

**EVALUATION OF THE
COOPERATION BETWEEN THE
GUATEMALAN RED CROSS AND THE
NORWEGIAN RED CROSS**

**External consultant:
Ignacio Cristóbal**

Final version
October 15, 2010

Contents

Contents	2
Index of tables	3
Acronyms	3
Acknowledgements and responsibility	4
Part I: Executive summary	4
Part II: Main document	6
0- Background, objectives and scope of the evaluation.....	6
1- Analysis of the programs.....	9
2- Institutional analysis of the Guatemalan Red Cross.....	16
2.1 Strengths and weaknesses.....	16
2.2 Key issues and priority actions.....	18
3- Building a future cooperation framework	23
3.1 Potential scenarios	23
3.2 Elements for defining a future framework	24
Programmatic approach.....	24
Funding.....	25
Cooperation model	26
Follow up and monitoring model	27
3.3 An example: The progressive institutionalization model.....	28
3.4 Some key points for the success of a cooperation framework	32
4- Final conclusions	33
5- Recommendations for the Norwegian Red Cross	34
Part IV: Annexes	36

Index of tables

Table 1: Details of the projects implemented by the Norwegian Red Cross in Guatemala in 2010	8
Table 2: Calendar of the evaluation process	8
Table 3: Comparison of some vulnerability indicators in the municipalities where the NRC funds GRC programs.....	11
Table 4: Potential future scenarios according to the cooperation time frame and their main triggers.....	24
Table 5: Programmatic approaches and their respective keys to success	25
Table 6: Potential funding scenarios and the triggers for their application	26
Table 7: Comparison of the bilateral and multilateral cooperation models	27
Table 8: Main follow up and monitoring options and the triggers for their application	27
Table 9: Main characteristics of the progressive institutionalization model	29
Table 10: Example of the progressive institutionalization model's planning and implementation matrix	31

Acronyms

AIEPI	Comprehensive care of diseases prevalent in infancy
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
GRC	Guatemalan Red Cross
HDI	Human development index
HIV/AIDS	Human immunodeficiency virus/ Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IFI	Institute for Integral Development
IFRC	International Federation of the Red Cross
KAP	Knowledge, attitudes and practices
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MFA	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NRC	Norwegian Red Cross
OD	Organizational development
ONS	Operating national society
PNS	Participating national society
VCA	Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis

Acknowledgements and responsibility

The external consultant would like to thank all of the key informants involved in the evaluation process for their valuable contributions and reflections. These were essential in enriching the analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in this document. A special mention should go to the officials and volunteers of the Guatemalan Red Cross from both the central headquarters and the territorial delegations for their availability, flexibility and collaboration in helping to overcome limitations and unforeseen events and bring this process to a successful conclusion.

It should also be pointed out that the opinions, reflections and information included in this document do not necessarily reflect the position of the Guatemalan Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross or other institutions involved in the process, and that the external consultant assumes all responsibility for the contents of this report.

Part I: Executive summary

The Norwegian Red Cross (NRC) is currently approaching the end of two funding cycles (MFA in 2011 and NORAD in 2012). With the aim of defining its action strategy in the country for the coming years, it has contracted an external consultant to evaluate the projects it has supported in Guatemala, as well as its cooperation model and institutional relations with the Guatemalan Red Cross (GRC) and other relevant actors. The evaluation process, implemented between August 30 and September 27, 2010, has centered on evaluating the relevance of the programs, the effectiveness of the cooperation between the GRC and the NRC in the last four years, and the GRC's capacity to manage more efficient, effective and sustainable programs. The following is a summary of the main findings, key issues, conclusions and recommendations resulting from the evaluation process.

It is possible to conclude from the **analysis of the programs** implemented that they are coherent with the main strategies and priorities established within the Red Cross Movement at the global, regional and country levels through strategic documents such as the 2010 Strategy, the Inter-American Plan 2007-2011, the Guatemalan Red Cross Strategic Development Plan 2009-2012 and the NRC Framework Document for the Americas Region 2010-2012. The HIV/AIDS, Maternal-Infant Health and Health in Emergencies programs are also pertinent and relevant to the country's needs and problems in terms of both the prioritized issues and the geographical areas selected, while the Organizational Development (OD) program is pertinent to the institutional priorities and needs identified by the GRC itself. In terms of efficacy, the HIV/AIDS, Comprehensive Care for Diseases Prevalent in Infancy (AIEPI), and Health in Emergencies programs have so far had an important influence and impact on the lives of the target communities and groups, and on the capacity, image and positioning of the GRC in the delegations in which they are being implemented. Despite important advances that need to be recognized, the achievements and impact achieved in the OD actions have been more limited than expected, due to factors such as a lack of ownership, the lack of linkage among the different actions and the absence of plans integrated and linked by the GRC.

The analysis of efficiency has revealed that generally speaking the resources have been well administered, although certain elements can be improved. The GRC has demonstrated an important improvement in its management capacity, although the conditions for an independent financial, administrative and technical management have not yet been achieved. There has been close, transparent, and collaborative coordination between the NRC and the GRC, and the four-year time frame of the funding cycles has proved to be sufficient for a medium- and long-term strategic approach. While it is too soon to assess the sustainability of the achievements and results obtained, it has been possible to verify that the programs have no integrated sustainability plans or strategies nor an exit plan for the conclusion of the current cooperation cycle in 2012. There are, however, examples of actions aimed at achieving sustainability, such as the strategic and operational alliances with the public health sector and other private local organizations.

In relation to the **Guatemalan Red Cross' institutional capacity**, the main strengths identified have been the existence of a solid basis for sustained growth in the future, a considerable improvement in the technical capacity of both the central headquarters and the delegations, accumulated experience in responding to recent disasters, and an improvement in the internal control and accountability systems. The main weaknesses found are related to the lack of a long-term institutional and strategic vision, weak strategic planning at different levels, the absence of procedures manuals and formal mechanisms for institutional management, limited diversification of external funding sources and the lack of a resource mobilization strategy, weaknesses in the volunteer management cycle, and the lack of an institutional presence in highly vulnerable departments and geographic areas.

Different alternatives are proposed for the definition of a **future cooperation framework** between the NRC and the GRC, based on elements such as the programmatic approach, the funding amounts, the cooperation model and the follow-up and monitoring model. The progressive institutionalization model is proposed as an example of a flexible model for future cooperation that can be modified and adapted in accordance with institutional circumstances and changing contexts.

The main conclusions are:

1. The cooperation programs supported by the NRC have allowed the GRC to grow in terms of its image, improve its links with the communities and other relevant local actors, and increase its technical and institutional capacity.
2. The actions of the OD program supported by the NRC have responded to the GRC's felt needs and have undoubtedly helped improve specific aspects of the institution, although their impact has been limited by factors such as the lack of an OD plan and limited support from other members of the Movement.
3. There is a positive climate and opportunities for more coherent and united work as a Movement, which requires a more proactive leadership and role from the Secretariat.
4. The GRC's current Strategic Plan needs to be revised and updated in the light of the 2020 Strategy to incorporate a more long-term institutional vision and a more profound strategic approach.
5. There is a need to improve and strengthen the linkage and coordination of the cooperation efforts of the members of the Movement in Guatemala.
6. The programs must be accompanied by institutional strengthening and development plans in the territorial delegations where they are being implemented.

7. The “combined” cooperation and funding model in which multilateral actions are integrated with other bilateral ones allows a diversity of actions and a complementarity that enables a greater impact in accordance with the national society’s needs and priorities.

Finally, the **recommendations for the NRC** are:

1. Conduct independent external evaluations of the programs to draw conclusions and produce recommendations to determine the programmatic priorities of a possible future cooperation cycle.
2. Systematize and capitalize the successful actions of the programs being implemented.
3. Initiate in the short term an open dialogue with the Secretariat and other members of the Movement present in Guatemala with the aim of identifying concerted organizational development actions.
4. Incorporate into the future cooperation models strategies that increase the NRC’s capacity for support, advice and technical accompaniment in the programs implemented.
5. In future cooperation agreements and cycles all the programs should incorporate organizational development components to strengthen the capacity of the territorial delegations in which the programs are implemented.
6. Implement cooperation models that favor the progressive responsabilization of the Guatemalan Red Cross and the sustainability and institutionalization of those programs considered to be priorities for the national society.
7. Provide the necessary steps to harmonize and align the implementation periods of the programs that receive external funding and the planning cycles of the Guatemalan Red Cross and the Federation in the Americas.
8. Prioritize support to the GRC in updating its strategic institutional plan.
9. Develop and implement a mechanism for the follow up, accompaniment and monitoring of cooperation with the GRC that includes process indicators and/or indicators for compliance with commitments and intermediate institutional goals previously agreed between both parties.
10. Prioritize programmatic issues in which the Norwegian Red Cross can offer added value and a comparative advantage compared to other members of the Movement and external donors.

