

**EVALUATION OF THE NZ RED CROSS  
INTERNATIONAL DELEGATES PROGRAMME**

**2004-2008**

**ALISON GRAY  
GRAY MATTER RESEARCH LTD  
WELLINGTON**

**DECEMBER 2007**

## Table of contents

Executive summary.....	1
1. Background.....	4
2. Methodology.....	6
3. Findings.....	7
4. Learning.....	16
Appendix 1 Glossary of terms used.....	17
Appendix 2 Terms of Reference for an Evaluation of the NZ Red Cross International Delegates Programme 2004-2008 .....	18

# Executive summary

## Introduction and methodology

1. For many years, the NZ Red Cross Society (NZRC) has provided personnel for both IFRC and ICRC missions through its International Delegates Programme (IDP). The Strategic Objective of the programme is: “To recruit, train, place and support appropriately skilled personnel for International Red Cross movement field operations.”

Under a four year funding arrangement which began on 1 July 2004 and ends on 30 June 2008, NZAID has provided \$NZ500 000 annually towards the cost of running the NZRC International Delegates Programme (IDP).

2. This evaluation aims to assess the effectiveness of the IDP in terms of training and supplying appropriate personnel who have played effective roles in the assignments given to them.

3. Information was collected through a review of documentation and interviews and questionnaires completed by current and recent delegates and International Federation of Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)/ International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) staff.

## Selection and preparation

4. Selection mechanisms can only be assessed in retrospect by measuring the proportion of successful deployments. According to this measure, the mechanisms are very effective. Including management skills would enhance the selection criteria.

5. ICRC/IFRC staff considered that NZRC delegates come well prepared and well briefed. They are also perceived as being politically neutral. Delegates also felt well prepared for deployments through completing the Basic Training Course (BTC) and attending the various briefings

6. Delegates maintained a positive view of the BTC once they were in the field. They particularly valued the information they received about the history, structure, mandate and operations of the IFRC/ICRC Movement, the practical exercises and information on emergency operations.

7. Suggestions for improvements to the BTC included:

- having more information on how NZRC and IFRC/ICRC work together
- discussing the roles and mandates of NGOs and the United Nations (UN)
- putting more focus on the role of National Societies and on development work (as opposed to emergency missions)
- having first or second time delegates speak rather than very experienced delegates
- offering a session on managing people from different cultures
- including a session on management, budgeting and report writing
- developing a constructive reading list of the challenges that delegates face in country, including brief biographies by seasoned delegates.

## **Deployment**

8. The match between delegates and deployment is good, with delegates performing to the standards expected. IFRC/ICRC staff agreed that both male and female NZRC delegates perform well in the field.

9. In performance appraisals, all delegates received overall ratings of 3 (Fully achieved expectations) or 4 (Exceeded expectations) for achieving objectives. Ratings for competencies were also high, with most delegates scoring a 3 or 4 or an “A” (Mastered) or “B” (Confirmed) for specific skills. “C” ratings (Developing) were often in the areas of negotiation, communication and teamwork, with supervisors commenting on the independence of delegates in thought and/or action.

## **Briefings**

10. Some delegates found the number of briefings confusing but acknowledged that when they were completed thoroughly and carefully, they did provide an opportunity to gain a fuller picture of the mission, the immediate social and cultural context and the larger organisation.

11. Almost all delegates received pre-departure briefings in New Zealand and found them useful. Suggestions for improving pre-departure briefings and arrangements included:

- providing more information on the purpose of briefings in Geneva and who would be involved
- reminding delegates of the need to complete a power of attorney, make a will and clarify any tax, banking and contact details
- trying to increase the amount of luggage delegates can take and providing Red Cross luggage labels to support this.

12. Briefings in Geneva were inconsistent in both quantity and quality. Some delegates neither expected nor had a briefing; others anticipated a briefing that did not happen. Where briefings were unsatisfactory this was because they were:

- too short
- did not cover all information areas
- appropriate people were not available.

13. The need for better and more reliable in-country briefings was a theme in end of mission reports. The most valuable briefings were usually on-site. In-country briefings would benefit from a clearer structure with better definition of content, roles and responsibilities.

## **Debriefings and reports**

14. Most delegates welcomed the debriefings they received at all levels, including in New Zealand, describing them as “satisfying” and “very useful”. The returned delegate questionnaire was helpful in guiding the debriefing process. They also valued discussion on career options and possible NZRC work in the future.

15. End of mission reports are required by NZRC but not by staff in Geneva. Delegates were unsure why this was the case or what contribution the reports made.

