the review. A Review Team of four Secretary-Generals was appointed to carry out the detailed work, assisted by the Secretariat’s Monitoring and Evaluation Department. The names of those involved in the work of the Review are given in Appendix 1.

3.2 The work has included:

- *Strategy 2010* Questionnaire administered to all National Societies, and a questionnaire prepared for Governing Board members.
- Interviews with a large number of National Society leaders, and with Red Cross Red Crescent Movement senior volunteers and staff members.
- Interviews with a large number of key external stakeholders, including a variety of international organisations and UN bodies, other aid agencies and civil society bodies, national and international media, and corporate supporters.
- An independent evaluation of the Federation's work in the field of health.
- Case Studies on nine key aspects of the Federation's work.
- Data provided through the National Society Self-assessment process.
- Content analysis of Federation policies, official documents and evaluation reports.
- Workshops and discussion groups (including a 2 day workshop for Governing Board members and other Movement leaders in Geneva).

A list of all those who contributed to the Review is given in Appendix 2, and Appendix 3 contains a list of all the documents consulted. The results of the National Society self-assessment, the Health Evaluation, the Case Studies and other documents are available on FedNet.

3.3 It should be noted that this is an interim review. A final evaluation of *Strategy 2010* will be carried out in 2008/9 as part of the process leading up to production of the Federation's next strategic plan.

3.4 This Review is a descriptive analysis of progress, in an attempt to identify ways in which the implementation of *Strategy 2010* can be enhanced over the next five years.

3.5 The Review Team has made recommendations which will have, directly or indirectly, cost implications. No attempt has been made to assess costs at this stage.

3.6 *Strategy 2010* gave few hints about how to assure or measure progress in implementing its recommendations. The Review Team has therefore produced a Performance Framework, consisting of a description of what success might look like for each of the Strategy's core objectives, and some performance indicators. The Framework, and a suggested methodology for achieving the objectives of *Strategy 2010*, are set out in Part 2 of the Review.

3.7 The Review Team would like to thank everyone who has helped in the production of this report. We have endeavoured to incorporate many of the excellent ideas and suggestions made to us during the course of our work, and we apologise to anyone who feels that we have missed a vital point. All errors or omissions are the responsibility of the Review Team alone.

4. The findings

4.1 The Review Team was struck, above all, by the power and inspiration of *Strategy 2010*. It set out with the goal of enabling the Federation to meet “the humanitarian challenges of the next decade”, and it created for the Federation as a whole a mission of quite stunning ambition

*to improve the lives of vulnerable people
by mobilizing the power of humanity.*

4.2 From all our interviews and discussions, throughout the Movement and beyond, it is clear that *Strategy 2010* has had enormous influence, and that it has been the foundation stone upon which National Societies and their Secretariat have developed their own strategies and planned their activities. In five short years, this is a very significant achievement indeed.

4.3 Looking back to the Nineties, *Strategy 2010* pointed to a lack of focus in the work of the Federation, to the need to give more attention to capacity building, to missed opportunities in resource and volunteer mobilisation, to failures in external relations and communications and in working together, and to the negative impact of competition between the Federation and the International Committee of the Red Cross. In all these areas, the Review Team felt that there has been great progress and many successes. We should celebrate these achievements!

4.4 But we must also accept that, in the five years to come, there is still much to do if we are to do justice to the inspiration and ambition of all the National Societies who participated in developing and approving the original strategy. There was clear evidence that the Governing Board and the management had reflected *Strategy 2010* in their decision-making, however, there was no really strong evidence of the Strategy having been driven in a determined way. The purpose of this Review is to highlight some “areas for improvement”, and to examine from experience ways of tackling them.

4.5 Following the main strategic directions outlined in *Strategy 2010*, the Review Team identified seven main questions to be answered. The remainder of this report looks at those questions in more detail – and suggests some possible answers. The questions are:

- Does the Federation occupy its rightful place in the world today?
- Are we sufficiently clear about, and guided by our vision, mission and values?
- Is our primary focus on “the lives of vulnerable people”?
- Did we get the focus right? Have we done enough to develop the four “Core Areas”, as defined in *Strategy 2010*?
- Do we have the well-functioning National Societies and Secretariat that will achieve the aspirations of *Strategy 2010*?
- Are we working together effectively?
- Are we clear, in any of these areas, what success would look like, and are we measuring our progress towards it and the difference we make in the lives of vulnerable people?

4.6 But, before examining these questions, a look at how the context has changed.

5. The changing context

- 5.1 *Strategy 2010* identified a number of trends and developments which, it was anticipated, would impact upon the lives of vulnerable people and the work of the Federation. Many of these predictions have proved largely accurate; for example, that globalisation would bring more opportunities but greater inequities, and that environmental degradation would increase both the number and severity of natural disasters.
- 5.2 These trends are worrying indeed, and all National Societies are having to deal with the consequences in one way or another, and to a greater or lesser extent, both in terms of the services to be offered, and in terms of their impact on areas such as fundraising, recruitment, and communications.
- 5.3 But, in addition to the trends foreshadowed in *Strategy 2010*, the Review Team noted a number of more recent developments that will also have significant impact in the remaining years of the decade and beyond. These are examined briefly below.
- 5.4 **Increasing polarisation**, both globally and within individual countries and communities, poses a big challenge to the Federation and the Movement as a whole. We pride ourselves on our ability to rise above the dogmas and differences that divide us, through our adherence to the fundamental principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality. However, the ongoing consequences of the fall of communism, September 11th, the “global war on terror”, the surge in separatist activity, the perceived growth in international terrorism, have all played their part in creating a world that seems to be becoming more divided and dangerous than ever, and in which security and the space for humanitarian action is increasingly threatened.
- 5.5 **Inequality** remains an issue today, just as it was in 1999, but the inequalities seem even more intractable, not less. The gap between rich and poor, between those with secure access to food and water, between those with good health and those without, between those living under stable regimes and those who are not, is getting bigger. Efforts to reduce them, however well-meaning, seem to fall short of the ideal. The UN’s Millennium Development Goals aim to alleviate these inequalities, and we have an important contribution to make towards these goals.
- 5.6 The full extent of **HIV/AIDS** has become clearer as possibly the most significant health challenge and, indeed, the greatest challenge to development, the world has faced.
- 5.7 **A move towards greater self-determination** for countries in the south and east is discernible. Countries labelled as “less developed” are advocating for a greater sense of identity, capability and capacity to govern their own destinies. No longer is the west seen as having all, or indeed any, of the answers, and there is growing recognition of the importance of traditional knowledge and local cultures; there is also a developing acceptance of human rights concepts (that may run counter to local traditions).
- 5.8 **The concept of “civil society”** is getting stronger, in many countries, as a countervailing influence to that of politicians and processes. This has brought with it more activism (with many diverse objectives), and increasing demands for accountability and transparency of individuals and institutions. There is a trend towards a more inclusive, community-based approach, and an emphasis on the empowerment of disadvantaged communities.

5.9 Global communications mean that news and comments, both good and bad, spread around the world fast. Sympathy and support can be mobilised very quickly, as in the case of the recent tsunami in the Indian Ocean. There is no guarantee, however, that the coverage will be balanced or accurate, or that every situation of need will receive equal attention.

6. Our place in the world

6.1 If the trends identified in the preceding section seem to be about an increasingly divergent world, the very strong sense both within the Federation and outside is of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement's potential to be a **unifying force**, a bridge, both locally and globally, between divided communities and countries. Practically all the external UN, aid and media agencies the Review Team spoke to thought that the Movement had a critical role to play here but, sadly, several expressed their disappointment that the potential was not, in their view, being realised.

6.2 Another plea from outside the Federation (but also from many within) was for all of us to **speak up and speak out more**, to be seen on the side of vulnerable people, and to be seen to defend our "humanitarian space". We are seen by many as a powerful organisation with a key role to play in creating, as the Head of one UN agency put it, a "powerful drumbeat in defence of humanitarian space", and in shaping the future of our world. But "outside the fairly narrow circle" of those who actually know what we do (it was said), we are felt to be somewhat invisible in terms of our active participation in the key debates, notwithstanding our membership of some of the relevant fora, and our attendance at key events.

6.3 This concern about our perceived lack of "voice" suggested to the Review Team that we are less effective than we should be as the organisation that **mobilises the power of humanity**. Are we doing enough to influence the actions of others and effect change, to engage with our beneficiaries and their concerns, and to recruit new volunteers and supporters of all ages to help us?

6.4 Despite its visionary and ambitious nature, *Strategy 2010* gave relatively little attention to the question of "our place in the world". The Governing Board has recently adopted a new policy on Advocacy, which goes some way towards developing the Federation's activities in this area, but the Review Team concluded from the external interviews that a **more focused and ambitious approach** is imperative. In an age in which the capacity to "get your message across" in an increasingly competitive environment is so important, the Federation cannot afford to be left behind.

6.5 Coupled with a criticism, voiced by some, that we are seen as somewhat bureaucratic, inward-looking, old fashioned, and inflexible, the conclusion drawn by the Review Team was that there is work to do for individual National Societies and for the Federation as a whole in developing consistent messages and positions on key topics. We must communicate these messages proactively, and **build an image** for the Federation and its components that is more consistent with the way we would like to see ourselves, and with the expectations of others.

6.6 In the fast-moving and sometimes scary world of global communications, an organisation like the Federation, engaged as it is on all the big issues of the day, simply has to be prepared to be more proactive and to **scale up its media response**

mechanisms. We need to be ready to take advantage quickly of opportunities that present themselves, and to counteract adverse stories the moment they appear. Most of the people we spoke to, both inside and outside the Federation, felt that we were some way from achieving this. More than one journalist commented that the Federation was understaffed in this area, and that it was difficult to find the right person to talk to or to get information.

- 6.7 One way of increasing our influence is to work more often in partnerships with other organisations. There has been efforts to do this more effectively in recent years, but the Review Team felt that more could be done in this direction, in the interest of beneficiaries, at international, national and local level.

6.8 The review team recommends that:

- We should consider how we may act more effectively as a unifying force in a divided world.
- We need to increase our efforts to speak out on behalf of vulnerable people, and to promote our work and our views externally and in partnerships.
- There should be a thorough review of the Federation’s communications strategy, conducted in association both with National Societies which have experience and capabilities in this area, and with the ICRC.
- The review should examine our positioning and “branding”, as well as the mechanics of communication, and should identify the resource implications and funding requirements. External advice and expertise should be engaged.
- The Secretariat should set up a “think tank” to put forward ideas for policy debates and campaigns, bringing in external experts for some new thinking.

7. Vision, mission and values

- 7.1 “Where there is no vision, the people perish”.

- 7.2 As we have already noted, *Strategy 2010* was an inspirational and ambitious document. However, several of the National Societies we spoke to suggested that the Strategy lacked a clear vision, in the sense of a description of the world we are trying to help create. They felt that it would be both helpful and motivating to develop a statement about the Federation’s vision, one that we can all share and work towards.

- 7.3 This is a task that properly belongs to the Federation of the Future group, but some suggestions were made about elements which might be included in the Federation’s vision statement:

- Building real resilience in communities.
- Equity and dignity for all.
- Vulnerability reduced.
- Humanity mobilised.
- The strength of our global network and reach.