Part II: Main document

0- Background, objectives and scope of the evaluation

For various years, the Norwegian Red Cross (NRC) has been cooperating with national societies (NSs) in the Americas, including the Guatemalan Red Cross (GRC), normally channeling the funds multilaterally through the Secretariat of the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC) and its programs in the region. As a result of tropical storm Stan, which affected Central America in October 2005, the NRC channeled aid bilaterally to the Guatemalan Red Cross for the first time. Since then, and without abandoning multilateral cooperation, the NRC has been directly and continuously supporting different GRC programs, mainly in the areas of health, disaster risk reduction (DRR), voluntary work and

EVALUATION OF THE COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GUATEMALAN RED CROSS
AND THE NORWEGIAN RED CROSS – Final version

organizational development (OD) with resources from external donors such as the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) and the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), as well as its own funds.

Initially, community health, water and sanitation, and HIV prevention projects were implemented bilaterally with NORAD funds for a period of three years (2006-2008) in regions affected by Stan. In 2009, NORAD approved a second funding cycle (2009-2012) focused on Health and Organizational Development. In 2008, support to the GRC was expanded through a Risk Reduction and Health in Emergencies project funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and an additional regional project, which includes Guatemala, to be executed during 2009-2011, also funded by the MFA. It is also planned to initiate a violence prevention project in the near future with the NRC's own funds.

Multilaterally, the NRC supports the IFRC's Americas Zone Office in a NORAD-funded regional HIV prevention project within the Global HIV Alliance, Health in Emergencies and Organizational Development; and another MFA-funded project on Risk Reduction and support to the Global Risk Reduction Alliance, whose aim is to develop shared tools and strengthen the region's national societies through advice and training, with the GRC being one of the beneficiary NSs.

Program (Area/focus)	Donor	Cooperation Modality	Time Frame	Amount NOK (2010)	Amount USD (2010) (approx.)
Health and Organizational Development (GTM10011) HIV Prevention and Organizational Development	NORAD	Bilateral	2009-2011	936,000	158,644
Disaster Preparedness and DRR (RAM 10041) Health in Emergencies and DRR	MFA	Bilateral	2009-2011	1,615,000	273,728
AIEPI (GTM10050) Maternal and Infant Health	NRC	Bilateral	2010	817,000	138,474
Global HIV Alliance and Organizational Development (RAM 10030) HIV Prevention	NRC	Multilateral		276,923	46,936
Emergency appeal for Tropical Storm Agatha (GTM10060) Temporary Shelter and early recovery	NRC	Multilateral	2010-2011	1,500,000	254,237

EVALUATION OF THE COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GUATEMALAN RED CROSS
AND THE NORWEGIAN RED CROSS – Final version

Program (Area/focus)	Donor	Cooperation Modality	Time Frame	Amount NOK (2010)	Amount USD (2010) (approx.)
DIPECHO VI DRR ¹	ECHO	Consortium	2008-2010		402,937
Total amount					1,274,956

Table 1: Details of the projects implemented by the Norwegian Red Cross in Guatemala in 2010

In addition to the NRC, other participating national societies (PNSs) have a presence in Guatemala and maintain bilateral cooperation with the GRC, such as the Spanish Red Cross and the Netherlands Red Cross. The ICRC also has an office in the country, while the Secretariat operates from the Regional Delegation in San José (Costa Rica).

Now that the end of the two funding cycles is approaching (MFA in 2011 and NORAD in 2012) and with the aim of defining its action strategy in the country for the coming years, the Norwegian Red Cross wanted to pause to evaluate certain aspects. These include the relevance, coherence, efficacy, efficiency, achievements and impact of the projects supported in Guatemala, as well as its cooperation model and institutional relations with the GRC and other relevant actors. With this aim, an external evaluation has been commissioned contracting the services of an external consultant with experience and knowledge of both Guatemala and the Movement in the region.

The evaluation process, implemented between August 30 and September 27, 2010, has centered on evaluating the relevance of the programs, the effectiveness of the cooperation between the GRC and the NRC in the last four years, and the GRC's capacity to manage more efficient, effective and sustainable programs. Methodologically, the process involved reading and analysis of relevant secondary information (see Annex 2), bilateral interviews and discussion groups with key informants on the global, regional, national and local levels (see Annex 3). This was followed by the relevant triangulation and comparative analysis for each relevant issue. The following table shows a chronogram of the main activities developed:

Activity	Where	When
<i>Induction meeting and interviews with Secretariat</i>	Panama	August 30 & 31 and September 1
<i>Review of secondary information</i>	Desk work	September 2, 3, 4
<i>Interviews and exchange with the GRC and other key informants</i>	Guatemala	September 6-14
<i>Exchange and feedback workshop with key GRC and NRC actors in Guatemala</i>	Guatemala	September 14
<i>Preparation of first draft of the report</i>	Desk work	September 20-26
<i>Delivery of first draft</i>		September 27
<i>Approval of Final Report</i>	Desk work	October 14

Table 2: Calendar of the evaluation process

During this process it has been possible to collect enough information of sufficient quality for the level and depth of analysis required in the terms of reference. However, it is important to mention two aspects that while not determinant for the quality of the final analysis have represented a limitation in terms of the amount and quality of information accessed and the depth of certain analyses:

¹ This was a consortium project involving the Spanish Red Cross and the Netherlands Red Cross. The CRN made a financial contribution to the total budget.

For security reasons beyond our control, it was not possible to make field visits to 3 GRC delegations (Cuatepeque, Retalhuleu and El Palmar) as there were landslides on the access highways caused by heavy rainfall. This made it impossible to visit certain beneficiary communities or directly observe the context, although this was partially resolved by organizing teleconferences and video conferences in which the external consultant was able to exchange information and interact with key informants from 4 delegations, including presidents, council members, technical coordinators, volunteers and in some cases groups of beneficiaries.

The time frame and the evaluation of the programs' results and impact based mainly on the review of secondary information, such as previous evaluations, and the assessment of key informants has been sufficient to establish certain general tendencies and points of comparison. However, it does not allow a sufficiently objective or in-depth verification of the real scope of certain actions. In other words, the program's efficacy and efficiency cannot be evaluated with the necessary depth.

The evaluation identified achievements, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, priorities and challenges which could be used to define the most appropriate strategic framework, time frame and cooperation model for a new cycle of cooperation between the GRC and the NRC. This document includes the main findings, conclusions and recommendations based on a general and comparative analysis of both the projects and programs implemented during the last four years (2006-2009), and the institutional reality of the GRC and the NRC in the regional context.

1- Analysis of the programs

Coherence

The programs supported by the NRC in Guatemala have so far been coherent with the strategies, policies and priorities established within the Movement at the global, regional and country levels.

The components and activities of the **programs on HIV/AIDS, Maternal-Infant Health and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) with an emphasis on public health in emergencies** come under the 2010 Strategy's Strategic Area 1, contribute to the first eight objectives of the "Inter-American Plan 2007-2011," the objectives and priorities of the first strategic area of the "Guatemalan Red Cross Strategic Development Plan 2009-2012" and coincide with the priority thematic areas of the "NRC Framework Document for the Americas Region 2010-2012." They also directly contribute to the first recommendation for the GRC resulting from the study "The Future of the Red Cross in Latin America and the Caribbean," which directly mentions the need to advance in community health. The HIV/AIDS program is also linked to the Global HIV/AIDS Alliance, which the GRC is also a part of, respecting the guidelines and priorities it has defined.

The **organizational development** programs and actions funded by the NRC both bilaterally and multilaterally are also related and aligned to the different strategic frameworks of the Movement in the region. In relation to the global and regional levels, the programs directly contribute to Strategic Area 2 of the 2010 Strategy, particularly in aspects related to the mobilization of resources and efficient management of the

volunteers; and to objectives 12, 13, 14 and 16 of the Inter-American Plan (2007-2011) related to volunteer management, the participation of young people, resource mobilization and diversification of sources, and participation with the public and private sectors and alliances. At the national level, actions are being implemented that are directly related to the second and third strategic areas of the GRC's Strategic Development Plan (2009-2011), such as promoting internal audits, supporting the production of procedures manuals, and support for the development of volunteer management tools (Area 2), as well as the production of resource mobilization plans and fostering alliances with the private sector (Area 3). A direct contribution is also made in terms of the recommendations for Guatemala resulting from the study "The Future of the Red Cross in Latin America and the Caribbean" (2009), which recommends reducing dependence on cooperation and developing alliances with the private sector (Recommendation 3).

Pertinence and relevance

We can state that the HIV/AIDS, AIEPI and Health in Emergencies programs are pertinent and relevant to the country's needs and problems in terms of both the prioritized issues and the geographical areas selected.

Guatemala is a country that has numerous **health problems**, registering high infant and maternal morbidity and mortality rates and being significantly affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. In relation to the risk of disasters, it is also a highly vulnerable country where earthquakes, floods, hurricanes and landslides occur regularly in a geographical context that greatly hinders access in the event of disasters. As a result, initiatives such as community preparedness for responding to disasters are particularly relevant, as is the case in the NRC's health in emergencies program. Geographically speaking, most of the municipalities where the GRC is implementing programs with NRC support can be considered highly vulnerable if we combine certain indicators such as the human development index (HDI), the extreme poverty index, the accumulated HIV/AIDS incidence rate, and the disaster risk level (see the comparative vulnerability indicators table below). However, not all of them are necessarily among the most vulnerable in the country, as the GRC does not have delegations in all of the country's departments, which represents an important limitation in terms of being able to implement development programs in some of the most vulnerable municipalities and communities. In summary, while the programs supported by the NRC are being implemented in highly vulnerable areas, there are other situations of vulnerability and potential opportunities for geographical expansion that cannot be exploited due to the GRC's limited capacity and institutional presence.