## **Support**

16. Delegates were most positive about the support they received from staff on site. Some were critical of the IFRC and ICRC, with one describing the former as “disorganised and inflexible”, and the latter as “not always approachable”.

17. IFRC and ICRC appreciated the financial support NZRC gives to delegates in the field. They noted that psychological support in times of critical incidents, and extra support to first time delegates, especially those who are alone and in a difficult security and religious context are always appreciated.

18. Delegates were very positive about the support they received from NZRC before and after a mission. They had mixed views about the support they received from NZRC while on mission. Their main concern was a lack of regular communication.

## **Systems and structures**

19. IFRC/ICRC staff considered that the NZRC Delegates Programme fits very well with IFRC/ICRC HR systems and had no suggestions for change.

## **Effectiveness**

20. Delegates identified three clusters of factors that contribute to an effective deployment: support from team members and national staff; professional and technical respect and back up; personal and contextual factors including personal attributes and good working conditions.

## **Learning**

21. The programme has had a very positive impact. It is highly regarded and provides good value for money. The IFRC and ICRC strongly recommend continuation and expansion of the programme.

22. The main suggestions for improving the design of the programme are to:

- include more information on the roles of IFRC, ICRC, National Societies, the UN and NGOs in the Basic Training Course.
- maintain contact with course participants who are waiting for a deployment
- improve contact with those on deployment, possibly through a regular newsletter
- work with the IFRC/ICRC to develop a clearer structure for in-country and on-site briefings with better definition of content, roles and responsibilities
- improve arrangements for pre-departure briefings in Geneva to ensure they happen and are productive

23. IFRC staff and HoDs recommended that NZRC consider expanding its programme by:

- supporting delegates who bring their families with them
- supporting more delegates at HoD and senior management level
- diversifying strategic priorities to other regions.

## 1. Background

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is an impartial, neutral and independent organisation whose exclusive humanitarian mission is to protect the lives and dignity of victims of war and internal violence and to provide them with assistance. It directs and co-ordinates the international relief activities conducted by the Movement in situations of conflict. It also endeavours to prevent suffering by promoting and strengthening humanitarian law and universal humanitarian principles. Established in 1863, the ICRC is at the origin of the International Red Cross Movement.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) works on the basis of the Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement to inspire, facilitate and promote all humanitarian activities carried out by its member National Societies to improve the situation of the most vulnerable people. Founded in 1919, the International Federation directs and co-ordinates international assistance of the Movement to victims of natural and technological disasters, to refugees and in health emergencies. It acts as the official representative of its members societies in the international field. It promotes co-operation between National Societies, and works to strengthen their capacity to carry out effective disaster preparedness, health and social programmes.

National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies embody the work and principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in 186 countries. National Societies act as auxiliaries to the public authorities in their own countries in the humanitarian field and provide a range of services including disaster relief, health and social programmes. During wartime, National Societies assist the affected civilian population and support the army medical services where appropriate.

New Zealand Red Cross (NZRC) is dedicated to improving the lives of vulnerable people by mobilising the power of humanity and enhancing community resilience. New Zealand Red Cross works to assist communities in need and was officially recognised by the ICRC in 1931.

For many years, NZRC has provided personnel for IFRC and ICRC missions through its International Delegates Programme (IDP). The Strategic Objective of the programme is: “To recruit, train, place and support appropriately skilled personnel for International Red Cross movement field operations.”

Under a four year funding arrangement which began on 1 July 2004 and ends on 30 June 2008, NZAID has provided \$NZ500 000 annually towards the cost of running the NZ Red Cross IDP.

This evaluation aims to assess the effectiveness of the IDP in terms of training and supplying appropriate personnel who have played effective roles in the assignments given to them. The evaluation is intended as a learning exercise for the New Zealand Red Cross (NZRC) as well as verification for NZAID that the programme has been an effective use of the Official Development Assistance budget.

## **Evaluation objectives**

The evaluation has sought answers to questions in four areas.

### ***Selection***

- Are current selection mechanisms doing a good job of drawing in people with the skills and attributes required for effective delegates?

### ***Training***

- How effective was the training provided to delegates?
- Are there any gaps or opportunities for improvements in the training provided?

### ***Deployments***

- Were delegates appropriately matched to the deployments they undertook?
- Did delegates perform to the standards required of them in their deployment?
- Were delegates adequately supported through their deployments?
- Are there ways in which the deployment system could be improved?

### ***Learning***

- What has been the overall impact of the Delegates Programme (IDP) and does it represent value for money?
- Are there any changes the NZRC should consider in the design of the programme?
- Is the NZRC or NZAID missing any opportunities to take fuller advantage of the programme?

