

# IMPACT EVALUATION

## Capacity Building, Organisational Development and Disaster Preparedness Project in Vietnam

Funded by Norwegian Red Cross



Commissioned by:



Funded by:



Anna Høybye  
September 2010

## Executive Summary

This report is an impact evaluation of the partnership between Vietnam Red Cross (VNRC) and Norwegian Red Cross (NRC) and the associated Capacity Building (CB) and Organisational Development (OD) projects.

VNRC and NRC have been in partnership since 1995. Until 2001 NRC provided support multilaterally through IFRC, while project-based bilateral support commenced in 2002. The partnership has involved three successive CB/OD projects, including the ongoing V7 project (2009-2010/2012), which targets VNRC chapters and branches in seven provinces in the Northern and central part of Vietnam. The projects have aimed at increasing VNRC chapter/branch capacity through the following types of activities: 1) Trainings, workshops & study tours; 2) Experience exchanges/knowledge sharing; 3) Dissemination of information, and 4) Material support. The ongoing V7 project target the provinces of *Binh Dinh, Phu Yen, Vinh Phuc, Yen Bai & Tuyen Quang* (these also participated in the previous project/s) as well as *Phu Tho and Thai Nguyen* (these are new project areas).

The objective of this evaluation was to verify the overall efficiency and sustainability of the long-term partnership between the VNRC and NRC and the associated OD/CB projects, which would also form the basis to determine the next stage of the partnership.

The evaluation involved field visits to three of the seven provinces targeted by the current V7 project, namely Binh Dinh, Vinh Phuc and Thai Nguyen. Multiple informants and stakeholders were interviewed and consulted for the evaluation and a series of findings and recommendations are contained in this document. The key findings are extensively reported on, and relate specifically to the:

- Objectives and activities with a predominant focus on the current V7 project as to their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability in addressing the complex issues of OD/CB in the organisation of VNRC.
- VNRC/NRC partnership including the relationship involved in the management and implementation of the project support and associated strengths and weaknesses.

The project goal of the current V7 project is:

To strengthen the seven provincial branches to become democratic and transparent actors in civil society in order to deliver improved services (in quantity and quality).

The specific project objectives of V7 are:

1. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have secured strong and stable financial resources for humanitarian work.
2. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have developed a strong human resource base with sufficient and capable staff and a wide network of functioning volunteer teams.
3. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have adequate office facilities and a better working environment.

The evaluation concluded that the partnership and associated project is highly relevant to the needs VNRC chapters and branches, consistent with VNRC and NRC strategies and priorities, but that it would be useful to be increasingly guided by the needs of the vulnerable communities served by VNRC, and thus increasingly approach CB/OD as a vehicle towards the development of a programme area/improved service delivery and less as a stand-alone process.

In relation to effectiveness the evaluation concluded that the project activities have largely contributed to the immediate project objectives being met. A consistent message from all consulted chapters and branches was that their organisation had been transformed from existing in name only to becoming an active, well known and respected entity. This is a very significant achievement.

In terms of efficiency the partnership/projects can be considered good value for money when comparing the relatively modest financial input to the quite impressive immediate results. However, it was also felt that resources are spread too thinly in the current V7 project, and that the number of involved chapters/branches should be reduced based on a combination of factors.

In relation to impact significant progress was also detected. E.g. the number of RC service models has increased as has general volunteer activity levels. Likewise, the RC branches have become much more effective in conducting advocacy on behalf of vulnerable people. Compared to the low levels of RC activity - or indeed in some cases almost complete inaction - which characterised most of the participating RC branches prior to the commencement of the OD/CB support, it is quite impressive what has been achieved. The Evaluation team found that most of the RC activities are focusing on charity and short-term humanitarian support. This support is indeed highly valued by beneficiaries, but considering the maturity and proficiency of some of the participating branches/chapters it is suggested to increasingly supplement this type of assistance with more long-term development models. It is furthermore believed that linking the OD/CB support more explicitly to a sector programme could help address this to the even higher benefit of end beneficiaries.

In terms of sustainability, it was found that sound measures have been taken to ensure that positive results can be sustained. However, it was also stressed that sustainability is particularly vulnerable to the staff turnover. It was also found that the current V7 project does not have a very significant VNRC headquarters component, which could be considered useful from the perspective of more easily replicating beyond the immediate project areas and countering the current “over-stretched” capacity of VNRC headquarters.

Furthermore, the VNRC/NRC partnership was found to be very strong and healthy in terms of key dimensions such as equality and respect, integrity, transparency and ownership, and this is believed to provide a solid foundation for a continuation of the collaboration.

Based on the above factors it was recommended to continue the partnership beyond the current phase, but with modifications as per the recommendations presented in summary below, some of which could already be implemented in the next funding cycle (2011-2012):

1. The approach to OD/CB should increasingly be driven by a focus on branch output/service delivery, and thus ultimately guided by the needs of communities.
2. A consolidated log frame should be developed as well as corresponding overall budget and activity plan.
3. Look into how widespread “forced donations” are, and if relevant address the issue.
4. Work towards a common understanding of what constitutes a RC member, a RC active member and a RC volunteer. A revision of the 2008 VNRC volunteer management guidelines might be relevant to provide clear direction in this regard.

5. Improve/extend the training of FA volunteers to ensure that all have the necessary skills and knowledge, and also ensure that FA volunteers at all times have protective gloves.
6. Develop more detailed records for trainings, networking/events and workshops to provide a better picture of at what level capacity is being built, the training delivery approach and the cost.
7. Reduce the number of chapters targeted by the project in connection with entering into the next funding period (2011-2012) to counter the current capacity constraints of VNRC headquarters and to enable a stronger focus on OD/CB needs at commune level in the remaining provinces.
8. Expand the central Project Management Board to include representatives of additional VNRC headquarter departments.
9. Direct the OD/CB support more explicitly towards nurturing sustainable development models.
10. Introduce more indicators measuring service delivery to further facilitate an increased focus on impact.
11. VNRC headquarters to continue its advocacy efforts towards local authorities and party leaders to ensure that new chapter chairpersons are genuinely qualified, motivated and engaged.
12. Include and strengthen the VNRC headquarters OD/CB component in the next funding phase of the project to embed the intervention more solidly within the VNRC headquarters.
13. Ensure the lessons learned from the successive OD/CB projects are fed into the strategy formulation process leading to the 2011-2020 VNRC development strategy and vision document.
14. VNRC headquarters and chapters/branches to intensify their advocacy efforts to increase the government funding for CB/staff development and to allow chapters and branches to spend a certain percentage from private donations on administration.
15. Continue the partnership beyond the current phase, but with modifications as per the recommendations above some of which can already be implemented in the next funding cycle (2011-2012).