EVALUATION OF THE COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GUATEMALAN RED CROSS
AND THE NORWEGIAN RED CROSS – Final version

Comparative table of some vulnerability indicators					
Municipality	Programs implemented	HDI (2005) ²	Extreme poverty index ³	Accumulated incidence rate HIV/AIDS cases notified (2000-2004) per department ⁴	Disaster risk (high) ⁵
Concepción Chiquirichapa (Quetzaltenango)	AIEPI	Medium Low	22.6	24.33 to 46.51	Earthquakes
El Palmar (Quetzaltenango)	AIEPI, HIV/AIDS and Health in Emergencies	Medium	24.5	24.33 to 46.51	Earthquakes Volcanoes and landslides
Coatepeque (Quetzaltenango)	AIEPI, HIV/AIDS and Health in Emergencies	High	6.1	24.33 to 46.51	Floods Earthquakes
Mazatenango ⁶ (Suchitepéquez)	AIEPI	High	6.1	46.52 or more	Earthquakes
El Estor (Izabal)	Health in Emergencies	Medium	14.2	46.52 or more	Floods
Santo Tomas de Castilla (Puerto Barrios) (Izabal)	Health in Emergencies	High	2.8	46.52 or more	Floods
Retalhuleu (Retalhuleu)	HIV/AIDS and Health in Emergencies, AIEPI ⁷	Medium Low	4.3	46.52 or more	Floods Earthquakes
Concepción Tutuapa (Serchil) (San Marcos)	AIEPI	Low	45.5	11.25 to 24.32	Earthquakes

Table 3: Comparison of some vulnerability indicators in the municipalities where the NRC funds GRC programs

In relation to the **organizational development** program and actions, generally speaking it can be said that all of the actions developed with NRC support are pertinent to the institutional priorities and needs identified by the GRC itself in the Strategic Development Plan. Currently the GRC has no formal resource mobilization strategy and needs to diversify its sources of income, while there are also no formally approved institutional procedures manuals (neither administrative nor programmatic). In relation to volunteer management, the recruitment, diversity and retention of volunteers are manifest weaknesses in terms of institutional management. The NCR's bilateral and multilateral actions have been helping to address each of the weaknesses mentioned.

² Source: Guatemala's Human Development Index (2005).

³ Source: SEGEPLAN, Government of Guatemala.

⁴ Source: National AIDS Program Case Notification System (2005).

⁵ Source: DIPECHO Guatemala Country Document (2010).

⁶ There is currently no work in this municipality, although there has been in previous years.

⁷ The work on AIEPI in Retalhuleu stopped last year.

Effectiveness

Based on the secondary information reviewed and the testimonies collected from the different key informants, it can be concluded that to date the **HIV/AIDS, AIEPI and Health in Emergencies programs** have had an important influence and impact on the life of the communities and target groups and on the capacity, image and positioning of the GRC in those delegations where the programs are being implemented.

A progressive improvement and consolidation can be observed right from the beginning in the actions and achievements of the HIV/AIDS and Maternal-Infant (AIEPI) programs, which have been implemented for the longest time. An external evaluation of the AIEPI program conducted in October 2007 identified as the main weak points the poor coordination with public health institutions, the high degree of rotation of volunteers, the need to improve methodologies, the low quality of the reports and follow up systems, and the lack of a strategic approach. While some of these aspects continue to represent a challenge and need to be improved, others have already been addressed, considerably improving the program's quality in aspects such as the implementation of more participatory and suitable methodologies; the development of follow-up and achievement-measuring tools; coordination with the health sector, particularly at the community level; and the development of alliances with other local health organizations. There are also concrete examples of improvement in the impact and quality of the services in the HIV/AIDS program, including the diversification of the target groups, integrating particularly vulnerable groups (e.g. pregnant women, people deprived of liberty, soldiers, sex workers, men who have sex with men, the transgender community); the expansion of the action lines (e.g. conducting voluntary rapid tests); and the standardization and quality of report formats.

The health in emergencies program, which has had a shorter lifespan, has also had important successes such as the creation and training of community health in emergency teams in coordination with the health authorities; training on psychosocial care; and, above all, the development of specialized training curricula on both Water and Sanitation and Health in Emergencies for national intervention teams, holding various formative courses. These were designed in coordination with the Red Cross' Disaster Preparations Reference Center in El Salvador and their use and dissemination has been expanded to the whole Americas region.

Thanks to the implementation of the above-mentioned programs and their achievements, the Red Cross' capacity and positioning has improved in the communities in which the programs are being developed, although the image still needs to be improved at the national level. The GRC is currently an actor that is starting to be recognized and respected in relation to the implementation of health programs (e.g. HIV/AIDS), particularly in the departments and municipalities where the programs are being directly implemented. According to the testimonies and appraisal of the volunteers, the GRC's acceptance and credibility has currently increased in the target communities thanks to the continuity of the work and the dedication demonstrated. The delegations in which the projects are being implemented have a well-trained group of volunteers with an in-depth knowledge of the issues, but although the high degree of rotation of volunteers has decreased in various delegations it is still a pending issue in others. It is also important to highlight the political and institutional backing that the delegations' governing organs provide to the volunteers and officials involved in the programs, which allows more effective and efficient work and the strengthening of the institutional image.

Although the programs have come a long way and important advances can be observed in their impact and achievements, as has been mentioned, certain issues must still be addressed to improve the projects' efficacy. The following aspects should be mentioned in this respect:

- Planning and implementing more comprehensive actions that allow the greater optimization of efforts and resources.
- The importance of guaranteeing a minimum degree of continuity and presence in the communities during the closing and annual planning periods (between November and February).
- The availability of appropriate measurement and information collection tools in the field.
- The systematization and institutionalization of lessons learned (e.g. the micro-projects experience and participatory methodologies).
- Developing a long-term vision, approaches, and strategies that incorporate exit and sustainability plans.

In relation to the actions and support in the area of **organizational development**, the successes and impact achieved have been more limited than expected, even recognizing important advances. In the financial and administrative area, support has been provided to internal auditing processes through the funding of an internal auditor and both internal and external audits have effectively been conducted annually, although there are still examples of insufficient progress in relation to the recommendations made (e.g. bank reconciliations, not all of the delegations following standardized procedures). In relation to the strengthening of volunteer management, the most successful action that deserves to be highlighted is the implementation by the volunteers of micro-projects in the communities, which were identified and formulated by the volunteers themselves. This activity has had a great impact among the volunteers, increasing their motivation and dignity and thus fostering greater volunteer retention. It is undoubtedly an experience well worth expanding and replicating in other places. Another success related to the volunteers has been the development and publication of management instruments and tools, although the processes still need to be grounded at the territorial level and in the delegations to achieve a real impact. On the other hand, in the regional OD program implemented by the Secretariat with NRC support, in which the GRC is one of the beneficiary NSs, there are still actions such as the production of fundraising guidelines and the formalization of agreements with the corporative sector in which advances have been minimal. Although achieving the final goals for these actions is planned for 2011 and 2012, it will be necessary to analyze the state of the processes and the outlook for achieving the initially proposed results.

According to the testimonies collected, the main causes that have influenced the achievements and limited impact of certain OD actions are:

- The absence of any GRC organizational Integrated Development Strategy and the limited medium- and long-term institutional vision of the support actions developed, meaning that they end up as isolated, unlinked efforts.

- The GRC's limited ownership of certain actions, in some cases motivated by a lack of understanding of the expected product (e.g. image strategy) and in others by difficulties related to the implementation process (e.g. inappropriate profile of the person contracted to support fundraising) due to inertia and a lack of prioritization on different levels.
- The OD effort has not been the result of an approach shared as a Movement, but has rather been mainly bilateral with the NRC practically the only PNS that has supported the GRC in certain processes.
- The multilateral efforts led by the Secretariat in the region do not always have the leadership, intensity and accompaniment capacity required to motivate and involve the GRC, due to the lack of a permanent presence and sufficient resources.

Efficiency

Based on the testimonies of certain actors and not so much on an exhaustive analysis of figures (cost-effectiveness), as this was not contemplated within the scope of the evaluation, there is a general perception that the financial resources handed over have been well administered and optimized for achieving the actions. However, in certain cases the profile of the people responsible and the material and logistical means employed (e.g. vehicles) were not the most appropriate for the actions developed. Normally, this has not been due to a lack of resources on the part of the donor or program, but rather to an inadequate prioritization and use of the means by certain people in the institution. For example, the inventory control in certain territorial delegations where the programs are being developed still lacks a mechanism for holding people responsible for the good use of the resources. And while the central headquarters has recently been implementing control mechanisms for the whole staff, with the support of internal auditing, there is still a long way to go in this sense.