## **2. Methodology**

The evaluation is based on a review of documentation and responses to interviews and questionnaires. It was undertaken in November and December 2007 and focused on the period from 1 July 2004 to the present.

### ***Documentation***

Information was collected from three sources:

- Course evaluation forms completed by 63 participants who attended Basic Training Courses offered in September 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007.
- Performance appraisals for 15 of 43 delegates deployed since 2004. Thirty completed a BTC between 2004 and 2006; 13 participated in a BTC in 2002 or 2003.
- End of mission reports completed by 21 delegates deployed since 2004; 12 also had performance appraisals completed by managers in the field.

### ***Interviews and questionnaires***

- Email questionnaires were sent to 28 delegates – 18 women and 10 men. Twenty undertook BTC training between 2004 and 2006, eight attended BTCs in 2002 or 2003. All have been deployed since 2004. Nine women and five men replied – a 50% response rate.
- Two delegates, who have recently been deployed, both women, contributed through an interview in-country.
- An NZAID staff member in Geneva interviewed HR staff at ICRC on behalf of the evaluation; staff at IFRC contributed emailed responses
- Three Heads of Delegations (HoDs) or sub-delegations also provided comment as did three Red Cross managers nominated by NZRC delegates who completed questionnaires.

The original plan was to triangulate data for individual delegates. The limited number of performance appraisals and end of mission reports made this impossible. Fewer delegates had taken part in BTCs and been deployed than anticipated. Responses were augmented by data obtained from HoDs and managers as well as from IFRC/ICRC Headquarters.



### **3. Findings**

#### **A. Selection**

Selection mechanisms can only be assessed by measuring the proportion of successful deployments. According to this measure, the mechanisms are very effective.

International Red Cross/Red Crescent staff agreed that delegates who come through NZRC do have the skills and attributes they need to be effective delegates. They are practical and adaptable, and have the right personal qualities for the task:

*NZRC delegates enjoy equally good human qualities [as technical skills]. They are usually open, constructive and genuinely committed. Most people recruited have previous field experience so they adapt and behave well once deployed. For those without previous experience, the cultural awareness comes quickly in the field owing to their sincere commitment and willingness to give a good contribution.*

#### **Areas for improvement**

Many NZRC delegates assume some managerial and coordination responsibilities. Contributors agreed that NZRC could strengthen its focus on management skills – human resources, strategic planning, communication, budgeting and reporting- both in selecting and preparing delegates.

One problem that NZRC delegates have in common with delegates from other countries is a little more difficult to address. That is the lack of language skills, particularly in French. If delegates are motivated and willing, this gap can be filled, but learning a language does take time and commitment.

#### ***From the BTC to deployment***

Selection for a BTC does not necessarily lead to a deployment. Opportunities depend mainly on the humanitarian/development situation. Reasons for non-deployment for participants in recent BTCs include:

- no suitable placement being available
- changes in family circumstances
- participants leaving the country
- participants needing to gain more experience before being ready for deployment.

In some cases, first time delegates are proposed for positions that require Red Cross/Red Crescent experience, which means that not all candidates make it to the short list. IFRC staff commented that where mentoring and coaching opportunities are feasible, first time delegates can sometimes be accepted.

#### **Delegates' views on selection for deployment**

Delegates had mixed views on NZRC selection process and support during the waiting phase. While several thought that potential delegates were well informed of their deployment options at the BTC, others would like NZRC to communicate with them better once they finished the course. They would like to know what missions

NZ delegates were currently engaged in and what courses were available. This would help maintain their interest and enable them to prepare better for a mission should one become available. They also suggested that NZRC link potential delegates with their local branch and encourage them to undertake volunteer activities while waiting for a mission.

One delegate had described a positive selection experience:

*They submitted my candidacy to the best available position. Before the interview, I was given access to the NZRCS mini-library to familiarise myself with the information about the region and the position. After I was selected, which was just before the Christmas break, NZRC ensured that I got a medical check-up on time and got a flight. They also made me a booking in a hotel in my destination.*

## **B. Training**

International Red Cross/Red Crescent staff considered that NZRC delegates come well prepared and well briefed. As New Zealanders, they are also perceived as being politically neutral, which is beneficial.

Delegates also felt well prepared for deployments through completing the BTC and attending the various briefings, although they agreed that basic training alone can never fully prepare people for the reality on the ground. One delegate strongly believed that first time delegates should attend a Red Cross/Red Crescent induction course, and that the National Society should consider this as an investment in delegate development planning.