**Acronyms**

AOV:	Agent Orange Victim
CB:	Capacity building
CBFA:	Community based first aid
DRR:	Disaster Risk Reduction
DNV:	Det Norske Veritas
FA:	First Aid
IFRC:	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IHL:	International humanitarian law
NORAD:	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NRC:	Norwegian Red Cross
NS:	National Society
OD:	Organisational development
PC:	People's Committee
PMB:	Project Management Board
PMER:	Planning, monitoring & evaluation, reporting
ToT:	Training of trainers
VNRC:	Vietnam Red Cross

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Background</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Purpose of the Evaluation</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Evaluation Methodology</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>5. An Assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the VNRC/NRC partnership and the associated projects</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>5.1 Relevance</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>5.2 Effectiveness</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>5.3 Efficiency</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>5.4 Impact</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>5.5 Sustainability</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>6. An assessment of the justification for continuation of the partnership/existing projects beyond the current time frame (2009-2012) and recommend revising the programme activities and indicators to further ensure relevance, quality assurance and sustainability</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>7. Recommendations</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>8. Conclusions</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>Annex 1: Terms of Reference</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>Annex 2: Programme of the evaluation mission</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>Annex 3: List of people consulted by the evaluation team</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Annex 4: List of documents reviewed</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>Annex 5: Map of Vietnam highlighting current V7 project areas</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>Annex 6: Summary of NRC Funded Projects</b> .....	<b>44</b>
<b>Annex 7: Consolidated Impact Indicators of V4</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<b>Annex 8: Consolidated Impact Indicators of V7</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<b>Annex 9: Proposed template for training/workshop/exchange record</b> .....	<b>51</b>

## Acknowledgements

The evaluation team wishes to express its sincere thanks to the many Red Cross staff, members and volunteers as well as officials and private persons who generously contributed their time and knowledge. Without their kind assistance and input the team could not have conducted the assignment.

NRC and the VNRC commented upon a draft version of this report. This version is the final one; the responsibility for the content belongs with the consultants who wrote it. Their views may not always coincide with the opinion of VNRC, NRC, resource persons or stakeholders.

## **1. Introduction**

This report presents the findings and recommendations of a team of external consultants to the Norwegian Red Cross (NRC) tasked to undertake an impact evaluation of the long-term partnership between NRC and Vietnam Red Cross (VNRC).

VNRC and NRC have been in partnership since 1995. During the period 1995 to 2001, NRC supported VNRC multilaterally through the IFRC, while the bilateral support commenced in 2002. The partnership has involved three Capacity Building (CB) and Organisational Development (OD) projects, namely the V3<sup>1</sup> Project (2002-2005), V4 Project (2006-2008), and an ongoing V7 project (2009-2010/2012). In addition, in 2008 the partnership was expanded to include a community development/WATSAN project, which has so far been implemented in 2 communes<sup>2</sup>, and in 2009 a Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) project covering two provinces was commenced. However, the two latter projects fall outside the scope of this evaluation.

The evaluation team consisted of Ms. Thu Ba (national consultant), and Ms. Anna Høybye (international consultant & team leader). A participatory evaluation approach was applied throughout the evaluation exercise and the team was working closely with: Ms. Luong Hong Thuy, Deputy Director of International Relations & Development Department, VNRC; Ms. Lan Anh, Project Officer, VNRC; Mr. Nguyen Xuan Duy, National Coordinator in Vietnam, NRC and Ms. Nguyen Thi Hong Giang, Project Officer, NRC. The evaluation was carried out in Vietnam in the period 15-29 August 2010 and involved consultations in Hanoi as well as field visits to the provinces of Vinh Phuc, Binh Dinh and Thai Nguyen. The full terms of reference and the programme of the mission are detailed in **Annex 1** and **Annex 2**.

## **2. Background**

### **Country Context**

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam is a densely populated country with a fast-growing population of approximately 86 million people. Vietnam is a single-party state with the Communist Party playing the focal role in all organs of government, politics and society. In 1986 an economic reform package with free market elements such as privatization was introduced resulting in a Socialist-oriented market economy, and today Vietnam is one of Asia's most open economies. In the last decade it has also been one of the highest performing economies, and has similarly made impressive progress in fighting poverty. According to the World Bank, the general poverty rate fell from 58.1% in 1993 to 16% in 2006. However, not all groups have benefitted equally from the economic development. E.g. in 2006, only 10.2 % of the Kinh/Viet and Chinese people were living in poverty, compared to 52.2 % of ethnic minority people, and though accounting for only 13.5 % of the total population, ethnic minorities now constitute 44.4 percent of the poor.<sup>3</sup>

Located in the tropical monsoon areas of South East Asia, Vietnam is one of the most hazard prone countries in the Asia Pacific region. Because of its topography Vietnam is suffering from typhoons, tropical storms, floods, drought, seawater intrusion, landslides and forest fires. Disasters triggered by typhoons and floods are by far the most frequent and severe. The storm season lasts from May to December. The 70% of the population living in lowland areas in the Red River and Mekong deltas or along the 3,200 km coastline are most vulnerable to such natural disaster, which often result in human casualties, economic and livelihood losses as well as environmental damage. According to a World Bank assessment, Vietnam is also one of the five worst affected

---

<sup>1</sup> The "V" stands for "Vietnam", while the number represents the number of provinces involved in the project.