In relation to coordination, the NRC and GRC have progressively built up a framework of trust and respect with good communication and stable institutional relations. The presence in Guatemala of an NRC country office with a delegate and administrator working full-time undoubtedly favors coordination and communication and guarantees closer follow up. However, a cost-effectiveness analysis would be required to assess the office's real cost in relation to the programs implemented to decide whether the country office model is the most appropriate and cost-effective, or whether another kind of follow up and accompaniment model would improve efficiency. On the other hand, certain actors consulted coincided in pointing out the value that would be added by the NRC providing closer specialized technical support to the projects, not necessarily on an ongoing basis, but rather at key moments in the projects' life, such as identification and planning and the intermediary or final evaluations.

Everyone agreed that the GRC's management capacity has improved considerably in recent years, particularly in the delegations where the programs are being implemented. This is due to the fact that the programs' life and accompaniment favor and oblige responsibility. However, at the delegation level there is a lack of a comprehensive approach in which a well-structured strengthening plan would accompany the program execution, enabling weaknesses and limitations to be overcome in a sustained and lasting

way, so that once the external projects are finalized the GRC and its delegations remain strengthened, with new installed capacities. In relation to the technical capacity, important steps have also been taken in both the national-level teams and the field teams where a significant group of volunteers and professionals have important experience in issues such as HIV/AIDS and AIEPI. However, the required maturity has not yet been reached for the GRC to implement future programs 100% independently, at least in the medium term. Section 2 on institutional analysis will examine the strengths and weaknesses and possible actions and solutions in greater detail.

Finally, the implementation of three and four-year funding cycles undoubtedly represents a strength and an opportunity to build medium-term and sustainable processes. This has not always been sufficiently exploited, especially due to the GRC's lack of a clear medium- and long-term strategy and the NRC's lack of a cooperation and accompaniment model that would allow the measurement of achievements and intermediary goals upon which consistent decision-making could be based.

Sustainability

While it is still too early to assess the **sustainability of the achievements and results** of the HIV/AIDS, AIEPI and Health in Emergencies programs, as they are still being implemented, it is possible to get an idea of to what extent the strategy implemented by the GRC takes into account the sustainability factor. There is currently no structured sustainability strategy or plan as part of an exit plan, and for this reason actions that could aim to provide future conditions of sustainability are isolated and lack linkage. Some achievements, such as the good practices of the communities from the AIEPI program or the community health in emergencies teams, have undoubtedly already been taken on by the communities. However, in order to know to what extent the communities and families have integrated it in a regular way would require a kind of knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) study towards the end of the programs, comparing the results with the baseline or intermediary achievements, such as the results of the intermediary evaluation of the AIEPI program's practices conducted in 2008.

Another aspect worked on in recent months with a view to sustainability has been the building of strategic alliances, specifically with the health sector at the local level and with other local organizations with a presence and weight in the areas where the work is being implemented. To date, agreements have been signed and events and training collaboratively organized, but according to certain informants it is still not clear whether these organizations and even the health sector have the right conditions to provide continuity and assume responsibilities should the programs finish. In fact, with a view to the future it is important to provide a better definition of the objectives and purposes of certain current alliances and collaborations.

In terms of **institutional sustainability** (which can be provided by the GRC), practically all of the programs in the health area (HIV/AIDS, Maternal-Infant Health and Health in Emergencies) and organizational development area currently depend on funding received through the NRC and its donors. This means that the institutional sustainability of these programs is currently neither viable nor realistic. However, it has been observed that there are minimum conditions and certain opportunities that allow sustainability to be planned in the medium term. In other words, those programs considered strategic will be

institutionalized and guaranteed ongoing minimum resources in approximately five years' time.

In terms of the conditions for future actions, the central-level GRC and some delegations already have the experience and certain minimum capacities required to independently implement the existing programs, including both the technical and administrative-financial aspects. There are officials and volunteers with extensive experience for coordinating and implementing the programs and multiplying the knowledge, especially in the HIV/AIDS and AIEPI programs, while there are also standardized accountability procedures that have been recently reviewed and improved.

In the same way, and while they may be limited, there are funding opportunities with other external donors as the GRC now has greater credibility and is a Guatemalan institution with a presence in a number of the country's departments. In other words, it has a suitable profile for negotiating with and presenting proposals to bilateral and multilateral donors other than members of the Movement, such as international NGOs, United Nations agencies and in some cases the private sector.

2- Institutional analysis of the Guatemalan Red Cross

2.1 Strengths and weaknesses

The Guatemalan Red Cross has undoubtedly undergone important transformations in different spheres in recent years that have allowed it to improve its internal management, positioning and public credibility. While there are determined aspects in which it still has to continue improving, the GRC currently has the foundations and minimum conditions for ongoing solid and sustainable growth and improvement. The main strengths identified during the evaluation include:

- ✓ Leadership, work capacity and commitment to transparency and institutional integrity on the part of the governing organs, both at the national level and in many of the delegations.
- ✓ A minimum level of organization and structure in the central headquarters, both in financial-administrative terms and in programs, with qualified professionals most of whom know the institution well.
- ✓ Increased technical capacity and internal organization for the implementation of the different programs financed by external donors, providing opportunities to volunteers with suitable profiles and incorporating professionals hired for other key posts.
- ✓ Improvement in the management of and returns produced by the traditional sources of income, such as the pharmacies, clinics and rental that allow the GRC to ensure minimum resources for the functioning and sustainability of the national structure.
- ✓ Thanks to foreign cooperation, there has been continuity in the implementation of programs during which quality has progressively improved, which has allowed

increased acceptance by the communities and target groups and an improvement in the institutional image and positioning.

- ✓ Delegations in which external cooperation programs have been implemented have developed a technical and administrative capacity for the autonomous implementation of external projects that can be shared and transferred to other new and existing delegations.
- ✓ An important increase in the work and presence in highly-vulnerable communities, in terms of both emergency operations (e.g. Stan, Agatha) and development processes.
- ✓ Implementation of new internal control procedures and mechanisms, which while they still need to be adjusted have improved the institution's transparency and accountability.
- ✓ Thanks to the implementation of programs such as HIV/AIDS, relevant advances and improvements have been produced in internal perception and behaviors related to the non-discrimination and non-stigmatization of people and groups affected by HIV/AIDS, people with different sexual orientations, indigenous people, etc.

Many successes have undoubtedly been achieved, all of them of great relevance and importance. But as recognized by most of the sources consulted, there is still a long way to go in order to consolidate what has been achieved and address other institutional aspects that must be improved in the near future in order to build a solid NS. The following are some of the most important institutional weaknesses that have been identified:

- ✓ Lack of a long-term institutional vision and strategic planning shared by the central headquarters and the different delegations through which external cooperation efforts can be harmoniously and complementarily integrated.
- ✓ Weaknesses in the handling of the volunteer management cycle, particularly in relation to volunteer recruitment, incentives and retention.
- ✓ Excessive dependence on funding from the PNSs for the development of programs that should be strategic and priorities for the GRC.
- ✓ Lack of formal and written internal processes and procedures for program-related planning, coordination, roles and responsibilities, and decision making.
- ✓ Lack of a human resources department/person, which limits the implementation of procedures and mechanisms for personnel management and performance evaluation.
- ✓ Limited involvement and participation of the volunteers, delegations and technical personnel in certain institutional processes, strategic planning and decision making.
- ✓ Administrative control and accountability procedures sometimes affect the timely implementation of the programmed actions as they are not adapted to the context and because people with a key role in the program do not know about them.

- ✓ Some of the efforts and actions in support of organizational development are not linked and do not respond to an institutional strategy or plan. Their impact is therefore limited or does not have the expected effect.
- ✓ The limited territorial presence of the GRC, which only has delegations in half of the country's departments. In certain regions and municipalities considered to be highly vulnerable, this limits the capacity for institutional action related to the programs and services offered by the institution.

Given all of the above, we can conclude that the GRC has the capacity and minimum conditions needed to lead, manage and implement the existing programs in an independent and autonomous way in the near future. However, most of the aspects and weaknesses identified must be taken into account by both the GRC and its collaborating partners so that they can be addressed and resolved in any future program planning and cooperation scenario. The following section stresses the most relevant aspects in this respect.

2.2 Key issues and priority actions

During the evaluation process, certain aspects and priority actions were identified related to institutional and programmatic aspects that should be taken into account by the Guatemalan Red Cross and the Norwegian Red Cross in future planning and strategic review processes:

Building a particular institutional vision and strategic approach as a basis for more integral programs

The absence of a strategic approach and vision of the future has been identified in the analysis of both the programmatic and institutional areas. While there is a Strategic Development Plan for the period 2009-2012 that has fulfilled its function up to the moment, the current situation in which the institution and programs have grown and changed considerably requires a tool that is more dynamic and profound in scope. The conditions are currently right for the new plan to be produced in a participatory way, rooted in the reality of the communities, volunteers, delegations and programs under execution, based on an integral assessment focused on the communities and local delegations. The future plan must include clear goals and realistic compliance indicators for each year, together with strategies for raising funds for its implementation.