### ***Basic Training Course***

#### **End of course evaluations**

Participants in the BTC courses 2004 to 2007 all rated the course as “good” or “excellent”, and judged practical sessions to be most useful. Examples included case study work, sharing experiences including with returned delegates, security briefings and the checkpoint exercise, group problem-solving especially in managing conflict and emergency situations.

Information on the structure of the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, International Humanitarian Law information and the media component were also rated highly, particularly in the 2007 course.

Dissatisfaction with the Stress Management component evident in the 2004 course has clearly been addressed. No other component has attracted consistent criticism or been judged dispensable in any of the subsequent courses.

#### **The course in retrospect**

Delegates maintained a positive view of the BTC and particularly valued the information they received about the history, structure, mandate and operations of the International Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement. They also appreciated the field exercise and information on emergency operations.

Two suggested that the section on the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement could include more focus on the role of National Societies, including their developmental role:

*I think there needs to be far more emphasis on national society relationships in the 'life and work in a delegation' section. Based on my own experiences and those of colleagues, often the biggest challenge isn't dealing with humanitarian challenges but maintaining a good relationship with the national society. Possibly some case studies from some of the more 'difficult' National Societies would be useful. I've seen delegates worn down/frustrated at what is perceived as slow or uncooperative National Societies. I think trying to adjust delegates' expectations to the realities in the field would be useful.*

Others wanted more clarity about how NZRC and ICRC/IFRC work together and what that means in practice for delegates in the field e.g. in applying for leave. The roles and mandate of NGOs and the United Nations could also be covered.

Other suggestions included:

- more emphasis on development work (as opposed to emergency missions)
- having first or second time delegates speak rather than very experienced delegates, who can be rather daunting
- offering a session on managing people from different cultures
- including a session on management, budgeting and report writing
- developing a constructive reading list of the challenges that delegates face in country, including brief biographies by seasoned delegates.

### ***Other training***

The ICRC was particularly positive about the willingness of NZRC to send delegates to training (and pay for it) when asked by ICRC. Courses have included war surgery, logistics, fleet management and language courses.

## C. Deployments

### *Matching*

Both delegates and their managers were well satisfied with the match between delegates and deployment. The IFRC, for example, described them as:

*Adapting quite well to new environments and able to work in a multicultural environment. Delegates are technically competent and have good relations with partners, counterparts and National Societies.*

Occasionally operational requirements have led to delegates being asked to take on different roles than they had anticipated and this has inevitably presented some challenges as they settled in.

IFRC/ICRC staff agreed that NZRC delegates generally performed well in the field and certainly to the standards expected. One HoD described them as:

*Primarily down to earth, pragmatic people, looking for results. I found them sensitive to local cultures. None of them had the 'arrogance' you see sometimes in the delegates. They also worked well with and respected the host society.*

None identified any particular differences in the quality of performance of men and women.

The limited number of performance appraisals on file showed that all 15 delegates received overall ratings of 3 (Fully achieved expectations) or 4 (Exceeded expectations) for achieving objectives. Where an objective was not met, that was rarely due to the delegate's performance.

Ratings for competencies were also high, with most delegates scoring a 3 or 4 (as above) or an "A" (Mastered) or "B" (Confirmed) for specific skills.

Those who received a 2 (Partially achieved expectations) or a "C" (Developing) for a particular skill or competency were all on their first mission. Comments explaining those ratings often referred to a delegate's tentativeness or growing confidence rather than to a lack of skills per se. There were no adverse comments on delegates' technical skills.

A number of "Cs" or "2s" were in the areas of negotiation, communication and teamwork. All but one referred to a delegate on an ICRC deployment. Supervisors recognised that some delegates had few opportunities to develop negotiating skills; others were used to operating independently. One delegate was surprised to end up in a teaching and 'troubleshooting role' and became frustrated at the level of local staff, despite several years' input from ICRC staff. A supervisor described another as "a very private person".

Some supervisors commented on the independence of their New Zealand delegate in thought and/or action. While they appreciated this attribute, one did suggest that it would be better if the delegate involved others in decision-making earlier on. Another appraisal referred to the need for the delegate to adopt a more serious attitude in undertaking their role.

Overall, supervisors were extremely positive about delegates' commitment, strong work ethic, adaptability and sensitivity to people and the situation.

### ***Briefings***

Some delegates found the number of briefings confusing but acknowledged that when they were completed thoroughly and carefully, they did provide an opportunity to gain a fuller picture of the mission, the immediate social and cultural context and the larger organisation.