<sup>2</sup> This project has been funded by Det Norske Veritas (DNV).

<sup>3</sup> [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

countries in relation to climate change, as a large proportion of the population, infrastructure and economic production including irrigated agriculture, is located in coastal lowlands and deltas.

Administratively, the country is divided into 63 provinces, which are divided into districts/cities, which are made up of more than 9,000 communes.

### **Organisational Context**

VNRC was established in 1946, by the then president Ho Chi Minh, who also became the first Honorary President of the NS. VNRC is a leading social and humanitarian agency in Vietnam with an extensive network of up to 200,000 members and volunteers.<sup>4</sup> VNRC has the following vision: “By 2020, the Vietnam Red Cross will become a well-functioning National Society, acting as a key force in the humanitarian cause, and actively contributing to the improvement of living conditions of vulnerable people”. In 2008 a law on Red Cross activities was passed by the national assembly, which identifies the following as main focus areas of VNRC: Emergency assistance and humanitarian relief; health care, first aid; blood, tissue and organ donation; restoring of family links; dissemination of humanitarian values; and disaster preparedness and response.

VNRC has a four-level structure with a National headquarters in Hanoi; VNRC chapters in all 63 provinces as well as VNRC branches in all districts/cities and in almost 99% of the communes. Unlike many other NSs in the region, VNRC has significant numbers of paid staff even at the commune level, and employs a total of approximately 18,000 staff, the vast majority of them funded through government/local government support.

VNRC Headquarters is divided into 13 technical departments, including a Social Welfare department; Health Care department; Blood Donation, Recruitment and Mobilisation department; Youth and Dissemination department; RC Training Centre; Fundraising Department; Finance department; Personnel department; and International Relations and Development department.<sup>5</sup> In VNRC Headquarters, OD is considered a crosscutting issue, and therefore does not rest within a single technical department. Review and restructuring of the headquarters organisational structure has been highlighted as one of the main challenges in the coming years by the International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) delegation in Vietnam.

VNRC is auxiliary to the government, and has an important role in relation to the government’s national strategies and priority programmes related to e.g. humanitarian support, poverty eradication, health promotion, and disaster preparedness and emergency relief/response. VNRC is a member of the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control as well as of the Fatherland Front, which is an umbrella group of pro-government mass movements in Vietnam. The Front is described by the Vietnamese government as “the political base of people’s power” and has a significant role in society. Many of the government’s social and poverty reduction programmes, e.g. housing programmes for the poor and support to Agent Orange Victims (AOVs) are conducted through the Front.

In relation to the chapters and branches, the statutes of the VNRC underline the rather decentralised and flexible structure of the organisation, according to which: “Red Cross at all levels are allowed to establish their own Red Cross units, supporting board, donors department, centers and other diversified activities in order to quickly response to the needs and organisation

---

<sup>4</sup> There are different figures provided for number of VNRC members and volunteers. The above figure is from the project documentation, while a recent VNRC publication makes reference to 5,765,743 members; 4,293,157 Red Cross youths and 531,699 Red Cross volunteers, VNRC: “Each Organisation, Each Person helps one Humanitarian Address”.

<sup>5</sup> Other departments are: Agent Orange Victims fund, Inspection Department, Representative Office in the South and General Office. Headquarters also has four Dissemination Agencies and nine Service Centers.



development and humanitarian activities of the Society”.<sup>6</sup> Most activities of the NS are carried out through VNRC’s network at the grassroots level.

### **The Norwegian Red Cross Support / the Projects**

The key focus of the NRC support to VNRC is strengthening OD/CB<sup>7</sup> of chapters/branches to support the VNRC in realizing its mission ‘to act as a key force in the humanitarian cause, and to actively contribute to the improvement of living conditions of vulnerable people’. As most of VNRC’s activities are implemented at the grassroots level, strengthening the organisational and operational capacity at VNRC chapters and branches is key in relation to ensuring VNRC effectiveness and responsiveness towards improving the lives of vulnerable people.

Various challenges related to the capacity and operational performance of VNRC Chapters and branches have been identified. These are related to the following four elements:

- 1. Inputs/resources:** Insufficient funds and resources for operational costs and service delivery; none/few volunteers; insufficient members, and many not contributing membership fee;
- 2. The capacity of VNRC to perform:** Lack of appropriate facilities; insufficient management capacity (e.g. HR management, volunteer mobilization and management; resource mobilization); insufficient technical capacity of staff and volunteers (e.g. assessment capacity; FA skills); lack of proper coordination and reporting mechanisms; insufficient RC image etc.
- 3. The services of VNRC and their impact:** Insufficient performance in terms of quality, scope and outreach of programmes and services.
- 4. The context in which VNRC operate:** Lack of understanding of RC role and mandate among authorities and communities; most staff at chapter and branch level appointed by local government; limitations on use of funds from government and funds mobilized through fundraising; chapters/branches not always free to decide beneficiaries etc.

The V3, V4 and V7 projects have all been funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD). **Annex 6** provides an overview of the projects in terms of duration, budget, management set-up, geographical coverage; key characteristics of implementation strategy etc. Five of the seven provinces targeted by the V7 project, namely *Binh Dinh, Phu Yen, Vinh Phuc, Yen Bai & Tuyen Quang*, have already participated in the previous projects (V3 and/or V4), while two, namely *Phu Tho and Thai Nguyen* are new participating chapters. While the V3 and the V4 project attempted to include all districts and commune branches within the participating chapters, the V7 project has deliberately chosen only to target those branches with the highest potential for improvement, and the latter project thus only targets 358 communes compared to the 631 communes targeted by the V4 project.

NRC has a project office in Hanoi employing two local staff, namely a National Coordinator and a Project Officer. During the V3 project, NRC deployed an international delegate, but this position was later phased out and replaced by the National Coordinator position. Staff from NRC headquarters in Oslo, Norway, such as the Programme Coordinator for Asia and Volunteer

---

<sup>6</sup> VNRC Revised Statutes, 2008, Article 11.2.a.