- 7.4 One interlocutor described the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement as a kind of “public good” which belonged to everyone. Another said that “the Movement belongs to the whole world, not just to us”. This emphasises the importance of our finding a vision that has resonance both inside and outside the Movement, and which captures something of the uniqueness of our organisation, and the expectations that people have of us.
- 7.5 In a divided, or at least a less united world, the creation of a strong and uniting vision for the Federation, which every single National Society could live by, would be powerful indeed.
- 7.6 Most of those interviewed felt that the statement of our Mission, as contained in *Strategy 2010* (“to improve the lives of vulnerable people by mobilising the power of humanity”), was sufficiently clear and challenging. A few wanted more clarity, and perhaps a reference to our core areas of activity, and to the means whereby humanity is to be mobilised.
- 7.7 The question of whether our values as an organisation were the same as our Fundamental Principles and, if not, what they were, generated considerable discussion and some confusion. On the whole, there was a recognition that the Fundamental Principles are of absolutely paramount importance, and that we have to make them “come alive” much more in the minds of the general public and, importantly, for our staff and volunteers.
- 7.8 But there was also acceptance that we should debate and develop a set of organisational values, which describes the way we do things in the Movement as a whole, and which we could use openly as a means of both encouraging and occasionally challenging each other. To the external world, our application of these values should present a coherent and recognizable persona. Some suggestions for these organisational values included:
- Committed to meeting the needs of vulnerable people.
 - Practical and effective.
 - Dynamic and responsive.
 - Open and welcoming to all/valuing diversity.
 - Trustworthy and transparent.
 - Cooperative and professional.
- 7.9 Developing this set of values may be harder than perhaps it sounds. The Red Cross Red Crescent Movement seeks to embrace many different countries and cultures. Whilst it should be possible to identify a core of common values, there will be differences of nuance and interpretation that may, from time to time, cause an apparent divergence from “the way we do things in the Movement”. But then, resolving apparent differences and divides, and finding the common core of humanity is what the Movement is all about.
- 7.10 One very important question that was raised related to the way we view “our beneficiaries”, and how they see us. Some felt that we are still rather paternalistic and old-fashioned in our approach, and that we should be more inclusive and empowering.

7.11 The review team recommends that:

- The Federation of the Future group should initiate a Federation-wide debate about our vision and organisational values; once developed, we should all resolve to live the values in every aspect of our work.
- Our Fundamental Principles and values should be expressly operationalised through all our programmes, policies and Appeals.

8. The three strategic directions

8.1 *Strategy 2010* sets out three “strategic directions”. They are worth repeating here:

Strategic direction 1

National Society programmes are responsive to local vulnerability and focused on the areas where they can have the greatest impact. The collective focus will be on promoting the Movement’s Fundamental Principles, disaster response, disaster preparedness, and health and care in the community.

Strategic direction 2

Well-functioning National Societies that can mobilise support and carry out their humanitarian mission, contributing to the building of civil society.

Strategic direction 3

The Red Cross Red Crescent and its supporters work together effectively, through programme cooperation, long-term partnerships and funding, as well as more active advocacy.

8.2 The Review Team felt that one of the main difficulties with *Strategy 2010* is that it made very little attempt to clarify what success would look like if we were achieving these “strategic directions”, nor did it give guidance as to how to measure that success. Some “expected results” were set out in the Strategy, but they are more like results of activities, rather than actual goals to be achieved.

8.3 The remainder of this Review therefore examines each of the key elements and objectives in the Strategic Directions, attempts to define what success would look like, analyses progress, and suggests what more we need to do if success is to be achieved.

8.4 But, before looking in more detail at the key elements individually, it is worth reflecting on the “big picture”. The three Strategic Directions have had an enormous impact on the Federation. Of the 135 National Societies which responded to the self-assessment questionnaire from 2000 to 2003, 84 percent said they had updated or adopted Development Plans in the last five years; no less than 96 percent of those plans reflected *Strategy 2010*. A review of some of those plans certainly bears out this degree of acceptance in broad terms.

8.5 Furthermore, a review of Governing Board discussions and decisions, of Secretariat actions, and of the resolutions of Regional Conferences and other meetings adds to the impression that the entire Federation has united (and remains united) behind the broad principles of *Strategy 2010* in a remarkable way.

8.6 On the other hand, the last five years have not been easy ones for our Federation. The financial crisis, precipitated in part by the decision of the American Red Cross to withhold its bareme payments; a steady erosion of confidence in (and the morale of) the Secretariat; the increasing number of National Societies wanting to work independently of a co-ordinating Secretariat – the Team saw that these events have

all impacted upon the Federation’s capacity to absorb and capitalise upon the full richness of the Strategy. In all the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that in some areas progress has been more limited than we might have wished.

9. Strategic direction 1: “Responsive to local vulnerability”

9.1 The Review Team found that there has been progress in this area. The Secretariat has introduced and disseminated a comprehensive “Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment Guide”, and 48 per cent of National Societies claim to have carried out such an assessment in the last three years. But, looked at another way, more than half of all National Societies have not yet carried out such a survey. For those which have done the survey, the Team found it hard to gather information about the extent to which service priorities, advocacy activities or resource allocation had changed as a result.

9.2 This does not necessarily imply that National Societies are failing to provide services to, or build resilience in, vulnerable groups. But it does suggest a worrying potential gap in our knowledge and understanding as a Federation and as National Societies about who we are trying to serve, their needs and the underlying causes of their vulnerability. This in turn suggests that some National Societies may not be prioritising or directing their services appropriately, and that they may not be acting responsively to changes in need in their communities.

9.3 The review team recommends that:

- Every National Society be asked to carry out a Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment by the end of 2007, supported where necessary by the Secretariat or by neighbouring or other National Societies.
- National Societies to review and start to adapt their services and/or advocacy activities in the light of that Assessments immediately.
- Regional plans should be created on the basis of identified regional vulnerability and capacity.

Success would look like this:

Every National Society has identified the main vulnerable groups and their capacity to withstand natural and man-made emergencies and other major health threats – and has adjusted its services and activities accordingly.

10. Strategic direction 1: “Focused on the areas where they can have the greatest impact”

10.1 *Strategy 2010* defined a collective focus for the Federation, based on the concept of four “core areas” of activity, which all National Societies were expected to develop, and in which they could count on advice and support from the Secretariat. National Societies were not to be prevented from carrying out activities in other areas that they consider necessary.

10.2 The four Core Areas were:

- Promotion of the Movement’s Fundamental Principles and humanitarian values.
- Disaster preparedness.
- Disaster response.
- Health and care in the community.

- 10.3** The Core Areas were defined as an “integral and interlinked package”, offering an opportunity to focus collective efforts on a narrower range of activities, to help with prioritisation and promotion. There were two dimensions to each Area – service delivery and advocacy. The Team found little evidence of a truly integrated approach to service development in National Societies or in the Secretariat, and advocacy often seemed under-developed or even non-existent.
- 10.4** It was assumed that a set of standards would be developed for each Core Area, and that serious attempts would be made to establish the extent to which beneficiaries were satisfied with the help that we give. Standards have been developed in some areas, and several National Societies have made substantial efforts to measure beneficiary satisfaction objectively. Others testified to their desire to do so, but said they found it difficult.
- 10.5** The Team felt that the development of “centres of excellence” and networks of National Societies wishing to expand their knowledge and understanding of particular service areas was greatly to be welcomed. They shared a concern, however, that (mostly due to resource limitations), there was little sense of these activities being co-ordinated, nor of the Federation as a whole becoming truly a ‘learning organisation’. We do a lot of training ourselves (particularly in the key area of first aid), but not a lot of learning! Much more could be done in time to enhance the sharing of knowledge and good practice around the Federation.
- 10.6** In discussions with National Societies during the Review, all claimed to have found the focus useful as a guide in considering and prioritising their own services. Some had based their own national plans entirely on the four Core Areas, thereby successfully slimming down what had often been an unmanageably large portfolio of assorted services. Others continue to offer a wide variety, but still see the four as priority areas for resources and development.
- 10.7** There was no suggestion that the list of Core Areas itself should be dropped or amended in any substantial way. The Review Team noted that there were some gaps – nothing on refugees and asylum-seekers, for example, nor tracing and family reunion. The Team felt that the Secretariat should explore with National Societies in due course whether these are felt to be areas that should receive more attention at a Federation level.

10.8 The review team recommends that, in developing activities within the four core areas:

- National Societies and the Secretariat should place a greater emphasis on integration and advocacy.
- The Secretariat should increase its efforts to develop standards and guidelines, and tools for measuring beneficiary satisfaction.
- The Secretariat should continue to encourage and facilitate the development of learning networks and centres of excellence, but this should be within a clearer policy and governance framework, and with more emphasis on dissemination.
- The Federation should strive in time to become a ‘learning organisation’, perhaps linking up with an academic institution to help us develop in this area.
- There should be consideration as to whether increased support should be given should resources become available for key activities undertaken by a large number of National Societies, but not currently included within the four Core Areas (e.g. work with refugees and asylum seekers).

11. Core area 1: Promotion of the Movement' Fundamental Principles and Humanitarian Values

- 11.1 The Review Team found that National Societies and the Secretariat have made increased efforts to spread humanitarian values and to promote understanding of the Movement's fundamental principles. These have included campaigns to curb violence in the community, programmes to include International humanitarian law and similar topics in school curricula, volunteer recruitment campaigns, and efforts to defend the principles of neutrality and impartiality in the face of sustained criticism and adverse comment. The Federation has adopted a new policy on advocacy.
- 11.2 However, several Societies acknowledged the challenge of making some of the Principles "come alive" in communications terms, let alone in terms of their day to day activities and behaviours and, as already noted, there remains a lack of clarity about what our "humanitarian values" actually are. We hope that the *Federation of the Future* review will address this, and that it will look at ways of ensuring that volunteers and staff understand and reflect them in everything they do. This is an area where we should be working closely with the ICRC, perhaps even to the extent of having a joint strategy for promoting the Fundamental Principles.
- 11.3 Furthermore, again as already noted, the Team was of the view that we are still not being heard speaking up and speaking out, or taking an active part in debates on the key issues of the day that concern us. People outside the organisation are puzzled and disappointed about this. Within the Movement, there is a growing acceptance that the Principle of Impartiality, whilst of vital importance in conflict situations, should not be used to excuse or prevent us from speaking out on behalf of vulnerable people in a responsible and professional way when, from our experience, we have something important to say. Indeed, there are many who argue that we have a positive duty to do so.

11.4 The review team recommends that:

there should be a full review of the Federation's policy and strategy on humanitarian advocacy, conducted in close association with the ICRC, as part of the wider review of the Federation's communications strategy. The objective of the review should be to identify steps for the Federation, and its component parts, to take in order to fulfil its role as an organisation that mobilises the power of humanity in aid of vulnerable people.

12. Core area 2: Disaster Preparedness

- 12.1 Preparing for and responding to disasters (both natural and man-made) is, seen as our core role as a Federation. After the many years of experience, and the large number of disasters we have responded to, often with considerable skill, courage and effectiveness, we should expect to be able to confirm that success in this area has already been achieved.
- 12.2 *Strategy 2010* deals with Disaster Preparedness and Disaster Response as two separate topics. The Review Team formed the view, shared by several interlocutors, that a more integrated approach under the general heading of Disaster Management would be more appropriate, and that the Federation as a whole should tackle the issue in a more holistic way than it does now. There is a continuum that runs through from basic capacity and resilience-building at the

Success would look like this:

The Federation is distinguished from other organisations by the way it lives its values and principles, is known for standing on the side of vulnerable people and is successful in persuading other actors to change their behaviour. The phrase "mobilising the power of humanity" has real resonance for everyone in the Federation and outside.

Success would look like this:

The Federation is universally recognised as a leading authority, exponent and exemplar of the principles and practice of effective, integrated disaster preparedness, particularly at the community level.

community level, through risk reduction and early warning systems, to relief, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, and the Team felt that the Federation's current approach to this continuum was fragmented and in some respects simply out of date.