#### **Pre-departure briefings and preparation**

Almost all delegates received pre-departure briefings in New Zealand and found them useful. They were most successful where NZRC:

- organised travel, medical and insurance requirements
- discussed employment issues, including responsibilities for leave entitlements, salary arrangements and other contract details
- gave practical information about living conditions and what to take (including initial funds for emergency deployments)
- put delegates in touch with personnel who were still in the field or had recently returned
- and were able to provide detailed information about what the work would involve.

Suggestions for improving pre-departure briefings and arrangements included:

- providing more information on the purpose of briefings in Geneva and who would be involved
- reminding delegates of the need to complete a power of attorney, make a will and clarify any tax, banking and contact details
- trying to increase the amount of luggage delegates can take and providing Red Cross luggage labels to support this.

One colleague commented that first time delegates are still appointed sometimes without an interview by the Head of Country Delegation. This means they have no real understanding of their role until they arrive.

#### **Briefings in Geneva**

Briefings in Geneva were inconsistent in both quantity and quality. Some delegates neither expected nor had a briefing; others anticipated a briefing that did not happen. Some delegates, both new and returning, found the trip to Geneva well worthwhile. They particularly appreciated the opportunity to feel part of the larger organisation, meeting people they would be dealing with during the mission, and knowing who to contact for various issues while on placement. Others were dissatisfied. This was usually because the briefing was:

- too short
- did not cover all information areas

- appropriate people were not available.

Some delegates thought that staff in Geneva need to be aware of the distance New Zealand delegates travel for a briefing and make more effort to be available, especially for first-time delegates. One delegate with considerable experience had had mixed experiences of pre-mission briefings. She commented:

*It is very expensive and a long way to fly to Geneva and then continue flying on to your place of work. On my first mission, none of the information given to me was useful; on other missions there have been good and poor briefings given. On some briefings I would have flown for 36 hours to get there, have a four hour briefing, which I believe was a waste of time or had nothing to do with the programme, I think the New Zealand public would be horrified to know that their donations were used for unnecessary international travel. Perhaps briefings between New Zealand and Geneva would be better done by telephone or tele-sat link.*

### **Briefings on arrival**

Briefings on arrival in country also varied in coverage and quality. Most delegates described them as useful but several delegates on their first mission, particularly those who had taken on unfamiliar roles, were dissatisfied with their briefings or the lack of them, both at the delegation and sub-delegation level. The need for better and more reliable briefings was an underlying theme in end of mission reports.

At country level, delegates referred to the value of meeting line and technical managers, and the broader country overview.

The most valuable briefings were usually “on-site”. Delegates valued meeting and being briefed by colleagues, going through the files and paperwork, and learning about the security situation. The briefings were particularly effective when there was an adequate handover period. Delegates on their first mission especially appreciated detailed briefings and good support at the local level. One commented:

*I could have benefited from practical orientation e.g. visiting with another health delegate or an experienced delegate. I appreciated ICRC integration course - had good support.*

Another suggested that in-country and on-site briefings would benefit from a clearer structure with better definition of content, roles and responsibilities.

### ***Debriefings and reports***

#### **Debriefings in country and in Geneva**

To many delegates, debriefings were just as valuable as briefings. They provided a sense of closure and offered an opportunity to raise issues, pass on information, discuss the current situation and constraints and look to the future. Most were very positive about the debriefings they received at all levels, describing them as “satisfying” and “very useful”. One felt that staff in Geneva were somewhat jaded from having to debrief so many people, although he himself found the process useful.

Some particularly liked on site debriefings because they could speak directly with supervisors and colleagues.

One suggested that NZRC should organise and manage debriefings in Geneva more systematically for delegates on their first mission.

### **Debriefing in New Zealand**

Delegates valued the opportunity to discuss issues they had experienced with IFRC or ICRC. While they accepted that NZRC may not be able to resolve these, the organisation was at least aware of the issues and could be better prepared should such issues arise for other delegates. One who had completed the returned delegate questionnaire found that helpful in guiding the debriefing process. They also valued discussion on career options and possible NZRC work in the future.

Most of those who had attended a psychological debrief on their return home found it useful. Some thought it should be optional.

End of mission reports are required by NZRC but not by staff in Geneva. Delegates were unsure why this was the case or what contribution the reports made.

### ***Support***

#### **Support from ICRC/IFRC**

ICRC staff had few comments on the support they offer delegates in the field, beyond pointing out that once delegates are in the field they are no longer considered New Zealand delegates but are rather part of the ICRC, the IFRC or the national society, depending on who they are working for. IFRC offers induction training for first time delegates as well as contact with HR for stress, security, code of conduct and general wellbeing for the team.