<sup>7</sup> In accordance with IFRC “A Common Approach to National Society Development”, adopted by the Governing Board and the General Assembly of IFRC, November 2005, OD can be understood as focusing on strengthening a NS at all levels to achieve the characteristics of a well functioning NS. It includes planning, governance, management, structures, human resources, image, and finances, while CB can be seen as focusing on strengthening a NS’s services, related structures, staff and volunteers in order to assist, work with, and empower vulnerable people at the community level in core programme areas. Thus, OD is related to the development of the basic core machinery of the organisation whereas CB is linked more directly to the performance of the NS in terms of programmes and services.

Advisor, visit Vietnam several times every year to discuss the cooperation, monitor progress and provide technical support where needed.

Across the three successive projects, activities/spending can broadly be divided into:

*1) Trainings, workshops & study tours*

E.g. trainings on RC movement, IHL, CBFA/FA/water rescue, financial management, computer training, fundraising and communication, proposal writing, volunteer management, ToT methodology, disaster preparedness, study tours abroad (e.g. to Norway, Nepal, Cambodia and China). Trainings target staff, volunteers and local authorities.

*2) Experience exchanges/knowledge sharing*

E.g. youth camps, various knowledge sharing and review meetings involving staff and/or volunteers, exchange trips to other provinces or within province, commemorations.

*3) Dissemination of information*

E.g. printing of RC information materials, production of bulletin and documentaries.

*4) Material support*

E.g. office equipment for chapters and district branches and materials to facilitate RC action on the ground such as volunteer uniforms, RC flags, FA materials, helmets, life vests, boats and other DM related materials, rice jars, donation boxes etc.

In addition, the V3 project also allocated funds to “Disaster preparedness”, while the V4 project, allocated funds to “sub-projects”, such as a gravity-fed water system in Binh Dinh; a water filtering system in one school in Vinh Phuc and kindergarten classrooms in several provinces.<sup>8</sup>

### **3. Purpose of the Evaluation**

This impact evaluation will be conducted to verify the overall efficiency and sustainability of the long-term partnership between the VNRC and NRC. This will likewise form the basis to determine the next stage of the partnership. This involves:

- To evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the partnership between the NRC and VNRC in general and the programmes/projects in particular.
- To evaluate the justification for continuation of the existing projects beyond the current time frame (2009-2012) and recommend revising the programme activities and indicators to further ensure relevance, quality assurance and sustainability.
- Should the recommendation be not to continue beyond the current time frame, to recommend modifications in modus operandi of the programme for the remaining time frame (2011-12) in order to secure sustainability in the programmes.

The complete Terms of Reference are attached as **Annex 1**.

### **4. Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation team used the following methods for the evaluation:

- Review of relevant documents. The list of documents reviewed is attached as **Annex 4**.
- Interviews with NRC Programme Coordinator, VNRC headquarters (Secretary General and Project Management Board) and VNRC staff at province, district and commune level according to semi-structured interview guides.
- Meeting with IFRC Head of Delegation and IFRC OD Manager.
- Interviews with local authorities at province, district and commune level according to semi-structured interview guides.

---

<sup>8</sup> E.g. in 2005, 33.6% of total expenditure of USD 200,042 spent on disaster preparedness, and in the period 2006-2008, 12.3% of total spending of USD 730,073 was spent on “sub-projects”.

- Focused group discussions (FGDs) with RC volunteers according to semi-structured interview guides.
- Interviews and/or visits to beneficiaries of RC support.
- Observation of selected RC activities (DP exercise, rice donation, FA spots).

The complete list of stakeholders consulted is attached as **Annex 3**. The evaluation team visited three of the seven provinces of the current V7 project, namely Vinh Phuc and Thai Nguyen in the North and Binh Dinh in the central part of the country. The province visits included visits to: 11 districts; 8 communes; 1 city; 1 ward and 1 town. The sample areas were pre-selected by VNRC and NRC based on the following criteria: One province has participated in V3, V4 and V7 (Binh Dinh); one province has participated in V4 and V7 (Vinh Phuc), and one province has only participated in V7 (Thai Nguyen). In addition, the strongest chapters/branches from the various phases were chosen (purposeful sampling), which means that the findings from the field visits cannot necessarily be generalised to all target areas.

The Team leader did not speak Vietnamese, and was therefore dependent on translation to conduct the interviews. Translation was done by stakeholders of the project, namely VNRC headquarters and NRC project office staff. In some cases it was difficult to conduct separate interviews with different types of stakeholders, and e.g. chapter and/or district VNRC staff were in most cases present in FGDs with volunteers and interviews with beneficiaries. Similarly, local authorities were often present in interviews with chapter and branch chairpersons, just as senior staffs were often present in interviews with more junior staff. This may have influenced the responses.

## **5. An Assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the VNRC/NRC partnership and the associated projects**

This section of the report considers how the partnership and associated projects have addressed the issues of OD and CB in relation to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. As separate project evaluations have already been carried out of the V3 and the V4 projects, e.g. in April 2009 a separate evaluation of the V4 project was undertaken, the focus will be a bit biased towards the current V7 project.

### **5.1 Relevance**

*“Before the V4 project we did not know how to implement humanitarian work in a sustainable way or to disseminate Red Cross messages. We had no professionalism, no continuous activities, no volunteer teams and no humanitarian team model” (Chairperson of Vinh Phuc chapter).*

The partnership/projects are assessed against the following criteria:

- Are the partnership/project objectives in line with the VNCR and NRC organisational priorities as well as relevant national development objectives?
- Is the current NRC funded project based on an adequate analysis of needs?

### **Relevance in relation to VNRC and NRC Organisational priorities and national development objectives**

From the perspective of the VNRC, the partnership fits very well with the objectives of the “Development Strategy of VNRC to 2010 and the Vision to 2020”<sup>9</sup>, which highlights the importance of “improving capacities and constructing Vietnam Red Cross to become a well-functioning

---

<sup>9</sup> VNRC is about to embark on a 6-month strategy formulation process, to develop a Development Strategy for the coming 10 years.