A renewed institutional vision and approach adjusted to the GRC's new reality would also provide an appropriate framework for the programs currently being implemented to have greater projection and a more integral and integrated approach. The programs are currently identified and planned independently based on a project or the existence of a funding opportunity, responding to a sectoral assessment rather than an integral assessment of the problems and needs of the context. While it is true that efforts are made during the execution to coordinate, optimize resources, and provide institutional consistency to the actions, achieving a certain degree of coherence, in practice there are gaps and sometimes inconsistencies that limit the programs' efficacy and efficiency. If we

analyze the 2020 Strategy and its three strategic objectives⁸, they are formulated under a logic of integrality in which the community is the center of the planning process, as various sectors or areas and issues can converge in each objective, which forces us to “think outside the box,” or integrally. Placing the community at the center of the institutional planning process is going to have various benefits, including the better administration of resources, allowing more to be done with less; improving efficiency and the impact on people’s lives; and improving efficacy.

In relation to the time frame, the most opportune moment for reviewing and adapting the existing Plan would be the second half of 2011, which would allow the integration of the objectives and lines of the new 2020 Strategy, the agreements resulting from the next Inter-American Conference planned for May 2011, and the results and recommendations of the program evaluations that should be conducted during 2011 in the framework of the cooperation from the NRC and other participating national societies. With the aim of optimizing time and resources, the process could also be linked to the production of the “Country Plan,” which the GRC should produce in the near future in the framework of the multilateral cooperation with the Secretariat. In short, there is a unique opportunity to align and harmonize planning times and processes at different levels.

Institutionalization of the programs considered priorities:

In harmony with the long-term strategic vision, the GRC should define which of the programs currently being implemented with important support from foreign cooperation must be integrated as part of the services the institution provides on a stable basis, both in the central headquarters and in the territorial delegations. In this sense, during the current funding cycle (2009-2012) the GRC should lay the foundations and plan for the future institutionalization of those programs it considers priorities for turning into “institutional programs.”⁹ In a hypothetical future funding cycle (2012-2014), it should be clearly established which programs should be institutional and which not, with differentiated objectives and goals. Two fundamental aspects for achieving institutionalization are the technical and management capacity and the securing of resources. It is therefore highly recommended that the planning of future programs consider a capacity-building plan and a sustainability and fund-raising strategy. These plans can integrate actions such as strengthening the delegations’ organizational structure, the prior evaluation of capacities, the delegations’ autonomous administration of the programs, stage-by-stage program implementation, etc.

Creation, formalization and implementation of standardized institutional processes and procedures

To date, the GRC has developed certain financial-administrative procedures but still has no system of processes and procedures in which the administrative-financial part is linked to the programmatic one. There are no written protocols and procedures in the programs

⁸ The 2020 Strategy’s three strategic objectives are: (1) saving lives, protecting the means of support and supporting the recovery following disasters and crises; (2) facilitating a healthy and safe life (2); (3) and promoting social inclusion and a culture of non-violence and peace.

⁹ As a reference, an “institutional program” is one that forms part of the institutional portfolio of long-term services (at least ten years) and has the minimum resources ensured for its survival, such as the minimum management and technical personnel and annual funds for the development of activities and services.

part for coordination, information and communication, planning and decision making. This means that the coordination, communication and integration among different areas and programs are subject to each individual's subjectivity and opinion without any institutional guidelines. In an institution that has grown rapidly and currently has a payroll of over 50 steady workers in the headquarters, without counting all of the officials and volunteers from the delegations, it is imperative to develop process and procedures manuals that are not only administrative, but rather integral, favoring a minimum degree of institutionality of processes independent of individual will and changes of people.

Review of the organizational structure and institutional organogram based on the reality and future growth

The current organizational structure and organogram should be reviewed based on the GRC's new needs and context. Certain aspects of the current organogram should be analyzed, such as: areas and posts that are not covered, like human resources; others in which the hierarchical line does not work as designed in the organogram, as in the case of the relationship between the presidency, vice-presidency and General Directorate; and yet others in which strengthening could be needed, as in the programs area, where there are three technical secretariats that do not have any unified technical and strategic coordination, with this responsibility falling to the General Director with the increased work load this implies. It is important for the model or organogram adopted by the institution to have a clear division of functions and responsibilities among the political and management levels to allow complementarity and increase management efficiency and efficacy. While a review tends to affect costs, it does not necessarily imply growth or the creation of new posts with a subsequent increase in spending. It can also be a reorganization and optimization of existing resources, or a reassignment of functions and roles to achieve greater efficiency; in other words, doing more with less. Whatever the case and the final result, it is worth conducting the reflection process in the light of new challenges and growth that the GRC decides to take on in the future.

Diversification of institutional income as a strategy for sustainability

Currently, although the GRC has managed to stabilize and improve the yield from its traditional income generation sources, this is not enough to support the spending of the basic organizational structure and it therefore has to resort to other external sources. The programs area is almost entirely supported by external funding sources, mainly from members of the Movement with a presence in Guatemala.¹⁰ In this situation it is neither viable nor realistic to think in terms of the sustainability and institutionalization of the existing processes. For that reason, there is a need for the GRC to design a funding and fundraising strategy based on the diversification of sources. This includes the diversification of its own resources, with the opening of new lines of business (e.g. the development and consolidation of the IFI for the sale of new services), and of external donors, strengthening the project design and management line to access new donors such as government institutions, UN agencies and international NGOs, as well as negotiating and signing agreements with the private sector. Achieving all of the above requires an

¹⁰ Spanish Red Cross, Netherlands Red Cross, Norwegian Red Cross, the IFRC Secretariat and, to a lesser extent, the ICRC.

increased management capacity and investment in qualified resources and personnel whose achievements can be measured based on results.

For a number of different reasons, the GRC currently has limited experience and knowledge in the area of fundraising and does not have personnel dedicated to or specialized in the subject, which means it cannot conduct appropriate management or draw up needs-based fundraising strategies. Changing this situation requires the design of an integral fundraising strategy whose implementation is supported by different partners, but which above all clearly and realistically defines goals according to the efforts made. In other words, it has to be possible to measure the advances achieved.

Strengthening the volunteer management cycle

In most of the delegations where the programs have been implemented, one of the factors that has affected the continuity and quality of the actions has been the high rotation of volunteers, which is still a felt problem for most of the territorial delegations despite having been reduced recently. The main consequence of this high rotation is the loss of the programs' historical memory, experience and technical capacity. In most cases it is due to external factors such as migration, people changing their place of residence, or a new labor or family status, given that most volunteers are young people and therefore more prone to change.

Improving this situation and other aspects related to voluntary action requires improving and implementing integral management of the volunteer cycle, stressing recruitment processes, performance evaluation, and work incentives and recognition.

For some time now, the GRC has been making efforts to improve its volunteer management processes and increase its active volunteer base both in the central headquarters and the delegations. Certain significant advances have been made to date, mainly with support from the NRC, thanks to the success of the micro-projects implemented by the volunteers and the development of tools and instruments such as regulations, policies, codes, etc. Likewise, a process to restructure the volunteer corps is underway with the aim of diversifying the profiles and number of volunteers. However, there is a need for these processes to be implemented and consolidated as soon as possible so that both the central headquarters and the delegations can consolidate their volunteer recruitment processes. Achieving results in this area involves strengthening the coordination of volunteers and the institutional prioritization of the corresponding actions.

Expanding the institutional presence to highly vulnerable areas

The GRC currently has 19 territorial delegations that taken together have a geographical coverage in 12 of the country's 22 departments, if we include the capital city where the central headquarters is located. Some departments, such as San Marcos and Quezaltenango, have various delegations, while others have no delegation at all. This situation considerably affects the GRC's capacity to attend to certain areas of the country—as it does not have the local infrastructure or means in determined regions—and limits the opportunities to implement development projects in municipalities and communities that are highly vulnerable with respect to certain issues. One example is the department of Esquintla where there is no delegation and which has one of the country's highest HIV/AIDS rates.

The case of the metropolitan area of Guatemala City deserves special attention as there has been no delegation there since 2006, when the existing one was closed due to internal motives. The area does have some volunteers and the central headquarters implements alternatives for the management of the volunteers and programs there. However, it has to be recognized that the lack of a delegation or autonomous management unit considerably limits and conditions the GRC's presence and positioning in the metropolitan area, where the country's highest levels of vulnerability and an important part of the total population are concentrated, and the HIV/AIDS rates are the highest in the country. In this sense, it is highly recommended that the GRC design efforts to strengthen its presence in the metropolitan area and seriously consider opening up new delegations in departments and municipalities considered to be highly vulnerable.

Strengthening the existing delegations and opening new ones will take time. So in areas with situations of high vulnerability, such as municipalities with a high HIV and AIDS prevalence where there is no institutional presence, the GRC in collaboration with its partners should seek solutions and alternatives that provide some kind of presence, such as the creation of support groups and strategic alliances.