- 12.3** The Federation does have a policy on Disaster Preparedness, but it is now more than five years old. In 2001, the Secretariat published a checklist describing the characteristics of a “well-prepared National Society”, which provides a starting point for discussion and analysis. From the self-assessment questionnaire data, 75 percent of the National Societies which responded said that they had both national and local level plans for dealing with disasters. Eighty two percent of National Societies had a formal role vis a vis their governments in terms of emergency response. These figures suggest, however, that perhaps 20 per cent of countries have no, or no adequate, disaster plans, and the question arises whether the Secretariat may intervene in those countries to ensure that the National Society is properly prepared?
- 12.4** Adequate investment in disaster preparedness (fully integrated with other activities) can lead to huge reductions in impact, and in the cost of disaster response itself. At national and international level, the Team felt that we should be advocating strongly with governments for additional investment in training and education, pre-positioning of stocks and equipment, the early identification of particularly vulnerable groups for whom special plans need to be made, and for identifying particular risks that need to be managed and/or reduced. The Team found that the World Disasters Report is well received and respected; however, it should seek to inform policy formulation or practice development more actively within the Federation and outside.
- 12.5** Another key issue is the need for the Secretariat to be fully prepared, and to be able to scale up quickly and efficiently when disaster strikes, both nationally and internationally, and to sustain the response over several weeks or even months. Good preparation is vital here too. Recent evaluations of Federation responses to disasters suggest that co-ordinated scaling up is sometimes problematic and inadequate, and that more explicit scale up preparation strategies and plans are needed.
- 12.6** Effective response requires close co-operation between the Secretariat and National Societies, and between the National Societies themselves. The Review Team felt that greater efforts should be made to establish a core group of Disaster Response experts within the Secretariat and from National Societies who could be trained and brought together quickly in an emergency to manage the Federation's response. Initial efforts made by the Secretariat in this regard need to be reinforced. There needs to be close cooperation with the ICRC in terms of conflict preparedness and terrorism activity.

12.7 The review team recommends that:

- The Secretariat, working closely with a team of experienced National Society practitioners and external experts, should produce a new Federation strategy for Disaster Management, covering all aspects of the task of preparing for and responding to natural and man-made disasters (including conflict).
- As part of this task, there should be a general review of what we need to do as a Federation to assure an acceptable standard of risk-reduction and preparedness at national, regional and international level taking into account resources and economics of scale.
- In the light of that review, the Federation should undertake a sustained advocacy campaign to ensure that relevant partners help us take the necessary steps to achieve the required standard.
- The Secretariat should establish a core group of Disaster Response experts from around the world, who can be brought together quickly to manage large-scale responses.

13. Core area 3: disaster response

- 13.1** Most disasters happen and are responded to by individual National Societies at the country level. The Review Team was not able in the time available to gauge the adequacy of these responses, and of course the context changes from country to country. No National Society expressed major concerns about its capacity to respond to a local emergency, but the Team was not able to judge if this apparent confidence was misplaced.
- 13.2** The Federation, and several individual National Societies, have rightly been praised for the responses to particular major disasters. Amongst recent events, Gujarat and Bam attracted special praise, from both inside and outside the Movement, for the quality of the National Societies' work, and the effectiveness of the coordinated Federation assistance.
- 13.3** The ERU system seems to be a reasonably successful feature of some current operations, and the FACT teams have also attracted praise. Some developments at the regional level also look promising. The *Sphere Guidelines* and the *Red Cross Code of Conduct* are internationally recognised and provide a strong basis for cooperative activity.
- 13.4** But a review of the evaluations of several recent major disaster responses suggests that there is room for improvement. Indeed, there is evidence for the view that we may in some respects be less effective than we used to be, and that this is becoming evident to other actors in this increasingly competitive field. Protection is also increasingly becoming a major concern.
- 13.5** The Review Team heard reports of uncoordinated bilateral or even unilateral activity, of "host" National Societies being overrun and even ignored, of poor information gathering, weak assessments, muddles over the transition into recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, frustrations over leadership and decision-making or the lack of it. The Team gained a general sense that, each time there is a disaster, we have to reinvent the way we respond. All these issues suggest that we could do much better. If any of these things happened just once, it would be of concern. But they appear to happen time and time again.
- 13.6** This is not to deny that our responses have helped many people, nor that we have within our Movement some highly expert National Societies and individuals who bring great credit to our Federation, and to the cause of humanitarian endeavour. But the Team wondered if it could possibly be right that an organisation that regards itself, and asks others to regard it, as pre-eminent in this field of disaster response should be able to identify (for itself, let alone through the independent evaluations of others) so many things wrong in so many operations?
- 13.7** One of the most difficult developments to deal with is the issue of bilateral responses. National Societies with money and expertise at their disposal naturally want to help; often they are under great pressure to be seen to do so by their governments, supporters or national media. In such circumstances it takes a very strong, decisive and confident Secretariat with a good and timely plan to keep them within the fold of co-ordination. It also needs the Societies themselves to see that fitting within a co-ordinated response framework is likely to yield a better result for the beneficiaries than the chaos we have seen in the recent tsunami response, for example.

Success would look like this:

Our disaster preparedness and response activity at both international and local level makes a significant, timely, effective, specific and measurable contribution towards ensuring that the loss of life is minimized, basic needs of people affected by disasters are met in a well-coordinated and effective manner, and that a reasonable standard of life is restored as quickly as possible. Beneficiaries are satisfied with the help they receive from us, and other actors value our support.

- 13.8** The issue of respect for the host Society is also important. *Strategy 2010* stated quite explicitly that “one of the objectives of international relief operations supported by the International Federation will always be the building of member societies’ capacities to respond.” This is always stated as an intention, but interviewees suggested that we do not always live up to these expectations. The principle that the host National Society should always be in the lead unless and until it requests assistance from the Federation is often not respected.
- 13.9** And then there is the issue of leadership and management. Many have expressed regret that we appear to have lost key experienced experts in this field in the turmoil of recent years. Disaster response is a very specialist job that needs credible, confident, specialist expertise, and dedicated resources that can be mobilised very quickly – and preferably without bringing other key areas of work to a halt. Many National Societies and Secretariat staff are concerned that the Federation has lost capability, and that urgent action is needed to restore credibility and confidence.
- 13.10** Another area where many expressed their concerns to the Team was the transition from the initial response phase through recovery to rehabilitation and reconstruction. The Team heard evidence that, having been overrun immediately after the disaster by eager sister Societies keen to play their part in the response, host National Societies often feel abandoned thereafter. There appeared to the Team to be little sense of an agreed strategy for sustained Federation participation in dealing with the aftermath of a disaster in a timely fashion, when the host Society is often exhausted and depleted, expectations have been raised, and when the local community faces a long haul back to “normality”.
- 13.11** Finally, the Team found a widespread sense that we do not communicate adequately about our disaster response activity to the international media, at least not in comparison to other actors. The result is a sense of frustration that our story is not heard.

13.12 The review team recommends that:

- The proposed new Federation strategy for Disaster Management should also cover all phases of Disaster Response including recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, and the subsequent capacity-building where necessary of the host National Society.
- All National Societies should be asked to agree and confirm that (in the absence of host National Society capability) it is the role of the Secretariat to co-ordinate and manage the Federation’s response to a major disaster requiring international assistance, acting with and through the host National Society.
- The Secretariat needs to be resourced and equipped to perform this role effectively as soon as possible, in accordance with an agreed framework of minimum service standards and operating guidelines which all participants will be bound by, and with assistance from a team of National Society experts.
- Independent evaluations of all major disaster response operations should be undertaken, in real time where possible, and should be submitted to the Governing Board and circulated to all National Societies with proposals for action to be taken to correct any deficiencies.
- Due attention must be given to communications in our Disaster Response planning and management.

14. Core area 4: Health and care in the community

14.1 The Health section was in many respects the most difficult area of *Strategy 2010*, and the least satisfactory in terms of the strategic direction described. Based on the belief that it is for governments to meet the healthcare needs of their populations, the Strategy recommended a focus (if that is the right word) on work in the following priority areas:

- Practical and emotional support to vulnerable people in the community.
- First aid services and training.
- A gap-filling role when “the formal health system is unable to reach certain areas or groups or when it suddenly collapses in a disaster”.
- “Connecting the international and the local health communities”.

14.2 Almost all our interviewees (whilst recognising the difficulty of describing a strategy to fit the diverse health and social care activities of 181 National Societies) felt that this was inadequate as a coherent strategy. It fails to describe a core role or priorities for the Federation in this enormous field, perhaps linked in some way to our disaster response work, and it ignores several health and social care-related activities that many, if not most, National Societies are engaged with (e.g. blood, ambulances, immunisation, health promotion and disease prevention etc). Astonishingly, there is no reference to HIV/AIDS.

14.3 Many National Societies and, indeed, the Federation as a whole, make enormous contributions in the field of health and social care, and the Team felt that these need to be better recognised, better supported and drawn together in a meaningful and well-prioritised strategy. It is estimated that health care activities make up nearly 70 per cent of National Society activity. We need to articulate fully what we do (and why, in terms of added value), and how we do it.

14.4 So, in association with the Health Department, the Review Team commissioned a study, which comprised desktop research, interviews and questionnaires and visits to four National Societies. The study can be viewed on Fednet.

14.5 The findings of the study may be summarised as follows:

- Federation activity in the field of health care has been hindered by lack of resources, and poor understanding internally and externally of the Federation’s role.
- *Strategy 2010* is felt to have helped focus activities to strengthen community-based responses.
- A regional or sub-regional focus and support network is seen as helpful, and has been successful in some areas (eg *ARCHI 2010*).
- Partnerships with other actors are common, and National Societies frequently have close relations with Health Ministries (sometimes in pursuance of the “auxiliary” concept).
- Resource limitations have restricted Secretariat support, particularly in terms of capacity-building and funding.
- There is a high degree of donor-dependency, and a lack of effective marketing to potential donors. Sustainability is a problem.

Success would look like this:

The Federation is recognised as an effective provider and mobiliser of health and care to vulnerable individuals and communities affected by health emergencies or other disasters, or where there are gaps in public health provision.

- Visibility is an issue, and more effort is required to demonstrate outcome and impact, and relevance to the Millennium Development Goals.
- Activities in the field of HIV/AIDS are developing, but concern was expressed that these may overshadow other health priorities.
- It was noted that several “traditional” activities (e.g. blood, clinics and hospitals, ambulance services etc) receive little attention from the Secretariat. Many of them are not really focused on vulnerability as such.

14.6 The Review Team was struck with the idea that, in terms of sheer numbers and potential reach, the Federation is probably the largest single actor in the field of health care on the planet. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be reflected in reputation, or influence, nor indeed in a sense of impact at the local or international level. The Team felt that this was due mostly to the wide range and diversity, and the need for a better focus to the Federation’s health activities. There was also a lack of investment at the international level, poor promotion, and a failure to capitalise on our global network of expertise and experience.

14.7 Overall, the Review Team felt that the Federation was missing a substantial opportunity by not articulating a clear focus for its health care activities, and by failing to maximise on the potential of its vast network of expertise, and volunteers in local communities. With clarity of objectives at the international and regional levels, and greater integration of activities the Federation would be much better able to prioritise Secretariat support, co-ordinate the development of standards best practice guidelines and knowledge-sharing, attract funding partners and conduct effective advocacy and promotional campaigns. We would also have much more impact.

14.8 As the study pointed out, there is a serious anomaly in the fact that the Secretariat appears to ignore, in terms of the advice and support it offers, some very substantial health-related activities carried out by large numbers of National Societies. Nearly two-thirds of National Societies, for example, are involved in the collection and processing of blood and blood products, notwithstanding the recommendation from the Secretariat that this activity should be phased out. This activity carries considerable risk, and mistakes could adversely affect not only the National Society concerned, but the reputation of the entire Federation.