In their end of mission reports and questionnaires, most delegates were very positive about the support they received on site. However, in commenting for this review, some delegates were critical of the IFRC and ICRC, with one describing the former as “disorganised and inflexible”, and the latter as “not always approachable”. Others said that communication with ICRC was slow and decisions were made without contact with staff on the mission. Another thought that the IFRC Geneva did practically nothing to support delegates in the field. At the very least, they could keep in touch regularly so that delegates felt acknowledged.

Examples of good support on-site included:

- providing good accommodation and working conditions
- responding promptly to requests.

Obviously, as in all organisations, the level of support depended very much on the individual manager.

Delegates’ suggestions for change included a better preparation for postings that have “accompanied status” (one comment) and improved medical evacuation procedures, although all those who had actually had a medical emergency were satisfied with the way it was handled.

### **Support from NZRC**

IFRC and ICRC appreciated the financial support NZRC gives to delegates in the field as well as the BTC, induction courses, briefings and links with other delegates in the field. They noted that psychological support in times of critical incidents, and extra support to first time delegates, especially those who are alone and in a difficult security and religious context are always appreciated.

While delegates were generally very positive about the support they received from NZRC before and after a mission, they had mixed views about the support they received from NZRC while on mission. Several described it as “poor” or “adequate”, mainly because of lack of communication.

One noted that while NZRC had responded very well in a crisis, normally they made no contact at all during a mission. She and others would have liked more contact from NZRC while in the field. They suggested this could be in the form of a newsletter or a regular phone call, perhaps once a month, just to keep in touch with what was going on in Red Cross in New Zealand as well as getting news from other delegates in the field.

One suggested that this contact could continue for up to six months after a mission. Another mentioned a delegate support group to which delegates could be referred.

### ***Systems and structures***

ICRC staff considered that the NZRC Delegates Programme fits very well with ICRC HR systems and had no suggestions for change.

One delegate noted that there are discrepancies between working for the NZRC and being seconded to the IFRC/ICRC and working for the IFRC/ICRC directly (e.g. remuneration, conditions) which need to be acknowledged and conveyed to delegates. Another expanded on this:

*Although I like to think and believe we are on mission as humanitarians, it is somehow hard to face when delegates from other National Societies and directly employed by the IFRC are doing the same job (or less) but earning double the salary. This is a difficult area I know, and directly related to funding, but I would say that NZRC loses many good delegates because it cannot compete with IFRC contracts or other National Societies.*

## **D. Effectiveness**

While a good match of skills and attributes set the ground work for a successful deployment, delegates identified a number of factors that contributed to an effective deployment. They fell into three groups:

### **Support**

- friendship and a supportive team
- support from on site/line managers
- a good team of National staff who have the skills to do the job
- adequate HR support



### **Professional and technical aspects**

- professional understanding of the role/appropriate qualifications
- equipment and technical backup
- being left to get on and do the job

### **Personal and contextual aspects**

- good understanding of the country/context
- good, well appointed accommodation
- common sense, a sense of humour and patience
- self awareness
- asking lots of questions at all stages of the placement
- having the full support of NZRC.

Factors that hindered a good deployment included:

- miscommunication, no communication or slow communication
- chauvinistic attitudes
- unprofessional line managers.

### **Other comments**

ICRC found the NZRC easy to communicate with and described the organisation as well managed and well resourced. Another, a New Zealander with experience as head of a sub-delegation, wanted a stronger focus on developing careers for NZRC delegates:

*I feel that NZRC is well placed to help the Federation overcome its greatest challenge. Throughout the organisation there is a lack of sound, quality leadership. Currently the NZRC is doing a great job in terms of delegate numbers but it seems to shy away from developing performance staff for senior management positions - particularly Heads of Delegations.... It is expensive and time consuming to develop quality staff. I could contend that we are better off targeting high performers and nurturing them. Many National Societies have their key staff on permanent contract.*

As is evident from the number of delegates that do take on managerial positions, they do make good progress, even if not to HoD level. A delegate now employed by IFRC added:

*I have moved quickly from delegate to coordinator to manager due to NZRC selection, training and support in placement. NZRC delegates are generally well respected and NZRC is well respected. It is great work that NZRC and NZAID should be justifiably proud of.*

## **4. Learning**

### **Overall impact**

The programme has had a very positive impact internationally. It is highly regarded and provides good value for money. The IFRC strongly recommends a continuation and expansion of the programme. Several international staff made similar comments to the one that follows:

*The Programme is a positive asset for the entire Federation. Its productivity allows both the New Zealand Red Cross and the Federation to respond to humanitarian crises due mainly to its predictability and consistency.*

### **Changes in design**

Suggestions for improving the design of the programme have been covered elsewhere in this report. The most significant are to:

- include even more information on the roles of IFRC, ICRC, National Societies, the UN and NGOs in the Basic Training Course
- focus more on management skills in selection and in the Basic Training Course
- maintain contact with course participants who are waiting for a deployment
- improve contact with those on deployment, possibly through a regular newsletter
- work with the IFRC/ICRC to develop a clearer structure for in-country and on-site briefings with better definition of content, roles and responsibilities
- improve the arrangements for pre-departure briefings in Geneva to ensure they happen and are productive.