Design of a comprehensive organizational development strategy

Although they have responded to felt needs jointly identified with the GRC, most of the efforts linked to organizational development, particularly those supported by the NRC, were isolated actions aimed at a specific weakness and not integrated into an institutional strengthening strategy, as the GRC did not have one. Likewise, other members of the Movement, such as the Secretariat and the PNSs present, conducted their OD actions bilaterally, with a consistently limited impact. According to the sources consulted during the evaluation, there is an openness and willingness on the part of the different members of the Movement supporting the GRC to implement a joint, multilateral effort in all areas related to organizational development. In other words, they are willing to participate in a coordinated and shared organizational development strategy led by the GRC. This willingness represents a unique opportunity for the GRC to design—with the support of its partners—a comprehensive OD strategy with an agreed vision and goals that integrates all of the needs and proposed actions in such a way that each partner can make its particular contribution, whether bilateral or multilateral, to one part of a whole rather than an isolated or disconnected activity or action. Even recognizing that there may always be some gaps, this approach is much more appropriate in terms of improving the efficiency and impact of the actions.

Consolidation and expansion of existing strategic alliances

During the last year, the programs have opened new fields of successful collaboration with other institutions, organizations and partners, particularly on the local level, but also on other levels. With a view to the future, it is important to establish a difference between alliances and temporary and permanent allies, as well as the nature and type of collaboration. In those cases in which it is clear that a strategic ally is long term, in other words reaching beyond a particular project or circumstance, the foundations must be laid to institutionalize and formalize the terms of the relationship through the signing of long-term institutional agreements or accords in which the roles of each party are well defined. A good example is the Ministry of Health and its representations at different levels (e.g. health post, health center, departmental unit, etc.), with which the different collaboration frameworks must be ordered and linked to provide coherence and consistency, and as far

as possible share the collaboration experiences and expand them to other levels or geographical spheres. This same logic can be applied with other institutions or organizations with which there is a history of working together.

Systematization and standardization of successful processes and methodologies

The health, AIPEI and HIV/AIDS programs have been implemented for over four years with the support of the NRC and it is highly recommended that the processes should be systematized before the conclusion of this funding cycle (2009-2011). This would allow the experience, learning and accumulated knowledge to be capitalized as a starting point and highly-valuable input for defining long-term strategies and the institutionalization and sustainability of the programs. Equally, as previously mentioned, the programs have included participatory methodologies adapted to the target groups, including puppet shows and drama presentations that have had great acceptance and success. It is important for these to be turned into formal tools that can be used in the execution of future projects in other geographical areas or even shared with other NSs and institutions. The involvement of the Integral Training Institute (IFI), recently-created within the GRC, represents a good opportunity for carrying out such actions.

Perfecting, piloting and standardization of follow-up and evaluation mechanisms and tools

While each program has been developing and trying out different monitoring and measuring tools and instruments, there is a need for the future consolidation of standardized mechanisms and tools that are common to all programs and become formal and mandatory institutional processes. Different actions can be implemented to achieve this, such as technical training for key people, the periodic conducting of external evaluations, making program coordinators responsible for following up on their projects, developing or acquiring monitoring programs (software), and developing user-friendly and context-appropriate information gathering instruments.

3- Building a future cooperation framework

3.1 Potential scenarios

In general terms, no elements have been identified that would justify or raise thoughts of a premature or sudden interruption of the cooperation the NRC provides to the GRC. In this sense, the options presented are based on the premise that—regardless of the final decision about the future of the cooperation between both national societies—the cooperation should be implemented based on aspects jointly discussed and agreed to and within a time frame that is not forced and is suitable for both parties. There are three main scenarios: Interruption of the cooperation before the end of the current cycle; finalization of the cooperation at the end of the current cycle; and the continuation of the cooperation.

Scenario 1: Interruption of the cooperation before the end of the current cycle: This option would be used only in an extremely serious situation in which one of the parties committed a serious failure to comply with the framework of cooperation and transparency, such as demonstrated corruption, non-accountability, and a serious failure to comply with

the programs' objectives. This option could also result from the unexpected suspension of funding by the donors, or the occurrence of a large-scale disaster that forces the prioritization of other geographical areas.

Scenario 2: Finalization of the cooperation at the end of the current cycle: This option would only make sense if there were a significant change in context during the period remaining before the finalization of the current programs (MFA in 2011 and NORAD in 2012). Triggers that could precipitate that option include lack of funding and a change in the NRC's strategic approach and priorities.

Scenario 3: Continuation of the cooperation beyond the current cycle: In principle, this option appears to be the most viable in the absence of the above-described triggers. The key would be the definition of the time frame, programmatic and institutional goals, and cooperation model for future cooperation.

Options	Factors that would trigger its application
Scenario 1: Interrupt cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Serious rupture of the cooperation agreements by one of the partners - Manifest and demonstrated institutional corruption - External donors unexpectedly suspend their cooperation - A large-scale disaster forces the re-directing of funds
Scenario 2: Non-continuation after the current cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impossibility of guaranteeing future funding - Change in the NRC's strategic geographical cooperation priorities - Future programmatic evaluations identify significant non-compliance with the goals - The management and accountability of the programs being implemented are not approved by the NRC - Significant disagreements between the GRC and NRC over the cooperation model, priorities and objectives
Scenario 3: Extend to another cycle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future programmatic evaluations recommend continuity - The NRC guarantees sufficient external funds for the medium term - The NRC and GRC agree on the cooperation model and strategic approach - Guatemala remains a priority country for the NRC

Table 4: Potential future scenarios according to the cooperation time frame and their main triggers.

3.2 Elements for defining a future framework

The following is a brief analysis of the different alternatives for constructing a future cooperation framework based on different factors such as the programmatic approach, funding model, cooperation model, and follow up and accompaniment mechanisms.

Programmatic approach

Two possible alternatives can be highlighted: specialization by sectors and the integral approach with a community focus.

Specialization by sectors is the model the NRC has followed up to now, in which the programs mainly focus on the health sector (HIV/AIDS, Maternal-Infant Health and Health

in Emergencies), based on which priority geographical areas are identified for implementing the programs.

The **integral approach with a community focus** is an alternative in which the community and its needs are the focus of planning. In other words, planning is based on a previous comprehensive assessment process, such as a Vulnerability and Capacity Analysis (VCA), and the priorities identified form the basis for formulating an integral intervention that addresses different aspects and sectors. If we follow the three objectives of the 2020 Strategy, interventions should be planned that at least integrate the risk reduction, health and violence prevention components.

It is also possible to have a combined programmatic approach, which at the same time as guaranteeing a minimum level of integrality based on the communities' needs, stresses some of the priorities and vulnerabilities most felt by the target communities and groups.

The following table shows the main elements for applying each approach:

Options	Keys to success
Specialization by sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other donors or PNSs complement it with other programs in the same zones of action. - Close coordination among actors and different programs. - GRC and its delegations must guarantee the integral approach. - Strong advice and technical accompaniment. - The GRC has a suitable program management system.
Integral approach with a community focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GRC and its delegations have an updated strategy with an integral approach. - Identify and ensure donors with a similar approach or diversify donors according to each program. - Updated, quality community assessments for decision making. - Inter-disciplinary technical teams. - Good coordination among work sectors within the GRC. - Strong inter-disciplinary teams. - The GRC has a suitable program management system.

Table 5: Programmatic approaches and their respective keys to success

Funding

The NRC's future funding in Guatemala, in terms of both amounts and percentages, will be mainly determined by factors such as the needs level and programmatic priorities identified in Guatemala, the possibility of the NRC securing medium-term funds, the GRC's capacity to secure funds from other donors, and the GRC's capacity to manage funds and provide adequate accountability, among others.

The following table shows different future scenarios in terms of the amounts of funding that can be applied based on determined conditions or triggers:

Options	Triggers for their application
Maintain the current funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The needs situation in Guatemala does not vary considerably according to the assessment studies conducted - The programmatic and institutional priorities identified by the GRC do not substantially vary compared to the current situation
Increase the current	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The future evaluations of the programs under implementation recommend an increase in the geographical coverage and the opening of new lines of actions.

funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GRC delegations and headquarters have a sufficient accountability capacity to increase the amounts involved. - Some event between now and the end of the current funding cycle that significantly increases the vulnerability of the country and the zones where work is being implemented.
Reduce the current funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existence of other countries in the region that are a greater priority than Guatemala to which the NRC must channel more funds and support. - The NRC cannot secure all of the funds required following the current funding cycle. - The GRC has developed capacities to diversify sources and secure funds from other donors to co-finance projects. - The GRC does not conduct satisfactory accountability during the current funding cycle.

Table 6: Potential funding scenarios and the triggers for their application

Cooperation model

The NRC currently channels its cooperation in Guatemala both directly supporting GRC projects (bilateral) and by funding projects and actions through the Secretariat (multilateral). Both are undoubtedly totally valid options and have their own strengths and weaknesses. With a view to the future, it is important to identify under which circumstances and in what way each of the options can and should be implemented to obtain the maximum effectiveness and efficiency for the GRC as the receiver of the cooperation. In principle, and based on the experience accumulated, continuing with a combined model appears to be the most appropriate option, at least for a possible future cooperation cycle, although there would have to be good identification of which issues and programs are most suitable for each of the models and the way of implementing them.