14.9 The review team recommends that:

- The Federation should define its core role and activities in the field of health care, and a strategy for Secretariat and peer support.
- The core role should be focused on health emergencies, and health issues in disaster situations (including first aid), HIV/AIDS, emerging global health issues or where there are gaps in public health provision.
- There should also be a mapping review of the health and social care activities (including public health education) of National Societies, with a view to identifying risks and support needs, and proposing policy changes where appropriate.
- There should be a framework of standards and good practice guidelines for all National Societies to follow.

15. Strategic direction 2: Well-functioning National Societies

- 15.1** The starting point for consideration of the second strategic direction has to be the linked questions of integrity, governance and management. More than one third (38 per cent) of National Societies in the self-assessment data reported having encountered integrity issues over the preceding five years, including violation of the Fundamental Principles or the Society's statutes, government interference, problems of financial management and accounting, or problems of individual integrity from governing board members or managers. Self Assessment data also finds that 41 per cent of National Societies reported having faced image problems in recent years – of whom only 46 per cent had been able to take corrective measures. There was no baseline established when *Strategy 2010* was adopted, so it is impossible to tell if the situation is improving or getting worse, and there were significant regional differences; in any case, whatever the trend may be, it could be argued that 38 per cent incidence of integrity issues and 41 per cent faced with image problems are bad enough.
- 15.2** Many Societies reported that the guidance document “Characteristics of a Well-functioning National Society” and the booklet of guidelines on National Society governance were very helpful in focusing governance and managers on the key issues, and the establishment of a Governing Board sub-committee to identify and give support to Societies facing problems is clearly a step in the right direction. But some would like to see stronger action taken to deal with Societies that fail to address difficulties within a reasonable time and to acknowledge those that have met the standards.
- 15.3** There is a general perception, not really borne out by the objective verifiable evidence, that the standard of both governance and management within the Federation family is improving slowly. Certainly, it is good to see Societies previously considered as being in the “recipient” group becoming stronger, and perhaps it is right to attribute that to the effectiveness of our capacity-building efforts. However, many respondents commented on their disappointment that the Federation did not have a more strategic approach to this key task or better engagement with the ICRC in this task and that we are still devoting insufficient time and attention to it.
- 15.4** Governance generally was also a topic for comment in its own right, and a view was commonly expressed that the Governing Board appeared weak and unfocused in its deliberations on key policies and strategies. There was discussion about the sheer volume of governance in the Federation at the local level, with some National Societies having hundreds of virtually autonomous committees and a question whether this made any sense at all for a supposedly dynamic, responsive and effective organisation – let alone one that espouses the principle of unity! Furthermore, in an increasingly competitive working environment the professionalism of senior management and introduction of modern management culture is critical for successfully delivering our mission.
- 15.5** There was much debate about the role, training, management, recruitment, cost, and retention of volunteers, whose service is one of the foundation stones of the movement, and as to whether we are making much progress towards the goal of “mobilising humanity” in a way that genuinely reflects the make-up of the population, as recommended in *Strategy 2010*. Many thought not. The Review Team recognised the enormous potential power of an organisation that could boast of having volunteers in nearly every community on earth, and wondered if we were doing enough to nurture and develop that force, particularly amongst young people.

Success would look like this:

Each National Society meets the success criteria and performance indicators for the four Core Areas, has growing resources, and credible, transparent and accountable governance and management. The Federation and its members are regarded as the partners of choice by governments, other civil society actors and international organisations, and by the communities we serve

- 15.6** Resource mobilisation (“the leading mistake/missed opportunity of the 1990s”, as *Strategy 2010* described it) is also still problematic for many National Societies. Both income generation and communications clearly need to be part of the strategic approach to capacity-building referred to above. The Secretariat also has difficulties with income generation: there is no guiding strategy, National Societies worry about the Secretariat competing with them, and some corporate partners to whom the Review Team spoke, told of a “frustrating and baffling experience” with the Federation after which they felt “bitter and used”.
- 15.7** *Strategy 2010* was curiously silent about the need to have a stable and well-functioning Secretariat. With confidence in the Secretariat, whether justifiably or not, declining over the last two or three years, one of the main tasks of *the Federation of the Future* exercise has been seen as achieving clarity over the role, functions and expectations of the Secretariat. A separate though linked piece of work to review budget architecture is also clearly necessary. There was acknowledgement that Secretariat staff members were highly committed and hardworking, and that a coherent human resource strategy was required to support and encourage them.
- 15.8** On the whole, the Review Team heard from most interviewees that the functions as described in the Strategy for Change were more or less right, and that what was needed was clarity around levels of service to “the customers” (ie National Societies), and cost. These matters are being considered elsewhere. But what is also necessary is for the Secretariat to feel confident enough to perform its leadership task, and for National Societies to allow it to do so.
- 15.9** In two areas, though, the Review Team did hear discordant voices, both connected to the role of regional delegations. There is a perception in some regions (though not shared by all) that, in their co-ordination and reporting activities, the delegations sometimes seem to act as a block on communications with Geneva and other National Societies. There was concern that in some respects they act almost as instruments of “quasi-colonial oppression”, and that their staff do not always have the skills or cultural sensitivity necessary for the job – particularly the key task of building the capacity of the weaker National Societies. If justified, the Team felt that this would be a damning criticism; it is clearly vital to understand and respond to the concerns as quickly as possible.
- 15.10** A possible way of addressing these concerns would be to look at ways of involving the National Societies more in the task of running the regional delegations, removing the universal suffrage for Governing Board members, and giving National Societies in each region the right to choose some or all of their own Board members.

15.11 The review team recommends that:

- There should be a review of the Federation’s CAS and capacity-building strategies, in order to ensure that resources in this area are put to best possible use.
- *The Federation of the Future* review should look at the issue of governance at all levels and make recommendations.
- The Secretariat, and many National Societies, should do more to recognize the centrality of well-supported voluntary service in the ethos of the Movement, and to develop policies and strategies that really do aim to “mobilize humanity” in the way envisaged by *Strategy 2010*, in all communities and generations.

- The Secretariat should develop, in association with National Societies, clear resource mobilisation and communications strategies for the Federation as a whole, and in terms of Secretariat support to National Societies.
- The Secretariat should develop standards of service in terms of its support activities to National Societies, and should send out a regular “customer satisfaction” questionnaire.
- The Secretariat should review the role, responsibilities, staff calibre and behaviours of regional and country delegations, in association with their “customers”, the National Societies.

16. Strategic direction 3: Working together effectively

- 16.1** In some ways, there is little more to say under the heading of this Strategic Direction. It has all been said. This is about our place in the world; living our vision, mission and values; delivering on our promise to mobilise humanity for the benefit of vulnerable people; making the words “tutti fratelli” come alive.
- 16.2** Unfortunately, many people expressed concern that we are not “acting as one” at the moment. As one workshop participant put it: “there is too much individual interest and not enough collective responsibility”. The Review Team was told by several interlocutors and potential partners that they wanted to see us working as one; they were not really interested in the various components of the Movement – indeed they found them confusing. Country presence is seen as strength, but not when it seems to get in the way of effectiveness.
- 16.3** In the relationship between so-called “Operating National Societies” and “Participating National Societies”, or “Donors” and “Recipients”, the Team felt that there is much to be done to create a better balance of power, influence and mutual respect. The Team heard worries that the relationship sometimes felt paternalistic, and lacking in trust and respect. However, there was also acknowledgement that this may sometimes be caused by legitimate concerns about capacity and integrity. Either way, the world is changing, and the Review Team recognised that this would inevitably require changes in our operating model. Overall, the Team felt that there should be some clear and agreed “Principles of Good Partnership”, which all should abide by.
- 16.4** Team members wondered if a greater willingness amongst National Societies to fund (and be funded by) other organisations might not create a healthy sense of competition and responsiveness to “the market”, and perhaps help reduce the sense of imbalance between “donors” and “recipients”. This issue is closely connected to that of capacity; in order to make such a behavioural change possible, the capacity of National Societies would need to be raised to a level that allows them to fundraise externally.
- 16.5** There was also discussion about how the Federation and the ICRC could be seen to work even more closely together, though it was acknowledged that there had been very significant progress here over the last five years. Both organisations recognised this, but the Team felt that there needed to be a stronger sense of the ICRC actively helping the Federation to achieve its objectives and vice versa. It is hoped that the reviews of the *Seville Agreement* and the *Strategy for the Movement* will produce a clearer enunciation of the principles underlying co-operation between the various components of the Movement.

Success would look like this:

Acting as one organisation, sharing the same values, and a sense of collective responsibility, and determined to maximise the full potential of our global reach and resources, in order to achieve the greatest impact for our beneficiaries, and the greatest influence on other actors. All National Societies are equally valued and respected as members of the worldwide Red Cross Red Crescent Movement.

16.6 But there is one more issue that needs to be tackled. It is the issue of difference. There are differences between us, differences of belief, and culture, and values, and race, and behaviour that sometimes seem to be forcing us apart.

16.7 These differences have sometimes meant that not all National Societies feel themselves to be part of the Red Cross Red Crescent family equally or individuals; that Societies that are richer, or bigger, or whiter, or whatever have felt a greater sense of “ownership” of our Federation than others; that sometimes we are partial in what we do or who we help, or in who we ask to help us. The Team believes that this is an issue that should be addressed openly, honestly and constructively. The Review Team discussed concerns that perhaps some of our core principles and strategies should be re-examined in order to ensure that they carry the same meaning and resonance in all cultures.

16.8 The review team makes no recommendations in this section. Instead, it poses a direct challenge to each of us:

In the early years of a new century, and during a troubled time in the history of our world, do we in the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement have the strength of purpose and the determination of spirit to ensure that the drumbeat of humanity, of dignity and equality, of trust and mutual respect is heard, if nowhere else, then at least here in this Movement of ours?

Part two

Performance framework

1. Implementing *Strategy 2010*

- 1.1 *Strategy 2010* said relatively little about implementation. The Strategy was intended to become “a shared framework for planning at the different levels of the Federation”, and the Secretariat was to develop a “Federation-wide evaluation system” to show “measurable progress in all core areas and in the process of achieving the characteristics of a well functioning National Society”.
- 1.2 As has been noted, the Strategy has been acknowledged by many National Societies as the basis for their strategic planning activities, but the evaluation system has yet to be fully developed and recommendations from evaluations and self assessments already done are not fully utilised.
- 1.3 A table of “expected results” was set out in *Strategy 2010*, but it was quite inward-looking, and didn’t really describe what success would look like, nor how we would recognise it.

2. Establishing a framework for achieving our goals

- 2.1 The *Strategy 2010* Mid-term Review Team has sought to produce a framework to help the Federation achieve the goals set out in the Strategy. We have tried to keep the framework realistic, so that it can easily be used as a tool at both international, regional and national levels.
- 2.2 The intention is that the Secretariat should use the framework to produce an annual report to the Governing Board outlining progress, and that the Board should produce a report to the General Assembly describing the impact we are making as a Federation in terms of the objectives we have set ourselves.
- 2.3 We could also use the framework to report to stakeholders on our activities and the difference we are making, and potentially to benchmark ourselves against other organisations.

3. Describing the framework

- 3.1 The framework is based broadly on the descriptions of what success would look like set out at the top of each main section of part one of the review.

- 3.2 For each success description, the Team has tried to identify two or three key indicators, which will tell us how much progress we are making.
- 3.3 The Secretariat will need to collect information through questionnaires, surveys etc to establish the position each year (or other interval).
- 3.4 Working out the right indicators is vital, and it is essential to make them as simple and easy to measure as possible - otherwise we will all drown in useless data, and be no wiser about our progress! The indicators in this paper are suggestions only, and it is likely that more work will be needed to get them absolutely right.