National Society”, and “To develop and strengthen the organisation, improve the competence of Red Cross staff, members, youths and volunteers to meet the long-term tasks of the Vietnam Red Cross Society”.<sup>10</sup> This was confirmed in an interview with the VNRC Secretary General, who highlighted OD as a top priority for VNRC, and commended NRC for its willingness to provide such explicit OD/CB support. He also praised NRC for supporting a very comprehensive approach to OD/CB, while the usual norm is to address OD/CB much more narrowly and often exclusively defined by a single sector or type of intervention, e.g. DM, health or vocational training. Further to this, it can be noted that the V3 project document was largely developed by VNRC itself, and thus in no ways imposed from the outside. The VNRC national PMB also stressed that the successive OD/CB projects have all been “derived from VNRC’s own initiative”, and that NRC only acts as advisor and not as implementer. Similarly, key VNRC informants stressed that despite the comparatively small budget of the NRC support, the amount of “attention from VNRC” was the same as for multi-million dollar projects. All of the above signifies a high degree of VNRC ownership of the projects, which is a good proxy for relevance from a VNRC perspective.

The partnership is also well aligned to most of the priority areas of the NRC international strategy, in particular it fits very well with the objective of making: “National societies that are priority cooperation partners for the Norwegian Red Cross (...) more capable of dealing with humanitarian and long-term development challenges using their own resources”.

From a national perspective, the partnership is relevant in its focus on increasingly enabling VNRC to perform its auxiliary role to the government in areas such as disaster preparedness and response, poverty reduction and public health. The OD/CB support to VNRC thus fits well with the development orientation of the current country socio-economic development plan, which outlines the following measures, among others, to reduce poverty and eradicate hunger: “Encourage humanitarian activities of all non-governmental organisations, social associations and unions to develop the social security networks and provide effective assistance to the vulnerable.” As well as: “Expand the participation and heighten the role of social, non-governmental organisations in the development of social security networks.”<sup>11</sup>

### ***Relevance in relation to needs***

In terms of needs, the partnership and the development objectives of the associated projects generally seem to be very relevant to the OD/CB needs of VNRC chapters and branches. The development objective/project goal of the current V7 project is “To strengthen the seven provincial RC branches to become democratic and transparent actors in civil society in order to deliver improved services (in quantity and quality)”. All the consulted chapters and branches affirmed that they had very limited capacity prior to commencement of project implementation, and that the various types of support were very relevant to their needs.<sup>12</sup>

Though the OD/CB support is very relevant, there appears to be a tendency across the three successive OD/CB project to approach OD/CB a stand-alone process, as opposed to a vehicle towards the development of a programmatic area and improved service delivery. The vast majority

---

<sup>10</sup> Likewise, article 3.4 of the VNRC statutes mentions the following as part of the VNRC mandate: “Build up to become a Well-functioning National Society, improving the qualification and skills of Red Cross staff, members, youth, as the key role in humanitarian activities. Representing for, caring of and protecting the rights and benefits of Red Cross staff, members, youth and volunteers”.

<sup>11</sup> The Socialist Republic of Vietnam: “The Five Year Socio-Economic Development Plan 2005-2010”, p. 81.

<sup>12</sup> As already explained in section 5 of this report, the evaluation team did not have the opportunity to visit all provinces targeted by the V7 project including target areas where the project, according to VNRC/NRC, has been less successful in achieving positive change. It could have been interesting to find out whether the reason for this less impressive success has to do with the external environment, or whether the OD/CB projects have perhaps not been responsive to the OD/CB needs as seen from the perspective of the chapters/branches.

of the budget is allocated to trainings/workshops, exchange trips, materials support/equipment, and admin support, while very little has been allocated to implementation of actual activities by volunteers and staff. The evaluation team believes that more effort should be made to combine the OD/CB support with tangible benefits for vulnerable communities to better ensure that OD/CB will eventually lead to sustainable better, broader, and more relevant services etc. It should be noted that the focus on organisational output/service delivery has increased over time as evident from a comparison of documents related to V3, V4 and V7 as well as interviews with stakeholders who have been involved in two or more phases of the partnership<sup>13</sup>, but it is recommended to promote this shift of focus further. One strategy for doing this could be to link the OD/CB support more explicitly to a sector such as DRR or primary health, and in line with this more funds could be earmarked to support volunteer teams in carrying out activities in this sector. At the moment volunteer teams are in most cases only supported with basic equipment such as donation boxes or basic FA materials, which are not replenished. From a CB perspective this should also involve more explicit training of staff and volunteers in community assessment methodologies and techniques, to provide a better analysis of the needs of local communities. This forms a key recommendation as discussed further in section 7 below.

## 5.2 Effectiveness

*“To be honest I did not want to be a Chairperson for RC then. It took me six months to decide, and even one key person from the PC told me not to accept. I was head of a clinic, which was in a big building with four floors, and I had to move to small tiny building. I am lucky because the NRC project started a few months after my appointment. Now I fell in love with the RC, and feel happy to work for RC”* (Chairperson of district branch).

The partnership/projects are assessed against the following criteria:

- To what extent have the project’s activities contributed to the specific objectives being met?

Answering this question will involve assessing the quality of the project activities and the effectiveness of the implementation methodologies and approaches, including the relevance and application of the training courses provided to the staff and volunteers.

As detailed in **Annex 6**, which provides an overview of the successive OD/CB projects, the objectives of the project has changed slightly over time. In particular, the V3 and V4 projects had immediate project objectives explicitly linked to disaster preparedness/response capacity, while the project objectives of V7 all relates to more general OD/CB strengthening. According to the VNRC Project Manager and the NRC Programme Coordinator this is due to the fact that the target areas of V3/V4 were all very disaster-prone, while the Northern provinces included in the V7 are less so.