The following table details some elements collected from previous experience, which can help decision-making in this respect:

Model	Multilateral	Bilateral
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allows greater integrality and harmonization with the Movement's policies - Facilitates South-South synergies and learning - Is generally more efficient - Favors the regional approach and connection with the global level - Is an opportunity for issues of organizational development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater opportunities for advice and technical accompaniment - Closer financial-administrative follow up - Greater participation in institutional life and influence in decision making - Exploits the NRC's learning and specializations
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secretariat's limited capacity for follow up and technical support - Fewer "in situ" synergies and less learning - Fewer direct implementation funds - Limited follow up of financial-administrative processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High implementation costs - Greater difficulties with harmonizing agendas - Fewer links with other countries and regions - Diversity of cooperation models
Keys to success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secretariat's strong leadership and presence in the country. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solid agreements between the parties

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existence of a solid and concerted GRC Strategic Plan. - A GRC with autonomous management and good accountability. - The Secretariat has a solid monitoring and follow up system - Strong Secretariat leadership - Identify in which issues the multilateral approach represents an added value. - Requires an agenda shared by the members of the Movement in Guatemala. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delegates and cooperation workers with appropriate profiles and attitudes - Establish priorities based on the GRC's Strategic Plan. - Transparency in the management of information and accountability.
--	--	---

Table 7: Comparison of the bilateral and multilateral cooperation models

Follow up and monitoring model

Since the NRC started a new bilateral funding cycle in 2006, it has had a permanent office/delegation with its own staff in the GRC National Headquarters to provide coordination, follow up and technical support in the implementation process. While this presence has been very important in building and consolidating a close and transparent bilateral relationship, there is a need to pause and reflect on which follow up and monitoring model is the most appropriate for the near future, taking into considering the GRC's current context, which is different to the context of four years ago. In this sense, the three most significant options would be: having a stable office/delegation in Guatemala; accompaniment from the Regional Office (Panama); and, finally, follow up from the Central Headquarters. The following table details and compares the most significant elements of each option:

Options	Triggers for its application
With a country office/delegation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need for closer technical dialogue with the GRC. - The need for monitoring and ongoing dialogue on procedures and accountability. - The NRC wants/needs to participate in the programs' day-to-day decision-making. - The existence of components that need the NRC's direct administration and management. - The NRC's desire to participate in day-to-day coordination arenas within the Movement.
From the Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GRC has an appropriate accountability system for the standards required by the NRC and its donors. - The GRC projects have a sufficient day-to-day technical capacity. - The need to reduce personnel and functional costs. - The GRC has its own functioning monitoring and follow up system.
From the Central Headquarters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GRC has the technical and administrative-financial capacity to implement the programs autonomously. - The NRC cannot secure funds to maintain territorial offices. - The volume of bilateral funding is low and does not require close accompaniment.

Table 8: Main follow up and monitoring options and the triggers for their application

3.3 An example: The progressive institutionalization model

Different cooperation models can be organized based on the elements of analysis mentioned above, according to the evolving context and needs of both the GRC and the NRC. The important thing is for the model or approach chosen not to be rigid, but rather sufficiently flexible to be adapted during implementation according to the process indicators and intermediary goals that both national societies should agree to at the start of each new cooperation cycle.

One example of a cooperation model that the NRC could implement in the future is the “Progressive Institutionalization Model.” The ultimate aim of this model is for both the central headquarters and the implementing delegations to have the right conditions after a previously agreed period of time to assume responsibility for the programs started some time ago with external support, institutionalize them and make them independently sustainable. The process can be divided into various stages in which—progressively and based on certain previously-agreed indicators (process and compliance)—greater degrees of autonomy would be gradually taken on by the GRC in aspects related to management, technical matters, administration and funding. The following are some of the characteristics of the proposed model:

Area	Characteristics
Time Frame	This must be sufficiently broad for the GRC to have time to responsibly and realistically plan the periods in which it must take on and guarantee everything related to the programs’ management and sustainability. In principle, an extension of the cooperation cycle similar to the current ones, starting at the beginning of 2012 and finishing at the end of 2016, should be sufficient to implement the model.
Funding amounts	The proposed model contemplates a decreasing progression in which the amount funded by the NRC is reduced year after year, while other sources of funding negotiated by the GRC must increase. It is this progression that will allow the GRC to gradually assume greater degrees of financial responsibility and implementation in line with the capacities it develops every year.
Cooperation model	The current progressive model proposes a combined approach; in other words, a balance between channeling bilateral and multilateral funds in the understanding that both are complementary. There is a need to identify those actions that make more sense using a multilateral approach—such as certain organizational development or humanitarian response objectives—and those that generate more synergy and impact through a direct bilateral relationship between the NRC and the GRC.
Follow up and monitoring model	The progressive institutionalization model would have a calendar in which the NRC’s accompaniment becomes increasingly less intense in line with the capacity and results demonstrated by the GRC. The existence of a country delegation would be contemplated for the first two years starting from now, while in subsequent years a more distant follow up from the regional office would be proposed, culminating in accompaniment from the global level, should the regional office no longer exist.

EVALUATION OF THE COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GUATEMALAN RED CROSS
AND THE NORWEGIAN RED CROSS – Final version

Role of Movement members	This model needs to be implemented based on a common agenda and a certain level of agreement among the different Movement members cooperating in Guatemala, particularly with regard to the Secretariat's leadership role with a clear mandate for the organizational development of the NSs in the Americas. The PNSs with a presence in the country should also adapt their cooperation strategies to and harmonize them with the agreed shared objectives.
---------------------------------	---

Table 9: Main characteristics of the progressive institutionalization model

The following is an example of the calendar for the above-described model:

	Year 2011	Year 2012	Year 2013	Year 2014	Year 2015	Year 2016
Programmatic areas	HIV/AIDS Health in Emergencies Organizational Development AIEPI Violence prevention?	HIV/AIDS Health in Emergencies Organizational Development AIEPI Violence prevention?	Areas defined based on the programmatic approach and the external evaluations conducted in 2011 and 2012	Programmatic framework defined for the 2013-2016 cycle with variables in accordance with intermediary evaluations and changes of context	Idem	Idem
Geographical areas	Delegations and communities defined in the cycles MFA and NORAD	Possible changes and expansion in accordance with the program evaluations conducted in 2011 and changes of context	New geographical areas in accordance with the new Strategic Plan, VCA assessments and final evaluations conducted during 2012	Geographical areas defined for the 2013-2016 cycle with changes in line with intermediary evaluations and changes of context.	Idem	Idem
Funding amounts	100% NRC	100 % NRC	80% NRC 20% other GRC sources	60% NRC 40% other GRC sources	50% NRC 50% other GRC sources	In line with compliance with the previous goals
Cooperation model	Bilateral (HIV/AIDS, Health in Emergencies, HIV/AIDS, OD) Multilateral (HIV/AIDS, DRR and OD)	Bilateral (HIV/AIDS, Health in emergencies, HIV/AIDS, OD) Multilateral (HIV/AIDS, DRR and OD)	Bilateral (Health Program Emergencies) Multilateral (OD)	Idem	Idem	Idem
Follow up and monitoring model	Country office/delegation	Country office/delegation	Regional office	Regional office	Regional office	Follow up from Oslo? Decision based on intermediary goals
Main process indicators (examples)						
Strategic and management sphere	GRC Strategic Plan updated (end of 2011) Organizational development strategy drawn up (end of 2011) NRC exit strategy drawn up (if this proceeds)	GRC opens new delegations in new departments Institutional procedures manual approved Institutional organogram reviewed and updated	GRC has a management unit or delegation in the Metropolitan Area Institutional procedures manual being implemented	Etc	Etc	Etc

EVALUATION OF THE COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GUATEMALAN RED CROSS
AND THE NORWEGIAN RED CROSS – Final version

	Year 2011	Year 2012	Year 2013	Year 2014	Year 2015	Year 2016
Programs	New vulnerable communities identified (during the year) External program evaluations (throughout the year)	GRC's technical capacity improved in accordance with the OD Plan Satisfactory program results	GRC delegations contribute 10% of the program budgets GRC co-finances 20% of the programs with its own funds or funds from other donors	GRC co-finances 40% of the programs (end of 2014)	50% of the priority programs have initiated an institutionalization process	50% of the delegations have institutionalized the priority programs and have an implementation strategy
Fundraising	Funding opportunities identified	Fundraising Strategy drawn up (end of the year) Creation of a project formulation and presentation unit	Central Headquarters increases its income from external sources by 20%	The GRC has increased its external fundraising by XX percent	50% of the HIV program can be sustained by the GRC. The project formulation and presentation unit is sustainable	The GRC can guarantee the sustainability of the prioritized programs
Administration and finances	Standardized procedures in all of the GRC delegations	The GRC's accountability approved by the NRC.	Delegations where NRC projects are implemented have the capacity for their own financial-administrative management	Mid-term external audits conducted	Etc	Etc
Role of the Movement	The Movement discusses common OD cooperation framework	Common OD cooperation framework agreed (Movement)	Common OD cooperation framework being implemented (during 2013)	Etc	Etc	Etc

Table 10: Example of the progressive institutionalization model's planning and implementation matrix

3.4 Some key points for the success of a cooperation framework

During the consultation and evaluation process certain issues emerged that the different informants considered to be minimum conditions or fundamental aspects for the success of the cooperation processes and the relationship between the operating national society (ONS)—in this case the GRC—and the PNS—in this case the NRC. The following are those issues that in the view of the people consulted and the consultant himself are most relevant in terms of being taken into consideration for the definition of future cooperation processes. While several are already being implemented by the NRC and GRC, it is important to bear them in mind for future cooperation model planning and definition processes.