4. Assumptions

- 4.1 That all National Societies will be prepared to commit themselves to implementing *Strategy 2010*, and to assisting with the process of monitoring and reporting on progress.
- 4.2 That future strategies and plans produced by the Secretariat will describe how they contribute to the objectives of *Strategy 2010*.
- 4.3 That a simple process for collecting and reporting on progress will be developed by the Secretariat and must be validated by independent evaluations.
- 4.4 That the Governing Board will hold the Secretariat and National Societies accountable for performance in the implementation of the Strategy.
- 4.5 That the Secretariat will be empowered and resourced to mobilise supportive and/or corrective action.

5. The framework

5.1 “Responsive to local vulnerability”

Success would look like this:

Every National Society has identified and defined the main vulnerable groups and their capacity to withstand natural and man-made emergencies and other major health threats – and has adjusted its services and activities accordingly.

Performance indicators:

- Number of National Societies that have developed their national plans based on VCA. (Source of information: self assessment system).
- Resource allocation changed as a result.
- Increased impact on beneficiaries.

5.2 “Mobilising the Power of Humanity”

Success would look like this:

The Federation is influencing the actions of others, recruiting more volunteers and supporters, and raising more money.

Performance indicators:

- Evidence of policy change through Federation advocacy.
- Increase in number and diversity of volunteers and supporters, and in their satisfaction with their involvement in the Movement.
- Increase in available resources.

5.3 Promotion of the Movement’s Fundamental Principles and humanitarian values

Success would look like this:

The Federation is distinguished from other organisations by the way it lives its values and principles, is known for standing on the side of vulnerable people and is successful in persuading other actors to change their behaviour. The phrase “mobilising the power of humanity” has real resonance for everyone in the Federation and outside

Performance indicators:

- Survey evidence of behaviour change within the Federation.
- Public recognition that the Federation and its members live by the Fundamental Principles, and the Federation’s humanitarian values.
- Survey evidence of increasing tolerance, acceptance of humanitarian values, and knowledge of Fundamental Principles of the public.

5.4 Disaster management

Success would look like this:

The Federation is universally recognised as a leading authority, exponent and exemplar of the principles and practice of effective, integrated, disaster preparedness, particularly at the community level; we make a timely, effective, and measurable contribution towards ensuring that the loss of life is minimized, basic needs of people affected by disasters are met in a well-coordinated manner, and a reasonable standard of life is restored as quickly as possible. Beneficiaries are satisfied with the help they receive from us, and other actors value our support.

Performance indicators:

- National authorities and other actors recognise the Federation as an expert in Disaster Management.
- The basic needs of all people affected by a disaster are met.
- There are no long queues, disease outbreaks or security issues.
- Reasonable living standards are restored quickly.
- Beneficiaries are satisfied.

5.5. Health and care in the community

Success would look like this:

The Federation is recognised as an effective provider and mobiliser of health and care to vulnerable individuals and communities affected by health emergencies or other disasters, or where there are gaps in public health provision.

Performance indicators:

- Authorities and the public recognise the Federation's role in health care.
- Community resilience increases.

5.6 Well-functioning National Societies

Success would look like this:

Each National Society meets the success criteria and performance indicators for the four Core Areas, has growing resources (including volunteers), and credible, transparent and accountable governance and management. The Federation and its members are regarded as the partners of choice by governments, other civil society actors and international organisations, and by the communities we serve.

Performance indicators:

- All National Societies satisfy the requirements for a well-functioning National Society.
- The Secretariat receives positive feedback from its customer satisfaction survey.
- Secretariat and National Societies are regarded as a partner of choice.

5.7 Working together effectively

Success would look like this:

Acting as one organisation, sharing the same values, and sense of collective responsibility and determined to maximise the full potential of our global reach and resources, in order to achieve the greatest impact for our beneficiaries, and the greatest influence on other actors. All National Societies are equally valued and respected as members of the worldwide Red Cross Red Crescent Movement.

Performance indicators:

- The Red Cross Red Crescent Movement is seen as the world's most effective humanitarian organisation.

Part three

Case studies

Argentina

Mobilising the Power of Humanity through advocacy

This is the story of how the Argentina Red Cross Society (ARCS) acted on opportunities, strategically managed dilemmas (not without apprehension), followed its strategic plan which focused on developing local community capacity-and to this, add leadership and calculated risk taking.

As Argentina's economic crisis advanced, it hit hard the already poor and underdeveloped provinces in the north, affecting thousands of people. The crisis especially impacted those most vulnerable-children under the age of six-but no hard data existed to actually verify the impact of the social crisis on them. ECHO (the humanitarian arm of the European Union) approached ARCS wanting to provide funding for activities in the north. However ECHO was restricted from giving funds unless data could be collected showing a direct correlation with the social crisis. A study was ultimately funded by channelling funds through the German Red Cross. This confronted ARCS with the first of several dilemmas: should they involve the government or not in the study? This was an election year and ARCS worried that an unpopular government might try to skew the data by soliciting individuals within communities to not respond or to respond inaccurately. The decision was taken not to involve the government because the message would ultimately be stronger if ARCS delivered it.

Once ARCS committed itself to the study, it hired a coordinator and assigned additional staff. UNICEF, the Ministry of Health (MOH) Mother and Child programme and other experts assisted to define the study parameters. ARCS volunteers actually collected the data, but the data analysis was undertaken by external consultants. The survey results soundly documented malnutrition among children under six years of age-but the malnutrition originated before the crisis-and was not a result or impact of the crisis! The immediate impact was that ARCS could not receive funds from ECHO because ECHO only funded humanitarian crises-not pre-existing situations. The impetus then changed to using the study for advocacy, which wasn't the original intent, but as Secretary General Ariel Kestens stated "it came to that." Advocacy was in the strategic plan and this provided the opportunity.

The key challenges ARCS faced at this point were internal Secretary General Kestens recalled: "Were we ready to use the power of ARCS on this? We needed to convince ourselves that we were ready and prepared to do advocacy. Were we the best ones to do this? Did we really know what we are talking about? Could we make a difference? Advocacy was in our strategic plan, but did this 'fit' our focus (the answer was 'yes'). Then, we needed to convince ourselves and the governance that we were prepared to advocate."

"This was a key moment in time," according to the Secretary General. "There was no clear moment that this group of elements all came together, but it did. Once we made that

decision, it was clear what we needed to do." ARCS sent 500 to 600 copies of the study to every "MOH office, including those in the northern provinces, embassies, enterprises, newspapers, NGOs, local government." But nothing happened. "We received no more than a couple of polite responses." Five weeks later, the MOH held a meeting with doctors on the social crisis along with other organizations working in health. While the meeting excluded ARCS, it did include a reporter from 'La Nacions'-the country's largest newspaper. Learning of ARCS' report at the meeting, she came to ARCS' offices. For half a day, ARCS reviewed the results of the study with her. The next day, it was on the front page of the newspaper, and for the next week, every TV channel and newspaper reported what ARCS had done. The conclusions of the study grew into a big debate by everyone in Argentina. "We were very careful not to go against the government or the MOH in this public debate. Our view was, let's work together."

The Secretary General "advises being prepared to speak and also having the elements and tools to do so. Know the key people to influence, maintain a data base, and know what you are talking about. We did not do anything that is not in basic advocacy handbooks." The best impact? "Drawings and letters received from children who have benefited from the resulting programmes."

Iran

Every disaster response operation is an opportunity for learning

Mostafa Mohaghegh¹ can still vividly recall the outstanding images from 26th December 2003, when an earthquake devastated the city of Bam, Iran, and its surrounding villages. "The shocking scene of destruction, thousands dead and the injured needing help." The thousands of volunteers helping he calls 'the beautiful side of a long story.' Then there was the "spirit of assistance"-the thousands of private emails and funds received from young and old around the world and the international teams from everywhere that "gave us encouragement."

What stands out regarding the emergency response in Bam is that order was maintained, there were no looting or food riots and no disease outbreaks; and medical facilities were quickly deployed. Independent reviews have noted that the response and cooperation between the Iranian authorities, Iranian Red Crescent Society (IRCS) and the international community was swift and exemplary. Still, every emergency response provides an opportunity to assess and share learning to minimize future loss of lives and corresponding vulnerability.

Strengths in this disaster are weighted on the side of preparation. These strengths included a strong, decentralized IRCS branch capacity. Within minutes of the quake, the IRCS launched a massive rescue and relief operation; within two hours, the first IRCS teams arrived from neighboring areas. The IRCS reserve food and non food capacity covered basic needs for four days until international aid was mobilized, which meant everybody had a tent and a blanket, which was called "remarkable". The IRCS deployed 8,500 volunteers specially trained in disaster relief and response. And critically, in May 2003, legislation had been passed giving the IRCS the lead role in disaster response. While role conflict issues did emerge in a limited scale, it was mainly attributed to lack of time for everyone to entirely operationalize their responsibilities by the time the earthquake struck in December.

1 - At the time director of IRCS international affairs, currently operations coordinator, Operations Support Department, IFRC Secretariat.

Direct and immediate communication between the IRCS and the IFRC Geneva Secretariat led to timely and coordinated actions. Based upon a rapid needs assessment undertaken by the IRCS, the Federation launched a preliminary appeal by 6:00 pm on the day of the quake. On 6th January 2004, the Federation coordinated and launched its main appeal jointly with the UN flash appeal, being the first such joint launch ever.

The response from every body in particular from Iranian people and from Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement was very strong and timely. When the international community did gear up, the volume of relief teams and goods were beyond the storage capacity in the affected areas. Ultimately, unneeded teams were requested not to be sent and the items received were piled up. International relief and recovery pledges totaled one billion dollars but less than 20 million dollars was actually received. This led to some challenges such as high beneficiary expectations and communication and reporting problems.

Information management and also relations with the media are at the core of a perpetual emergency response dilemma-without providing communication and information management from the first moments of the emergency-nothing happens. But taking the time to 'feed' the media (whether national, international or donor) may look conflicting with priorities on the ground to save lives and set up an infrastructure for services. In the Bam operation, an IRCS international section was designated which coordinated the international response. Language capacity can be the 'forgotten' specialty but an effective coordinated international response depends upon it.

Mostafa emphatically calls volunteers "the major asset of the Red Crescent-Red Cross. It takes experiencing an emergency to know how to manage an emergency. Do whatever it takes to keep your experienced people." And "if you don't have a national disaster management plan that clearly specifies your National Society role, then advocate and get one!"

Mostafa's personal learnings after a year's reflection is that "the National Society should be well in the picture. Listen, look, learn, and then teach to be better prepared for future disasters."

South Africa

The hard work of resource mobilisation

When the South Africa Red Cross Society (SARCS) launched a systematic transformation process in 2002, it identified external relations and resource mobilization including fund-raising as a high priority. Since funding means securing the public trust, all financial matters must meet the highest standards and be visibly transparent. Over the years, however, this wasn't always the case in SARCS. A sense of crisis existed because resource mobilization had been so neglected and the accountability systems-the corresponding administrative and financial management procedures, systems and structures-simply did not exist or were weak. A further complication was that fundraising could only be done at the regional or provincial level with the national office excluded from influencing these strategies.

The Red Cross has been represented in South Africa since 1869. However, it was only in April 1994 that free and democratic elections were held in which Nelson Mandela and the Black majority voted for the first time. In 2000 and 2001 SARCS prioritized rebuilding and restructuring to make SARCS truly representative of the country's diverse population-which, in turn, brings its own complexity and challenges. In a complex National Society such as SARCS, building consensus for action can take time. Resource mobilization requires *wanting* to change and on-going commitment at *all* levels is crucial.