Unfortunately there is no project log frame for the V7 project illustrating how outcomes/programme goals are linked to specific objectives, how these are linked to outputs/expected results, how outputs/expected results are linked to activities, and how activities are linked to inputs. It was also not possible for the Evaluation team to see an overall consolidated budget or project action plan for the V7 project, just as it appears that the province chapters targeted by the V7 project budget, plan and report according to different templates. There are indicators (with in-built targets) for the programme goal and expected results, but the development of a comprehensive log frame, other key project documentation and planning tools as well as standardized templates to be used by chapters, is encouraged, as it would facilitate a ‘tightening’ of the rationale for achieving the project objectives, provide a good structure on which to build a professional project, and provides clarity

---

<sup>13</sup> E.g. the V3 project had no indicators measuring impact, understood as the degree to which indirect beneficiaries (local community members, vulnerable etc.) would benefit from the NRC support.

on what the project wants to achieve and how to make it reality. This forms a key recommendation.

The specific project objectives of V7 are<sup>14</sup>:

4. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have secured strong and stable financial resources for humanitarian work.
5. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have developed a strong human resource base with sufficient and capable staff and a wide network of functioning volunteer teams.
6. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have adequate office facilities and a better working environment.

Regarding the first specific project objective, all the chapters visited had increased the amount of resources mobilised as well as diversified the number of funding sources. The picture is, however, less consistent if looking at all the targeted chapters, as Phu Yen and Yen Bai chapters have actually experienced a reduction since the V7 project started. See **Annex 8** for more detail. The stakeholders interviewed largely attributed the increased resource mobilisation to the trainings held, in particular the RC movement/dissemination trainings targeting local authorities, which had resulted in better image building of the RC and more effective advocacy, and the trainings in fundraising and project proposal writing, which had resulted in new types of fundraising strategies and approaching donors in a more professional manner. In addition, commercial FA involving businesses had resulted in an improved relationship to the business community, and exchange visits had resulted in effective fundraising models being shared across provinces, e.g. donors' clubs and fundraising volunteer teams. However, it should be noted that the figures provided in **Annex 6-8** are aggregate figures summarizing the achievements at all levels within the province i.e. including districts and communes. As evident from the field visits, the positive trend in resource mobilisation levels is much more pronounced at the province/district level, compared to the commune level. In addition, most of the resources raised are earmarked for immediate humanitarian support as opposed to more long-term development oriented activities and in some instances the resources mobilised are not managed directly by the RC, but through e.g. an Aid Coordination Committee chaired by the PC.<sup>15</sup> In one of the communes of Thai Nguyen province visited by the evaluation team, the practice of forced donations was introduced through a PC resolution in 2009<sup>16</sup>, and it was highlighted by the relevant RC chairperson as a positive result of the VNRC advocacy work. It is recommended that VNRC headquarters and VNRC look into how widespread "forced donations" are, and sensitize chapter/branch RC staff about the ethical dimensions of such a practice. The Evaluation team acknowledges that the issue of forced donations goes beyond the Red Cross, but still believes it should be attempted to address this issue in line with the Characteristics of a Well-functioning NS.

Regarding the second specific project objective, all the chapters visited appear to have a much stronger human resource, both in quantity and quality, now compared to when the OD/CB support commenced. See **Annex 6-8** for more details. The higher staff numbers cannot necessarily be solely attributed to the OD/CB projects, but the local authority representatives interviewed all affirmed that they had got a much clearer and positive perception of RC after the OD/CB support had commenced, and that the higher activity levels and visibility of RC had contributed to the decision to fund more staff. In addition, the project activities have resulted in a more professional organisation at the various levels of VNRC as well as a much higher commitment among staff. This

---

<sup>14</sup> In the analysis, reference is made to the document containing the revised indicators shared with NORAD in 2010. The specific objectives have been changed slightly compared to the original Plan of Action for V7, and are now termed "expected outputs".

<sup>15</sup> E.g. this was the case for Vinh Tuon RC district branch in Vinh Phuc.

<sup>16</sup> From 2009, all households in this commune with the exception of poor families were instructed to give 10,000 VND annually to a humanitarian fund managed jointly by VNRC and the Fatherland Front.

change in attitude is well expressed by one of the RC chairpersons at district level interviewed by the evaluation team, *“Before RC staff would only be in the office if an event happened, otherwise they would be at home”*.

Despite the progress, there are still challenges remaining. E.g. the evaluation team did not come across proper job descriptions for RC staff neither at chapter, nor at branch level.<sup>17</sup> However, it should also be cautioned not to be unrealistic in terms of what can be realised in the short to medium term in the area of human resources (HR). Some HR practices and systems, not least in relation to recruitment and performance appraisal, are difficult to change due to external constraints. Some of the recommendations of the otherwise very informative V4 mid-term review thus appear unrealistic considering the current context, in particular the recommendation stipulating, *“special efforts should be made to ensure that the chapters will be able to select their own leaders”*. Currently the practice is that senior management staff of chapters and all staff of districts are recruited/selected by the local authorities, who also fund the vast majority of salaries, and in some instances also appraise RC staff.<sup>18</sup> To make changes in this regard, will require a very long time horizon and the main drive will probably have to come from VNRC headquarters. When that is said, it would be possible for the chapter leaders to develop genuine job descriptions for their staff, while district and commune branches face big constraints in this regard.

Another positive change, which deserves mentioning, is the stronger collaboration between the chapter and branch level, which stakeholders attributed to the NRC support. One district chairperson described the improved chapter/branch relationship like this: *“Before we only got support from the provincial chapter if a disaster struck. Now we get support in dissemination and training, and we now report according to special formats and have received guidelines for resource mobilisation”*.

There is also consistent evidence that a bigger network of trained, active and enthusiastic volunteers has been brought about through the project support. As a matter of fact many of the branches did not have any volunteers prior to the commencement of the OD/CB interventions, and generally RC volunteers did not wear RC uniforms, in some instances because they were embarrassed to be associated with RC. In some branches NO activities were carried out before the project started (e.g. Binh Xuyen district branch in Vinh Phuc). Especially the trainings on volunteer management have contributed to this positive development, just as the trainings, workshops and exchange visits involving volunteers have made it more attractive to join VNRC, and as indicated in **Annex 6**, the V3/V4/V7 projects have resulted in 1,875/4,085/659<sup>19</sup> new volunteers respectively. Furthermore, the increase in volunteers has resulted in higher activity levels, which has helped improve the image of RC, which again has made it easier to recruit more volunteers. The model of volunteer teams also seem to yield positive results, not least because it promotes a group spirit and ensures leadership and structured mentoring/support. A member of a motorbike/FA team expressed it in the following way: *“It is more fun to be in a team, and belong to an organisation. The team has a good brand name in the whole region and get good recognition. I feel very proud. I can give FA in a professional manner. I feel like a doctor”*.