- A. **A shared strategic vision:** The priority issues it is decided to support, as well as the geographical areas, time frame and model of cooperation, must be the result of a process of joint and participatory identification that both the ONS and PNS feel reflect their priorities and needs. It is equally fundamental to agree from the beginning on certain intermediary and final goals and their respective compliance indicators and sources of verification, which should be accepted and internalized by both parties.
- B. **Formalized and disseminated cooperation and implementation agreements:** All of the agreements, political as well as technical and operational, must be formalized and written from the beginning so they can be disseminated among the key people on different levels and to ensure there are no ambiguities, crossed wires or misunderstandings. The agreements must be as concrete and specific as possible, avoiding generalities or ambiguities. As far as possible, starting actions before the minimum agreements have been formalized should be avoided.
- C. **Agreed and shared system and mechanisms for follow-up and measuring achievements:** The criteria, tools and instruments for providing follow up and measuring the successes and goals achieved must be agreed from the beginning and accepted by both parties on both the political and the managerial and operational levels. There must also be clear and objective review and assessment mechanisms. These mechanisms must allow the measurement of aspects related to the programs' external impact and institutional aspects related to accountability, compliance with agreements, etc. It is also important to define from the beginning the calendar and methodologies for the follow up and evaluation (e.g. external evaluations, visits from the headquarters, audits, etc.).
- D. **Well-defined coordination and decision-making mechanisms:** It must be clear which departments and people—from the GRC, the NRC and other actors—should intervene at each moment and what their sphere of decision making and responsibility is. In this respect, it is recommended to differentiate between political-strategic, management or coordination, and technical-operational levels, defining who forms part of each level and their sphere of action.
- E. **Established information and communication protocols and channels:** The information and communication flows and channels must be well defined and known by everyone right from the beginning so that people have access to the information they need to carry out their work in a timely way. The protocol's objective is to reduce subjectivity as far as possible and avoid information excesses or gaps and communication short-circuits.

- F. **Transparency in accountability:** There must be clarity and transparency in the information supplied by both the collaborating and the receiving partners. At all times the required information must be supplied or valid and clear explanations given as to why the information is incomplete. Transparency in accountability must work on all levels of the relationship i.e. the political-strategic, coordination and technical-operational levels.
- G. **A climate of respect and trust:** This aspect cannot be attained by command or by decree, and there are no magic formulas and no tools or methodologies to achieve it. Rather it is built up day by day through respectful and professional attitudes and behavior, at both the institutional and personal level. A good working atmosphere and relations are undoubtedly much more likely to achieve goals than a tense atmosphere. Respect must be given from a relationship of equality, with the receiving partner accepting the collaborating partner and its particularities and idiosyncrasies, and the collaborating partner making an effort to understand the context of the National Society and the country.
- H. **People with an appropriate aptitude and attitude for the ends pursued:** The choice of people with an appropriate profile for the responsibilities they have to assume in terms of both professional and technical preparation and their attitude to team work, decision making and respect for others is a very important factor for the success of the cooperation. In this sense, it is recommended that the selection and performance evaluation of those hired for positions of responsibility and decision making related directly to the programs should be done collegially and transparently with the involvement of the key people from the NRC and GRC.

4- Final conclusions

- 4.1 To date, the cooperation programs supported by the NRC have allowed the implementing delegations and the GRC as a whole to improve their image, improve their links with the communities and other relevant local actors, and increase their technical and institutional capacity. This has laid the foundations for the GRC—on both the central and local levels—to be able to assume in the near future the responsibility for and institutionalization of those programs considered strategic and priorities for the country and the institution itself, as could be the case with HIV/AIDS and Maternal-Infant Health programs.
- 4.2 Generally speaking, the actions of the NRC's Organizational Development program have responded to the needs felt by the GRC and have undoubtedly served to improve specific aspects of the institution. However, the GRC's lack of a comprehensive OD strategy and the limited involvement and support of certain members of the Movement have affected the linkage of the efforts and the ownership and continuity provided by the GRC, which has limited the desired impact and changes.
- 4.3 Guatemala has the right climate and opportunities for the Movement to have more closely coordinated and coherent work with the involvement of all the PNSs present and the ICRC. Above all, this should involve a more proactive role and closer, more

effective leadership from the Secretariat in structuring a shared agenda and vision on organizational development based on the vision and priorities felt by the GRC.

- 4.4 The GRC's current Strategic Plan has served to show the road map and harmonize the actions and programs with the Movement's priorities and policies in the institutional setting of recent years. However, it needs to be revised, updated and harmonized with the 2020 Strategy to incorporate a longer-term institutional vision and a more in-depth strategic approach based on the lessons learned and achievements of the programs being implemented, as well as the country's most recent needs.
- 4.5 Although the Movement members with a presence in Guatemala have coordination and information exchange arenas, the cooperation strategies and models respond to a bilateral logic. In this sense, there is a need to improve and strengthen the linkage and coordination of the cooperation efforts of the Movement's members in Guatemala, mainly the Secretariat and the PNSs, identifying priorities and issues where a joint and linked strategy as a Movement would be appropriate for achieving the desired impact.
- 4.6 Program implementation should be accompanied by institutional strengthening and development plans and actions in the territorial delegations in which they are being carried out. These should be in line with their needs and done in such a way that once the cooperation and external support have concluded, the delegations (branches) have been strengthened and have the capacity to face the future autonomously.
- 4.7 The "combined" cooperation and funding model in which multilateral actions are integrated with other bilateral ones allows a diversity of actions and complementarity that enable a greater impact in terms of the NS's needs and priorities. While the multilateral approach favors integrality and linkage as a Movement, the bilateral approach provides a closer relationship, more learning opportunities and greater wealth from diversity.

5- Recommendations for the Norwegian Red Cross

- 5.1 During 2011, conduct independent external evaluations of the HIV/AIDS, Maternal-Infant Health¹¹ and Health in Emergencies programs that allow an in-depth measurement of the impact, efficacy and efficiency of each program and the establishment of detailed conclusions and recommendations for determining the programmatic priorities of a possible future cooperation cycle starting at the end of 2012. In the case of programs like AIEPI, it would be worth analyzing the possibility of conducting a final KAP study to compare with the initial base line.
- 5.2 Systematize and capitalize the successful actions of the programs being implemented, such as the micro projects managed by volunteers, in order to draw lessons, improve their implementation, and be able to replicate them in other delegations.
- 5.3 In the short term, initiate an open dialogue with the Secretariat and other members of the Movement present in Guatemala with the aim of identifying organizational

¹¹ In the case of the AIEPI, two intermediary evaluations have been conducted at the end of 2007 and beginning of 2008, and it would be important to conduct a final evaluation at the end of 2011 to assess the final achievements.

development actions in which a coordinated and linked effort would allow a greater impact to be obtained compared to bilateral actions.

- 5.4 Whatever the time frame and cooperation model that the NRC defines for future cooperation with the GRC, it should include strategies that increase the NRC's support, advice and technical accompaniment capacity in the programs implemented, guaranteeing at all times a quality technical contribution in accordance with the GRC's demands and needs.
- 5.5 In future cooperation agreements and cycles all the programs should incorporate organizational development components to strengthen the capacity of the territorial delegations in which the programs are implemented. In this sense, it is recommended to conduct institutional capacity assessments in the program-implementing delegations that can be used as a basis for jointly determining institutional strengthening plans, which should be implemented alongside the programs and whose advances and achievements would also be measured using process indicators.
- 5.6 In possible future funding cycles, implement cooperation models that favor the progressive responsabilization of the Guatemalan Red Cross and the sustainability and institutionalization of those programs considered priorities for the NS.
- 5.7 Provide the necessary steps to harmonize and align the implementation periods of the programs receiving external funding with the planning cycles of the Guatemalan Red Cross (every four years) and the Federation in the Americas. This could be carried out between the end of 2011 and the beginning of 2012, taking advantage of the fact that the GRC must update its strategic plan in the light of the 2020 Strategy and the priorities resulting from the next Inter-American Conference (May 2011), while the programs of the current funding cycle will also be concluding (MFA at the end of 2011 and NORAD at the end of 2012).
- 5.8 Among the organizational development actions, prioritize support to the GRC in updating its institutional strategic plan, the design of an institutional organizational development and capacity-building plan, and the design of a resource diversification and sustainability strategy.
- 5.9 For possible future funding and cooperation cycles, develop and implement a mechanism for the follow up, accompaniment and monitoring of cooperation with the GRC that includes process indicators and/or indicators for compliance with institutional commitments and goals previously agreed between both parties.
- 5.10 Prioritize programmatic issues in which the Norwegian Red Cross can offer added value and a comparative advantage compared to other members of the Movement and external donors, such as the HIV/AIDS program, seeking complementarity and synergies with other programs under implementation.

Part IV: Annexes

Annex I: Terms of Reference

Annex II: List of documents consulted

Annex III: People interviewed