### **Opportunities to expand**

IFRC staff and HoDs recommended that NZRC consider:

- supporting delegates who bring their families with them
- supporting more delegates at HoD and senior management level
- diversifying strategic priorities to other regions.

All were enthusiastic about the NZRC International Delegates Programme and wanted to see more New Zealand delegates in the field at all levels within the organisation.

## **Appendix 1 Glossary of terms used**

BTC	Basic Training Course
HoD	Head of Delegation
HR	Human Resources
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDP	International Delegates Programme
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NZRC	New Zealand Red Cross
UN	United Nations

## **Appendix 2 Terms of Reference for an Evaluation of the NZ Red Cross International Delegates Programme 2004-2008**

### **Background Information**

The current Financial Year, 2007/08, is the last of a 4-year funding arrangement through which NZAID has provided annual funding of NZD500,000 towards the cost of the New Zealand Red Cross International Delegates Programme. The 4-year funding arrangement runs from 1 July 2004 to 30 June 2008.

The Grant Funding Arrangement document spells out that: “NZAID and the Red Cross both work according to their respective mandates to improve New Zealand’s contribution to international humanitarian aid and development. Together both parties seek to respond appropriately to humanitarian emergencies in both complex emergencies and natural disasters.” The document also states that: “The purpose for which funding is provided under this Arrangement is to support the NZ Red Cross International Delegate Programme, carried out in the context of the Red Cross’s Strategic Plan.

The Strategic Objective of the programme, as set out in the NZ Red Cross’s description of International Humanitarian Activities – 2007/08, is: “To recruit, select, train, place and support appropriately skilled personnel for International Red Cross movement field operations.”

In the same document, the rationale for the programme is set out as follows: “The International Red Cross Movement relies on National Societies to provide staff for its field operations. NZRC has long been a major contributor of personnel to ICRC and Federation field operations and has developed a comprehensive National Society selection, training and support programme.

The field placements programme provides opportunities for skilled New Zealanders to contribute to the humanitarian work of the Movement and provides an international profile for NZRC.”

The main stakeholders in the International Delegates Programme are the New Zealand Red Cross, the wider Red Cross Movement, the delegates themselves and the colleagues with whom they work around the world, and NZAID.

The programme has supported the selection, training and deployment of around 100 delegates, of whom 50 are to be selected at random for a documentary review and 25 of these are to be selected for further follow-up for the purpose of this evaluation.

### **Purpose of the Evaluation**

The 4-year funding arrangement states that: “A full evaluation will take place in 2007/08 before completion of the current arrangement and in time for the results to be fed into negotiations of a new arrangement.”

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the International Delegates Programme in terms of training and supplying appropriate personnel who have played effective roles in the assignments given to them. The criteria against which effectiveness will be assessed will be those defined by the standard appraisal process for the delegates.

The intention is that the evaluation will be a learning exercise for the New Zealand Red Cross as much as it is a verification for NZAID that the programme has been an effective use of the Official Development Assistance (ODA) budget.

As such the evaluator will report back to both the New Zealand Red Cross and NZAID. The NZ Red Cross will use the evaluation findings to make any changes to the programme that would enhance its effectiveness. NZAID will use the findings as the basis of information for negotiation of any future arrangement for a continuation of support to the International Delegates Programme.

### **Scope of the Evaluation**

The evaluation will cover the training and deployment of around 100 delegates who have come through the programme over the three years since the current funding arrangement came into effect on 1 July 2004. The delegates have been deployed all around the world, but the evaluation will be a desk-based exercise, drawing primarily on the extensive documentation that Red Cross NZ retains on every deployment undertaken by each of its delegates.

### **Overall Objectives of the Evaluation**

The evaluation will seek to answer the following questions:

#### Selection

- Are current selection mechanisms doing a good job of drawing in people with the skills and attributes required for effective delegates?

#### Training

- How effective was the training provided to delegates?
- Are there any gaps to fill or improvements to make in the training provided?

#### Deployments

- Were delegates appropriately matched to the deployments they undertook?
- Did delegates perform to the standards required of them in their deployments?
- Were delegates adequately supported through their deployments?
- Are there improvements that could be made to the deployment system?