To begin this process, SARCS first actions involved hiring an external consultant experienced in resource mobilization and gathering data upon which to make decisions. A comprehensive stakeholder assessment asked SARCS stakeholders for their views on SARCS along with SARCS 'internal readiness' to take on this challenge. The mixed response among board members, staff and volunteers and provincial/regional offices highlighted the difficulty of gaining consensus on a country wide resource mobilization strategy and in building an integrated organisational fundraising culture. Since it takes the whole team to raise money—from staff to the Board to branches, each supporting the other, significant emphasis has been placed on internal communication and building trust, through trainings, consultative sessions and the development of SARCS own in-house Resource Mobilisation, Fundraising and External Relations handbook.

Resource mobilization has been called "humbling". It takes hard work in which results are rarely immediate but slowly emerge three years or more after beginning a serious effort. The foundation of an effective programme begins with relationship development or 'friendship-raising'. SARCS took on this effort by diligently courting the Ministry of Health, provincial and local governments to establish good relationships. It updated its statutes to better comply with national laws, all the while keeping officials informed. These actions resulted in contracts for disaster management preparation, health and HIV/AIDS, all of which are core areas of work for SARCS at national, provincial and district levels. However, the relationship development must continue for long term sustainability.

A key SARCS learning as it has restructured, is that too many assessments, in too many areas (HR, governance, etc.) can be difficult to absorb or cope with as the number of recommendations for action can become overwhelming. It may be better to pace the assessments and prioritize actions realizing that development in *all* the areas will ultimately be needed for effective resource mobilization.

SARCS hard work was tested by its success of raising a targeted goal of ZAR 10 million within two weeks for the Tsunami Appeal. This has never happened before in any disaster appeal. Because SARCS had done its homework, the government recommended that all contributions (corporate and individual) were to be channeled thru SARCS. According to Secretary General Leslie Mondo, this has significantly raised SARCS profile in the media and throughout South Africa. "People did not understand how *our* country profile was different from the Federation's—now they do. The next 3 to 4 months will be critical for us to use this heightened visibility to take things forward for the medium and long term mobilization." That very afternoon the SARCS staff was meeting to develop a strategy for how to build and carry the momentum forward. That's progress.

Bangladesh

Using the fundamental principles for peace

The conflict in the Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT) began in 1972 based upon religious, political and ethnic lines, between tribal groups and Bengalis settlers. Until the peace accord was signed in 1997, thousands of families became refugees or internally displaced. Upon their return, the Bangladesh Red Crescent Society (BDRCS) provided relief to the returnees, among them former combatants and their families.

In 1999, BDRCS and the communities engaged in a conflict resolution process ultimately based upon the 'Better Programming Initiative' (BPI) which sought to reinforce the fragile peace agreement by taking into account the needs and the aspirations of the local people. The challenge was to reduce the deep-seated mistrust and discrimination between the tribal groups and Bengali settlers along with reducing the real impact of the disaster among all the groups.

Using the BDRCS as the main agency/moderator, the CHT Development programme is based on the premise that if basic local needs could be collectively identified by them and addressed—water, sanitation, health, income, links with government institutions and NGOs—then there would be a reduction in tension and less potential for future conflict. What the BDRCS became through the BPI process was a bridge—the point through which communities could have a dialogue.

A strategic component of BPI asks communities to collectively analyze 'dividers and connectors', those factors that either contribute to conflict or to peace. The process also asked BDRCS to assess whether the aid they were delivering was contributing to problems. A basic assumption of the BPI is that traditional relief programmes aggravate inequity tensions and that agencies are unaware whether the impact of aid has a positive or negative impact on the community. In CHT, connectors were identified with basic services, democratic processes, respect for tradition, and a strong desire for peace. The BDRCS could work with these issues. The dividers were more difficult as many were outside BDRCS control, such as who has access to land, and religious issues between buddhists and muslims. However, these dividers became less strong as connectors became more emphasized and resolved.

The means to implement these programmes, the programme strategy, was the Federation's Fundamental Principles. BDRCS had to overcome accusations of favouritism and exacerbating tensions through the very services they were providing, by strictly adhering to and demonstrating impartiality, neutrality, independence. As one BDRCS volunteer noted "it is one thing to profess the principles, but we had to demonstrate that we were not showing any partiality in choosing beneficiaries."

Challenges were numerous as the BDRCS learned how to make the 'principles come alive' and also to manage everyday realities, such as whenever peace talks did break down, there was a distinct increase in tension in the region.

Lessons learned by the BDRCS were many. A key lesson had to do with being able to ensure health, clean water, hygiene, and a livelihood to all as a strong connector, which reduces tension. Another involved doing the 'connectors and dividers' exercise on an on-going basis to keep a 'pulse' on what is really going on in the communities.

Finally, a major learning was that you've got to be able to articulate the Principles to yourself and to the communities themselves. BDRCS staff were initially seen as outsiders and mistrusted, but emphasis in word and actions, including workshops, on the Fundamental Principles, ultimately gained the trust of the community. Bijoy Patro, Regional Humanitarian Values Coordinator noted "community members remember every detail of the dissemination workshop on the Fundamental Principles. Think about that."

Costa Rica

Mobilizing communities and the region for disaster preparedness

The Costa Rican Red Cross (CRRC) didn't initially focus on community based disaster management education (CBDM). However, in a little less than 10 years, CRRC has taken one project focusing on training rural communities in disaster preparedness to an expanded regional training programme with seven other sister societies called "Major es Prevenir" (Is Better to Prevent), to creating the first national office which focuses specifically on CBDM, to being designated in 2003 as the home base for the Central American Community Based Disaster Reference Center.

The aim of the Centre is to create community training models for Central America in community based disaster management, focusing on the most vulnerable in the region to reduce their risk. The foundation for the training is community based vulnerability and capacity assessments (VCA). The Centre's goal is to design the modules by working with National Societies to share their experiences and lessons learned in order to develop better and improved disaster management methodologies. Sharing and consolidating lessons learned has numerous benefits for a region that in any one year, can suffer dozens of disasters which typically have a devastating impact on the region's vulnerable populations.

However, community work is specialized and is as much an 'art' as it is a science or technique (just as not everyone is appropriate for search and rescue). Creating regional CBDM training modules necessitates active participation, consultation and agreement by all partners. The materials must fit unique community needs within the region, requiring adaptation to the situation and cultures of each country. Volunteer capacity, literacy, gender, and the style and language used, among many other factors, must also be taken into account.

'Thinking differently' is also required. The Regional Delegation had to rethink its role in the region, putting more direct effort into National Society development. For the CRRC, their challenge was to think *regionally*, rather than nationally, which also necessitated different behaviours from within the CRRC. Jose Bonilla, Head of the Centre, states "it changed our vision; national is important, but now we needed to think *regional* needs." The CRRC Governing Board had to adapt and agree to accept the additional administrative responsibilities involved. Finally, the National Societies in the region had to think differently about the lead role of the CRRC and agree to accept the Centre to provide training services to them in CBDM.

One of Jose's first actions in seeking common ownership was to call together all the National Societies to give them an opportunity to state how they saw the Centre as a "benefit for all." The presidents of all the National Societies during their annual meeting in July 2003 were given another chance to provide input and decide on their participation. The third key action was to invite all the involved National Societies to support and provide input into respective training modules. Internships' established by the Centre includes an exchange programme between National Societies in the region so as to better understand each other's reality and facilitate an improved approach to disaster management in communities other than their own.

A challenge is the lack of consistent follow-up among National Societies, with differing people attending meetings, not aware of prior discussions and agreements. This issue is being addressed by encouraging each National Society to identify a consistent focal point, which is being done.

Benefits are still emerging. The Centre has worked hard on harmonizing materials among the differing countries by bringing together technical people from each National Society to solve differing National Society approaches. An immediate benefit is everyone 'talking the same language at meetings'. In the recent Dominican Republic floods, the Centre's approach was tested. Four facilitators, each from a different National Society, coordinated with the Centre, to develop VCAs with the communities involved. The resulting plan was accepted by the Dominican Republic Red Cross. Jose notes that "the best part of this was seeing the local communities realize they can transform and influence decisions about their lives."

Mozambique

Capacity building for greater benefit to vulnerable people

Think about the challenges a young National Society might face when confronted with armed conflict to post conflict transition issues in an unusually natural disaster prone country (droughts, floods, cyclones and epidemics) while *also* being one of the poorest countries of the world. Include the additional challenges of Society programme management being heavily supported by delegates during the war resulting in minimal national ownership. Then severely cut the staff as external support diminished following the war and a drought emergency. After that, give the MRCS a strong message that the Society had to change as its credibility had been seriously eroded. Then add serious flooding. Mrs. Fernanda Teixeira, Secretary General since 1998 describes this post war period "as hard and painful."

Despite these tough challenges, over the past 15 years the Mozambique Red Cross Society (MRCS) has made tremendous strides in developing its capacity (a planned change process to strengthen its organizational systems and services) and has given high and uninterrupted attention to this. These events also significantly influenced how MRCS viewed its capacity building efforts—that they had to be based upon credibility and ownership.

With external assistance² the MRCS conducted a base line survey of society activities in every province that resulted in a report that was ruthlessly honest about the need for change and restructuring. Senior management developed an action plan that its board endorsed, including a national workshop which brought together board members, provincial representatives, staff and volunteers. All key areas of society functioning (management, finance, volunteers, etc.) were analyzed for weaknesses. Following this, small groups of senior staff and board members visited each province over the next several months to assess and make recommendations on personnel, activities and priorities. During this time, the Norwegian Red Cross Society (NRCS) provided significant funding, delegates and specific trainings based upon identified needs from the workshop.

As this work was proceeding, the MRCS concurrently developed a vision and 5 year strategic plan. The impact of this plan was to fundamentally change the MRCS focus from an emergency to a development organization; and the programme emphasis from working for the community to working *with* it. This necessitated a major attitudinal shift for both MRCS and for the communities who were used to being beneficiaries.

What kept the MRCS going during this challenging time period? The stability of the management team, combined with very good support from the Board and the sharing of a common vision. This, along with NRCS providing flexible support and technical assistance contributed greatly to MRCS' stability and progress.

Mrs. Teixeira advises other National Societies to have the courage to "be open and to not be afraid to recognize mistakes or admit weaknesses." She re-emphasizes the crucial need to involve everyone, from bottom to top. As a tool, she found the *Characteristics of a Well-Functioning National Society* very, very useful. Mrs. Teixeira also underscores "the importance of partner continuity over the long time it takes for a Society capacity to develop." The MRCS is not yet self supporting, but is working toward that goal

"Today" Mrs. Teixeira emphatically states "we know we are making a difference. We have credibility-people believe and support us. Volunteers are joining. Contributions are being received. Our priority is to meet the needs of communities." The voice of MRCS is now respected by the communities and the government "because it expresses *their* need."

Spain Giving youth a voice

The Spanish Red Cross (CRE) has more than 50,000 youth volunteers, many of whom have 'grown up' with the CRE. A child as young as age eight may attend a CRE programme run by youth volunteers such as after school day care. Or as an immigrant child, receive tutoring. Parents rely on CRE for its organized programmes for youth of all ages. Combine this with CRE having good relationships with schools and that the CRE receives overwhelmingly good publicity, it should be no surprise that CRE is perceived as the logical organization for youth volunteers to join. But "friends talking to friends about the CRE and their volunteer work is our best way to recruit new volunteers" according to Carlos Montes, CRE Youth President.

It also helps that the CRE has built a reputation for consistently delivering quality programmes. Since government funds are received for many of the programmes, CRE does continuous evaluations to improve the programmes and has a quality control system for grants that the young volunteers must respect. CRE also receives funds from the corporate sector both nationally and locally. Since their names are associated with the programming, they also expect professionalism. As a result CRE youth volunteers learn an early and important lesson in stakeholder accountability.