There does however, appear to be some confusion among staff about what constitutes a member versus a volunteer. Instead of just operating with the concept of member, as someone who pays a

---

<sup>17</sup> Annex 8, prepared by VNRC headquarter/NRC Project office, indicates that job descriptions exist in all participating chapters, but what the Evaluation Team came across in the field, could not be considered proper job descriptions. In all cases, the relevant local authority had prepared a consolidated 2-3-page document listing the very general responsibilities of each staff of the chapter/branch with just a few lines for each position.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. in one district branch in Thai Nguyen province, the chairperson was selected by the local government, while all the other four staff members, working under his supervision, had close family members in central positions of the district PC.

<sup>19</sup> The figure for V7 only captures the achievement of 2009.

membership fee to VNRC and the concept of volunteer as someone who contributes his/her time to conduct activities in the name of VNRC, the concept of “active members” has been introduced, which appears to be a combination of the two. In some of the places visited, there were also very demanding requirements for being accepted as a volunteer. E.g. in one branch, the RC branch chairperson insisted that people would have to work daily to be counted as volunteers.<sup>20</sup> It would be useful if more uniform guidance could be provided to chapters and branches from VNRC headquarters in this regard. The Evaluation team has not had the opportunity to study the VNRC volunteer management guidelines of 2008, and can therefore not assess whether the guidelines provide guidance in this regard, but it appears that more attention should be directed at putting the guidelines into practice. This forms a key recommendation.

Regarding the third specific project objective, the material support has resulted in more adequate facilities and a better working environment, though only at province and district level, and made branches much more effective in their work. Targeted chapters and district branches now have e.g. computers, fax machines, printers, scanners and cameras, which has facilitated better coordination and communication between different RC levels; better reporting, better advocacy and showcasing of RC work etc. As could probably be expected all the visited chapters and district branches were extremely appreciative of the material support facilitated through the OD/CB projects. The material support has been combined with training in e.g. English and computer skills, and all participating chapters and district branches now have access to internet, which appears to have greatly contributed to the improved collaboration between the different levels of VNRC as described above. Overhead projectors have enabled the conduction of in-house trainings. In Binh Dinh, the RC chapter furthermore highlighted how the improved understanding and appreciation of RC among the local government has resulted in more district branches getting their own multifunctional offices, which sent a much better message in terms of independence compared to just having a room within the government building.

#### ***Quality of project activities including relevance and application of the training courses***

Trainings and experience sharing form a key component of the project strategy. E.g. in 2009; a total of USD 53,603 was spent on trainings, workshops and study tours, while USD 21,545 was spent on experience exchanges, which combined translates into 32% of the total 2009 V7 spending of USD 233,018.

It was not possible within the time frame to conduct a thorough review of all the different types of trainings and exchange visits organized, but a consistent message from various stakeholders from central to commune level was the usefulness of trainings and exchange visits. The majority of the trainings conducted are addressing general management capacity needs as opposed to more technical capacity needs. The most common trainings provided are: RC movement (including VNRC, IHL, VNRC activities and management skills), FA training/water rescue and communication and fundraising. Generally, a ToT methodology is used, and the trainings of the V7 project, are mostly facilitated by RC province and/or district staff. The stakeholders provided numerous examples of the immediate applicability of the trainings. E.g. several volunteer teams explained how they had adopted regulations specifying roles and responsibilities of team leader, the tasks and rights of the members of the team, and the working principles of the team after having attended volunteer management workshop and/or exchange activity. Several key informants also explained how the communication training had dramatically improved their knowledge of how media works with the media. E.g. Binh Dinh has established very good collaboration with the media, especially in times of disaster, which has had a very positive impact on their ability to raised funds for victims.

---

<sup>20</sup> Similarly, according to information from Binh Dinh chapter, the number of volunteers had gone down in some districts due to a new definition of volunteers involving more demanding requirements.



Regarding the most common type of technical training conducted, namely FA training, the evaluation team was unfortunately not able to meet beneficiaries who had received FA support. Different training delivery approaches are used according to resource persons available. In some places it is conducted by chapter staff, in other places by retired doctors, who are part of a RC medical volunteer team, in some places in collaboration with the Health department. The FA training is a standard training for motorbike/FA volunteer team members, who usually receive 2-3 days training. In certain places, it appears that the FA training is too short. E.g. members of several motorbike safety teams explained how they had been too afraid to use their FA skills when required, but had just resorted to providing transport service. FA volunteers of several teams also complained that they were not provided with protective gloves, and that they sometimes risked their own health because of this. The evaluation team is aware that the NRC project office and VNRC headquarters have insisted that VNRC branches find the resources to replenish first aid kits (including gloves) to avoid the branches becoming dependant on the project, but according to the findings not all branches have complied with this instruction. As described in section 5.5 on sustainability below there are some very good examples of branches partnering with local donors, who fund a continuous supply of first aid materials, and it would be obvious to try and replicate this good practice elsewhere. Further to the above, it is recommended to ensure that all FA volunteers have sufficient knowledge and skills to carry out FA. E.g. it could be considered to introduce a more formal testing of FA volunteers' skills and also to introduce more frequent and regular refresher/follow-up FA trainings. Likewise it is also strongly recommended that the safety of FA volunteers is being considered, and as a minimum they need to be provided with protective gloves.