#### Learning

- What was the overall impact of the Delegates Programme and does it represent value for money?
- Are there any changes that NZ Red Cross should consider making to the design of the programme?
- Are there any opportunities being missed by NZ Red Cross or NZAID to take fuller advantage of the programme?

### **Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation will be largely desk-based and consist of the following steps:

1. A review of training course evaluation documentation for those training courses run for new delegates over the period of the current funding arrangement in order to assess perceptions of the quality of the training.
2. Follow up through questionnaires with a sample of those who participated in these training courses in order to assess the subsequent usefulness of the training provided.
3. A review of the documentation pertaining to the deployments of delegates over the period of the funding arrangement in order to assess the effectiveness of the deployments. This should involve a triangulation of delegates' own end of mission report, the appraisal report on their deployment and the report of their debriefing with NZ Red Cross following their deployment.
4. Follow up through e-mail and/or phone questionnaires with a sample of the delegates deployed and those who worked with these delegates in order to deepen the assessment of the effectiveness of the deployments and surface any issues that may be of interest or concern.
5. Follow up with the International Human Resources Department of the IFRC in Geneva responsible for the organisation of deployments in order to ascertain any lessons learnt or observations regarding the Red Cross NZ Delegates Programme and how it fits with the IFRC's International HR systems and structures.
6. Aggregation and consideration of the trends, lessons and issues arising out of the information-gathering steps above and extraction of useful lessons for Red Cross NZ and NZAID.

The steps above are expected to take six weeks, three of them at full-time and three at half-time. This is based on a total of around 100 delegates, of whom 50 are to be selected at random for the documentary review and 25 of these are to be selected for further follow-up. An initial two weeks at full-time is allowed for the review of documentation, followed by three weeks at half time for follow up (allowing for time-lag in responses). A final week at full-time is allowed for analysis and writing up. Additional days may be required for finalisation of the report following the presentation and discussion of comments by Red Cross NZ and NZAID on a draft report.

The six-week period for the evaluation is to commence on 1 October 2007 and the evaluator will be expected to submit a detailed workplan for the job.

### **Management of the Evaluation**

This evaluation is commissioned jointly by Red Cross NZ and NZAID as per the terms of the Grant Funding Arrangement. Following an initial conversation between Red Cross NZ and NZAID about the scope of the evaluation, these terms of reference were drafted by NZAID and discussed and agreed with Red Cross NZ. The evaluation is to be undertaken by a single evaluator whose appointment is to be agreed by both parties to the evaluation. The evaluator will be based in the Red Cross NZ office for ease of access to the documentation to be analysed.

The contact people for the evaluator will be Andrew McKie, Operations Manager for Red Cross NZ, and Mike Bird, Civil Society Development Programme Manager for NZAID.

The evaluation report will be presented to the Evaluation Committee of NZAID as per NZAID's standard procedure.

### **Selection of the Evaluator**

The evaluator will be selected from the NZAID Approved Contractors Scheme by Red Cross NZ and NZAID together, based on mutually agreed criteria.

These selection criteria will include the following:

- Familiarity with the humanitarian sector
- Understanding of the missions of Red Cross NZ and NZAID
- Appreciation of gender issues and understanding of gender analysis
- Experience of the human resources sector and understanding of people management in an international and cross-cultural context
- Excellent analytical skills and judgment coupled with experience of teasing out information from written documents and from conversations
- Proven track record of timely and clear reporting

### **Reporting Requirements**

The output required is a written report on the findings of the evaluation for Red Cross NZ and NZAID grouped around the three sets of questions in the Objectives of the Evaluation section above.

A draft report will be provided to Red Cross NZ and NZAID in the final week of the evaluation period, not later than 7 November 2007, and discussed by both parties to the evaluation as well as the evaluator. Any changes requested by either party will be discussed together with the evaluator with a view to reaching an agreement on such changes or a clear explanation of the varying views of either party if agreement is not reached.

The total length of the report should not exceed 12 pages and the focus should be on a thorough exploration of the questions referred to above. Information on methodology and evidence for conclusions reached should be provided in annexes.

NZAID will make available to the evaluator the "OECD DAC quality standards for evaluation" as well as NZAID's "Evaluation Policy Statement and "Guideline of the Structure of Evaluations" in order to inform the methodology and reporting of the evaluator.

### **Evaluation Follow-Up**

The findings of the evaluation will feed into negotiation of a new Funding Arrangement, as per the terms of the current Arrangement.

A summary of the evaluation report may be published on the NZAID website and may also be distributed by both Red Cross NZ and NZAID.