Carlos notes that "when young volunteers first begin, they only want to work on a project." This lasts about six months to a year. Then, as a result of working on the project, they see the opportunity for doing more -such as identifying new problems and developing a project to meet that need. They also see other youth volunteers in leadership positions. "At that point they want to do more." Youth involvement in decision making evolved over time as CRE discovered that more than a simple youth project, the projects themselves could be used as a means to improve and broaden the perspectives of the young volunteers themselves.

What the CRE strives to do is to create a space for youth to speak out and to act. "This is our foundation for youth volunteer management" remarks Carlos. For example, CRE youth identified youth and gender violence prevention as a priority issue because of the impact on young people. An ad hoc commission developed a manual and a programme to take action on the issue, which is now recognized as a country priority too. Other CRE youth volunteers are active in human rights, working with UNICEF to learn how to have a global impact.

The CRE, through its peer-to-peer approach in local communities, is another way CRE contributes to strengthening civil society. Whether in schools or on the streets, CRE youth ensure that other youth get the right information on drug or alcohol consequences, on safe sex, eating healthy food, or on environmental protection and other key issues that impact upon them.

Typical challenges include keeping volunteers once trained, and competing time commitments for school and work activities. CRE manages these challenges by developing interesting programmes that allows youths to be with their friends. Encouraging their involvement in decision making has the added value of creating buy-in. CRE youth volunteers benefit in numerous ways depending upon the volunteer, from acquiring skills, to developing a work ethic, to learning how to solve real life problems, to managing and leading their peers, or how to make a global difference.

CRE has developed an organizational structure that allows youth their autonomy but is well integrated within the overall CRE structure. The youth and adult structures are parallel but a strong, intergenerational link is made between them at each level. Each local board has representatives from the youth section and the branch leader must endorse selected youth leaders. This allows experienced adults to provide support and guidance. Since many of the CRE adults began their involvement in the youth section, they know how important it is to grow and 'feed' it. "Youth need to talk and work with senior staff or volunteers. They just can't work alone. This is very important as we must all work together," says Carlos. Carlos, who is 27, must resign at age 30, but as with many youth volunteers, he intends to transition to the adult CRE because "there is still a good deal to be done."

France A new red cross front line

The French Red Cross Society (FRCS) envisions a new kind of Red Cross professional where the front line is considered to be in disadvantaged and neglected urban areas, proactively addressing issues of social inequity and exclusion. Through its *Urban Moderators (UM) Programme*, young professionals are recruited from the housing projects to promote RC services and provide mediation services³ between residents and public and private services in the city-while gaining professional experience in their first paid jobs. Why do this? To the FRCS "the reason is self evident. This is where tens of thousands of families in distress are to be found. This is exactly where we belong. Acting on the RC Principles and Values *should* mean pro-actively advocating and addressing issues of social disadvantage without discrimination."

Xavier Humbert, assistant to the social welfare Head of Unit, acknowledges that there are widespread differences in desire and will in France to address these issues. He notes that "one of the key objectives of the project is to elevate national understanding of the issues involved and then to 'push down' this understanding through action into communities. From within the FRCS itself this will require changing the long term perspective and mentality of how the FRCS works in urban areas."

While the programme was initiated in 1999 it is still considered to be in its pilot phase. Mr. Humbert forthrightly states "results have been mixed. Every local branch is responsible for its own implementation and the programme can be managed very differently. A key planning consideration (and learning) is to consider how the French Red Cross headquarters intends to maintain good communication and ensure global consultation with local branches and those involved with the programme. Our intent is to complement the work of the various agencies already assisting in these areas and to not duplicate or offer competing services."

Implementation brings other challenges. "Reach out is a challenge because of the background of the communities and background of the more traditional Red Cross volunteers. Sometimes this can result in misunderstandings between volunteers and the Urban Moderators. In some branches Red Cross membership acceptance can take time. And simply reaching out to meet across cultures can be a challenge, as for example in Muslim societies it is essential that women reach out to women."

To address these issues, branch project teams are balanced between traditional volunteers and paid staff. The paid staff, along with a specially designated 'reference person', becomes

3 - In France the term social mediation is also used to refer to restoring the links between inhabitants, institutions and society, and fostering the contacts between different communities. This is not to be confused with mediation in the legal sense of the term.

the critical link between the Red Cross volunteers and the young UM. This reference point provides guidance to the UM, assures his or her integration into the department, determines that plans and activities proposed by the UM are based upon solid needs assessment, and that the UM and the FRCS can meet quality implementation standards. Additionally, each UM is put through obligatory Red Cross training to ensure knowledge of the movement and understanding of the Principles and Values and job specific training.

The beneficiaries are multiple in this programme. They include those who receive services and the Urban Moderators themselves who gain professional skills and training. Myriam, 22 years, believes that being an UM has helped her to discover herself while helping others. "I feel useful, metamorphosed." For Pascal, age 28, "being an UM has given me confidence." The biggest beneficiary is itself, which the FRCS readily acknowledges. The FRCS gains national visibility and a cadre of volunteers who are learning how to bridge France's multicultural society. Additionally, as a result of facilitating the integration of young people from a multicultural background into the FRCS, the FRCS is creating a new kind of Red Cross professional.

Nepal The meaning of partnership

The Nepal Red Cross Society (NRCS) is the largest humanitarian organization in Nepal with partnerships that span the UN and international organizations, numerous National Societies, and relevant government departments. Since 1996, the country has been embroiled in an internal conflict in which Maoist rebels are fighting against the current political system. As a result, most districts in the country are conflict affected. NRCS, by maintaining neutrality, has been able to continue to work through-out the country.

Over the past 20 years, the concept of partnership within the Federation has been interpreted in many ways with the dawning realization that 'partnership', meaning equity in the relationship, is often difficult to realize in practice. There is the sense that money is considered the most important resource, and that local capacity, knowledge, staff and volunteers, access to communities and authorities is not recognized nor leveraged by National Societies as an equally important commodity.

In 2003, the NRCS initiated a detailed Cooperative Agreement Strategy (CAS) process. The overall aim of the CAS is to develop a framework for effective partnership with shared ownership of responsibilities among and between partners both inside and outside the Movement. Within this process, partnership has been explored from the NRCS perspective as well as partners' themselves with the goal to arrive at common understanding.

"Partnerships do not mean you giving and us taking-it is about what needs exist and how we work together to provide for these needs," stated Mr. Dhakhwa, NRCS Secretary General. "Partnerships must adhere to our strategies and partnerships must be on equal footing. Essential components of this include first having your own vision and development plan and that the partnership be based upon your needs and plans."

A basic partnership premise is to agree on principles for the partnership and methodologies from the point of view of both the donor and the partner. "Remember," Mr. Dhakhwa notes "the reason for mutual advantage is to reach a common target for meeting the needs of the vulnerable." The NRCS believes that this emerging concept of mutuality has resulted in NRCS negotiating more in its own interest than it has previously.

Additionally, because of the country situation, NRCS partners must adhere to the Federation Principles. "They provide added value, support, and common ground. There is

no compromise on these" the Secretary General adamantly states. Partner funding has been rejected when not in agreement with these principles. "We have had to be very clear with partners that their actions must be within these limits. Therefore partners must understand the Principles and know how to act neutral and impartial and follow the NGO Code of Conduct."

A learning and a reality is that partnerships are actually complicated to implement in practice. A major NRCS challenge, with its sheer number of diverse partner relationships, is that each has its own accounting, reporting, and audit systems to ensure upward accountability. The NRCS has been working with its partners as part of the CAS process to come up with a common reporting system. To do this, the NRCS asks what is more practical and common, most acceptable and agreeable to all. However some question as to whether western management approaches and procedures, which are a predominant partner preference, reinforce donor domination rather than shared learning and whether these approaches are inappropriate to the social and institutional context in Nepal⁴.

Overall, the NRCS is noted for its openness to partners, and its ability to manage and nurture its partner relationships, which are considered important reasons for the high number, as well as long duration, of many of NRCS partnerships. "We must have an open mind" commented Mr. Dhakhawa "there is much common ground that we can share with humanity, both here and internationally."

4 - Discussion Paper, Partnerships or Skewed Power Relationships: Can The Balance Be Restored? Reflections on Movement Relationships in Nepal, April 2004.

Appendix one

Participants in the review

Review team

- Sir Nicholas Young, Chief Executive Officer – British Red Cross (Team Leader)
- Mrs. Geri Lau, Secretary General – Singapore Red Cross
- Mrs. Kristiina Kumpula, Secretary General – Finnish Red Cross
- Mr. Alphonse Kalinganire, Secretary General – Rwanda Red Cross.

Steering committee members

- Mr. Wolfgang Kopetzky, Secretary General - Austrian Red Cross (Chair) and members:
- Mr. Chrystold Chetty, Honorary President - Seychelles Red Cross
- Mrs. Geri Lau, Secretary General - Singapore Red Cross
- Mr. Mouhamed Ben Ghanem Al-Ali, General Manager - Qatar Red Crescent
- Mrs. Nivea Garcia de Meerhoff, President - Uruguay Red Cross
- Mrs. Razia Essack-Kauaria, member of the Governing Board, Namibia
- Mrs. Zoy Katevas de Sclabos, member of the Governing Board, Chile
- Mr. I. Usichenko, member of the Governing Board, Ukraine
- Mr. K.N. Al-Suwaidi, member of the Governing Board, United Arab Emirates

The Review was managed and supported by the Monitoring and Evaluation Department.

Appendix two

Contributors to the review

- The Approach Paper for the *Strategy 2010* was prepared by Mrs. Elizabeth McAllister, World Bank;
- The Health Review Report was prepared by Mr. Markkus Michael, independent consultant;
- The Case Studies have been prepared by Mrs. Rebecca Philips, independent consultant.

External

- ARONSON Mike, Chief Executive, Save the Children UK
- AFRIKA Philbert, Director, Operation and policies, Department, African Development Bank Tunis
- ALDERSLADE Richard, Senior External Relations Officer/Acting Deputy, WHO
- BELLAMY Carol, Executive Director, UNICEF
- BERGQUIST Henrik, Desk office, Department for Global security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden
- BONILLA Joe, Head, Costa Rica Regional Centre of Reference in Disaster Community Education
- BURGSTALLER Signe, Deputy Director, Global Security Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden
- CHERPITEL Didier, Former Secretary General of IFRC,
- DABELSTEIN Niels, Head, Evaluation Secretariat, DANIDA
- DAVEY Stephen, Former Director IFRC,
- DENNIS Geoffrey, Director, Care International UK
- DORYAN Eduardo, Special Representative to the UN, World Bank
- EGELAND Jan, Under Secretary General, OCHA
- ESSENGHAIRI Kamel, Director Social Affairs, Department, African Union
- FRISELL Fredrik, Programme Officer, SIDA, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
- GAWANAS Adv Bience, Commission, Social Affairs, African Union
- GOLDRICK Simon, Unilever, Corporate Social Responsibility for Europe
- ILUNGA B Ishinko, Division Chief, Health and Social Affairs, Department, African Development Bank Tunis
- JEUGMANS Jacques, Principal Health and Nutrition Specialist, Asian Development Bank
- KABAGAMBE Anne, Chief, Cooperation Officer, Cooperation Department, African Development Bank Tunis

- KORHONEN Helena, Principal Health and Nutrition Specialist, Standing Commission
- MARCH Alan, Assistant Director General, East Timor, AUSAID
- MAZIMPAKA Patrick, Vice chairman, African Union
- MUSYIMI OGANA Litha, Advisor, Gender and Civil Society Organisations, Secretariat, NEPAD
- NDIYE Orraca, Division Chief, Cooperation Department, African Development Bank Tunis
- NDUKWE Felix, Division Chief, Operation Policies and Review Department, African Development Bank Tunis
- ONG Peter, Partner, The Gallop Organisation
- ÖRNÉUS Per, Head of Humanitarian Sector, Global Security Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden
- PATRO Bijoy, Coordinator, Delhi Regional Humanitarian Values
- PEETERS Bart, Director of Operations, DHL
- SAIDY Deborah, Deputy Director, WFP
- STOCKING Barbara, Chief Executive, Oxfam
- TRAORE Bubacas, Division Chief, Planning and Strategic Department, African Development Bank Tunis
- VAN MY Thien Luong, Public Affairs Issues Manager, Nestle, in consultation with Neils Christianson, Head, Public Affairs
- WAHLSTROM Margaretta, Assistant Secretary General/Deputy Emergency Response Co-ordinator, OCHA
- WEEKS Chris, DHL, Manager, Disaster Response Network Unit
- WHITLAM Mike, Former Director General of BRCS,
- WILES Peter, Consultant, DFID, Federation, BRCS, ISB review
- ZIRIMWABAGABO Gerald, Executive Director for Eastern and Horn of Africa, African Development Bank Tunis

Media

- ANTONOWICZ Anton, Journalist, The Daily Mirror Newspaper
- BEESTON Richard, Journalist, The Times Newspaper
- CAPELLA Peter, Journalist, Agence France Press (AFP)
- FAULKES Imogen, Journalist, The British Broadcasting Company (BBC)
- HARILELA Krisna, Journalist, CNN
- LOYN David, Journalist, The British Broadcasting Company (BBC)

ICRC

- GNAEDINGER Angelo, Director General of the Directorate
- GUSSING Angela, Head of Division, Policy and Cooperation within the Movement
- LUEDI Christoph, Head, Planning and Evaluation Department

National Societies

- ADUGNA Shimelis, President , Ethiopian Red Cross
- AL KHATIB Younis, President and General Director, Palestinian Red Crescent
- AL-HADID Mohammed, President, Jordan National Red Crescent Society
- BOWN Ann, External Relations and Resource Mobilisation, South African Red Cross
- BUCHERT Hubert, Senior Advisor, International Relations, Swiss Red Cross
- CABOUAT Jean-Pierre, Conseiller pour les Relations Internationales, French Red Cross
- CALDERÓN PAREDES Edgardo, President , Peruvian Red Cross
- CHARLES Terry, Director General, Grenada Red Cross
- CHENITI Tahar, Secretary General, Tunisian Red Crescent
- Cross section of staff and volunteers, American Red Cross - Florida Chapter
- DHAKHWA Dev Ratna, Secretary General, Nepal Red Cross
- ELLIS Marylee, Director General, Belize Red Cross
- ESSACK-KAUARIA Razia, Secretary General, Namibian Red Cross
- FREMONT-D'ANDERT Sophie, Chargée de Programmes Europeens, French Red Cross
- GABR Mamdouh, Secretary General, Egyptian Red Crescent
- GUGER Johannes, Head, International Relations, Austrian Red Cross
- GUR Yochanan, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Magem David Adom
- HASHIM Hisham Harun, Deputy National Chairman, Malaysian Red Crescent Society
- HIGASHIURA Hiroshi, Director General, International Relations Department, Japan Red Cross
- HUMBERT Xavier, Assistant to the Social Welfare Head of Unit, French Red Cross
- KESTENS Ariel, Secretary General, Argentina Red Cross
- KOPETZKY Wolfgang, Secretary General, Austrian Red Cross
- KURIA Mary, Secretary General, Kenya Red Cross
- MALAFA-OBI Jondo, Branch Director, Cayman Islands Red Cross
- MALNIECE Dita, International Relations and Programme Coordinator, Latvian Red Cross
- McBAIN Kanongodza, Secretary General, Malawi Red Cross Society
- McDONALD Wayne, National Director, International Programs and Humanitarian Issues, Canadian Red Cross
- MONDO Leslie, Secretary General, South African Red Cross
- MONTES Carlos, Youth President, Spanish Red Cross
- NERY Mario, Chair, Development Commission, Philippines Red Cross
- OTAIBA Anas, Director of External Relations, United Arab Emirates Red Crescent
- PEDERSEN Freddy Karup, President, Danish Red Cross
- POWEL Carole, Member, Federation of the Future Commission, Jamaican Red Cross
- POZDNYAKOV Alexander, OD Desk Officer, Russian Red Cross

- RAHMAN Obaidur, Secretary General, Bangladesh Red Crescent
- RATTLE Niki, Secretary General, Cook Islands Red Cross
- RICHERT Johannes, Director of International Operations, National relief division, German Red Cross
- ROMANOVSKY Anton, Secretary General, Belarus Red Cross
- SAYED MOHD A.S.Rahman bin, Secretary General, Malaysian Red Crescent
- SOCHOROVA Linda, Head, International Department, Czech Red Cross
- SOLAN Deniz, Head of International Department, Turkish Red Crescent
- STOIMENOVA Sophia, Secretary General, Bulgaria Red Cross
- SUKANDER Iyang, Secretary General, Indonesian Red Cross
- TA'A Getachew, Secretary General, Ethiopia Red Cross
- TEIXEIRA Fernanda, Secretary General, Mozambique Red Cross
- VICHITRAN W, Manager, International Services, Thai Red Cross
- WANG Xiaohua, Director of External Liaison Department, Chinese Red Cross
- WHARRAM Paul, Deputy Secretary General, Canadian Red Cross
- ZAJC Srecko, Secretary General, Slovenian Red Cross
- ZETTERGREN Christer, Secretary General, Swedish Red Cross

International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Secretariat

- AIT-MOHAMMED PARENT Malika, Head, Principles and Values Department
- ALI ALI Saeid, Head Middle East and North Africa Department
- BALPE Aurelia, Senior Officer, Movement Cooperation
- BARRENA Inigo, Senior Officer, Disaster Preparedness Response
- BATRA Amanda, Head, Human Resources Department
- BERGSETH Olaug, Regional Officer, Americas Department
- BLEWITT Richard, Director Movement Cooperation
- DE WEVER Luc, Chief of Cabinet - Office of the Secretary General
- CASTELLANOS Xavier, Regional Disaster Preparedness Delegate, Regional Delegation Panama
- ESHAYA-CHAUVIN Bruce, Head, Health and Care Department
- GIL GARCIA Santiago, Head, Americas Department
- GWYNN John, Organisational Development Coordinator, Asia and Pacific Regional Service Centre, Malaysia
- HOMAYRA Etemadi, Senior Officer Relationship Development Unit
- HUGHES Jeremy, Head, External Relation and Communication Department
- HUNLEDE Richard, Head, Africa Department
- INGLES Stephen, Director Support Services
- JOHNSON Susan, Director National Society and Field Support
- LAMB Chris, Special Adviser, International Representation, External Relations and

Communications Department

- LOWNDES Lynette, Head, Europe Department
- LUNA Luis, Regional Officer, Americas
- MALIKA Alen, Head, Principles and values Department
- MOHAGHEGH Mostafa, Operations Coordinator, Operations Support Department
- NISKALA Markku, Secretary General
- OSMAN Ibrahim, Director Policy and Relations
- PHILLIPS Ken, Head, Organisational Development Department
- REES-GILDEA Peter, Head, Operations Support Department
- ROY Jean, Senior Officer, Technical Unit
- SOUTH Christine, Senior Officer, Organisational Development Department
- STALDER-OLSEN Birgitte, Head, Logistics Department
- SUAREZ DEL TORO Juan Manuel, President
- SUGAI Satoshi, Senior Officer, Asia and Pacific Department
- TYRNINOSKA Seija, Federation Representative for South Africa
- VON OELREICH Eva, Head, Disaster Preparedness and Response Department
- WAINWRIGHT Stephen, Organisational Development Department
- ZAK Martin, Pakistan Delegation
- ZUCHEGNA Roberta, Youth Officer, Organisational Development Department

Appendix three

List of documents consulted

- *Characteristics of a Well-Functioning National Society*, endorsed by the Executive Council in 1994 and welcomed by the General Assembly at its 10th Session in 1995.
- *Council of Delegates documents and decisions*.
- *Development Cooperation Policy*, adopted by the 11th General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1997.
- *Development Policy*, adopted by the 10th General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1995.
- *Disaster Preparedness Policy*, adopted by the 12th Session of the General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1999.
- *Emergency Response Policy*, adopted by the 11th Session of the General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1997.
- *Evaluation of the 1986 Africa Drought Relief Operation*, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom, 1986.
- *Evaluation of the Goma Volcano Operation*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2002.
- *Evaluation of the Pan American Disaster Response Unit*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2004.
- *Evaluation of the Response by the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement to the India Earthquake*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2003.
- *Evaluation of support by the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement to the Chernobyl Humanitarian Assistance and Rehabilitation Programme (CHARP)*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2002.
- *Gender Policy*, adopted by the 12th Session of the General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1999.
- *General Assembly documents and decisions*.
- *Governing Board documents and decisions*.
- *Guidance for National Societies Statutes*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Geneva, 2000.
- *Health Policy*, adopted by the 12th Session of the General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1999.
- *HIV/AIDS policy*, adopted by the Governing Board meeting on 6 November 2002.
- *IFRC Response to HIV/AIDS pandemic*, a seven country case study, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2002.

- *Learning from the Nineties and supplementary papers to Strategy 2010*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1999.
- *Management review of International Federation's response to the Southern Africa Food Security Operation*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2004.
- *Mid Term Evaluation Report of IFRC and Russian Red Cross Tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS and Visiting Nurses Service Programme*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2001.
- *National Society Capacity Building Framework*, prepared by Organisational Development Department, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Geneva, 2002.
- *National Society Governance Guidelines*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Institutional and Resource Development Department, 1997.
- *National Society Self-Assessment 2000-2003 Report*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2003.
- *Operations Review of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement Response to the Earthquake in Bam, Iran*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2004.
- *Regional conference decisions and declarations*
- *Review of Hosting Arrangements for Inter-Agency Initiatives*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2002.
- *Review of the International Federation's Management and Coordination of the Preparedness Phase Iraq Crisis 2003*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2003.
- *Seville Agreement, Agreement on the organization of the international activities of the components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement*, adopted the Council of Delegates (Resolution 6) of International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, 1997.
- *Social Welfare Policy*, adopted by the 12th Session of the General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1999.
- *Southern Africa Food Security Operation - Real Time Evaluation Report*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, 2002.
- *Strategy 2010*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, adopted by the General Assembly in October 1999.
- *Strategy for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement*, Resolution 3 of the Council of Delegates in November 2001.
- *Strengthening National Societies and Delivering a More Effective Service, A Change Strategy for the Secretariat*, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 2003.
- *Tufts University Study on Harmonization, 2004*
- *Volunteering Policy*, adopted by the 12th Session of the General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1999.
- *Youth Policy*, adopted by the General Assembly in 1991 and confirmed by the 12th Session of the General Assembly of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 1999.

The Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement

Humanity

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, born of a desire to bring assistance without discrimination to the wounded on the battlefield, endeavours, in its international and national capacity, to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect life and health and to ensure respect for the human being. It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst all peoples.

Impartiality

It makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavours to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.

Neutrality

In order to enjoy the confidence of all, the Movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.

Independence

The Movement is independent. The National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the Movement.

Voluntary Service

It is a voluntary relief movement not prompted in any manner by desire for gain.

Unity

There can be only one Red Cross or Red Crescent Society in any one country. It must be open to all. It must carry on its humanitarian work throughout its territory.

Universality

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in which all societies have equal status and share equal responsibilities and duties in helping each other, is worldwide.



PROTECTING HUMAN DIGNITY



The *International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies* promotes the humanitarian activities of National Societies among vulnerable people.

By coordinating international disaster relief and encouraging development support it seeks to prevent and alleviate human suffering.

The Federation, the National Societies and the International Committee of the Red Cross together constitute the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.