Considering the strategic importance attached to trainings and experience exchange, it is recommended that more detailed records are developed, which provide information regarding trainees according to the dimensions of: a) Types of participant, i.e. staffs, volunteers, local authorities or community members; b) "Level" of participant, i.e. province, district, commune or hamlet; and c) Geographical area in terms of province. In addition the records should specify duration of the event, who delivered the training/facilitated exchange and total cost. A suggested template is attached in **Annex 9**. Such information will give a more comprehensive picture of the extent to which the project is decentralized, and provide more information about what level of capacity to expect at what levels of the organisation.

It is also recommended, the budget allowing, to conduct more trainings in needs assessment, e.g. PRA or VCA, to ensure that the volunteer led service models to be developed are relevant to the local community needs.<sup>21</sup> This is in line with the recommendation made in section 5.1 about "Relevance" above.

### **5.3 Efficiency**

The partnership/project is assessed against the following criteria:

- To what degree has the resources/inputs been converted into results/outputs?
- Coordination process between NRC, VNRC HQ and Provincial Chapters?

#### ***Conversion of resources/inputs to outputs***

The amount of input compared to the results of the project appears very reasonable. The project has very low administrative costs compared to e.g. other PNS funded projects, which has to do with the fact that NRC does not deploy international delegates in Hanoi, but also that the majority of financial and project management responsibilities have been delegated to VNRC headquarters.

---

<sup>21</sup> E.g. in some commune branches of Thai Nguyen there was a feeling among staff and volunteers that the safe motorbike/FA volunteer model was imposed from above without a proper understanding of the most urgent needs of the communities.

It could be discussed whether the project budget is spread too thinly with the increase from 4 to 7 provinces, which has not been matched by a corresponding budget increase. VNRC headquarter staff were complaining that they were becoming increasingly over-stretched with the increase of provinces, while NRC was also arguing for a reduction in number of chapters involved, but based on staff rotation in some chapters, which has brought in new leaders, who are apparently both uncommitted and non-responsive. The Evaluation team believes it could be justified to reduce the number of provinces to facilitate a strengthened focus on OD/CB needs at the commune level in the ext funding period (2011-12). As the Evaluation Team has not visited all participating chapters, it is not possible to guide as to which provinces to phase out from, but an in-depth analysis considering factors such as vulnerability/needs and potential for change in chapters/branches should be conducted. Also it could be considered to phase out of some of the provinces that have been involved since the V3 project, and which are already very strong.

It is also recommended to discuss with VNRC headquarters if any measures could be taken to avoid VNRC headquarter capacity becoming a stumbling block in relation to capacity building efforts at chapter/branch level. Great efforts have been made in relation to securing that the ownership and management of the project lies with VNRC headquarters, so it is worth considering if NRC could also provide support to the central level of the organisation. If appropriate in the VNRC context, it could e.g. be discussed if NRC could second additional VNRC headquarters staff, or alternatively whether other VNRC departments could be more involved in the project. This forms a key recommendation.

### **Coordination Process**

As the collaboration between VNRC and NRC has matured, NRC has delegated the general project management responsibilities, including communications with and instructions to chapters, to VNRC. The day-to-day management of the current V7 project is thus the responsibility of the VNRC International Relations & Development department, while a Project Management Board (PMB), composed of 2 representatives of this just-mentioned department, 1 representative of the Finance department, 1 representative of the Personnel department and the NRC Project Coordinator, approves budgets/work plans and provides technical and policy direction. At province level there is also a PBM composed of the relevant RC chapter Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Accountant, Project Officer and in some instances a volunteer representative.

VNRC headquarters advances funds to chapters on a quarterly basis according to an approved budget. Over time the decision-making has been increasingly decentralized, which is also reflected in the budgeting process. E.g. provinces are provided with a lump-sum amount for volunteer development, which can be spent according to their own needs analysis and prioritization. The majority of spending takes place as province level, but in some instances funds are transferred to districts on a single-activity basis, e.g. for FA training or a DP exercise. All spending follows the cost norms set by VNRC headquarters and its RC Movement partners.

The coordination process has also been increasingly decentralised over time, and compared to earlier phases of the partnership, chapters and also district branches now have a more formal role in the planning and budgeting process. This development was very much appreciated by chapter/branch staff, especially those from Binh Dinh and Vinc Phuc, who were also familiar with the earlier coordination processes. In the two new participating chapters, quarterly planning meetings take place to review progress and plan/budget for the coming period. These meetings involve the province PBM as well as the chairpersons of all participating district branches and one volunteer representative per district. The districts consult with the communes prior to attending the meeting. In the chapters that were also part of V3/V4 projects, the same process takes place, but on a bi-annual basis.

It is recommended to expand the VNRC Project Management Board to include representatives of additional departments of VNRC headquarters. In particular it should be considered to involve the Youth & Dissemination Department and possibly also the Red Cross Training Centre in this body to ensure that the lessons learned from the project are more easily replicated by VNRC, but also to ensure that relevant VNRC norms, standard operating procedures, approaches and strategies are applied in the project areas. This forms a key recommendation.

#### 5.4 Impact

*“Now the commune RC staff was able to provide counselling for the PC to provide support for people in need. E.g. how to support victims of typhoons appropriately. Thanks to them we provide a more equitable support to needy people in the commune”* (Vice Chairperson of PC of Chua Hang town, Dong Hy district, Thai Nguyen province).

*“Support from the RC in terms of money is very small but it has a great mental impact on our family. I’m a disabled soldier. I have 3 children affected by Agent Orange. When the RC staff visited us at home with some small gifts I cried because of the feeling of being shared”* (Beneficiary of VNRC support, Vinh Yen city).

The partnership/projects are assessed against the following criteria:

- To what extent has the partnership / projects brought about positive change for indirect beneficiaries/local communities, including to what extent have they contributed to reducing vulnerability in the targeted areas including enhanced participation, accountability, non-discrimination and empowerment of different ethnic groups?

Before going into the findings, it should be highlighted that certain factors limit the validity of an impact assessment. Firstly, VNRC does not operate in a vacuum, but is influenced by the external environment, and it is therefore not always straightforward to establish cause – effect relationships. E.g. a certain development, positive or negative, may not always be attributable or 100% attributable to NRC support, but could also be caused by a change in government regulations, support from other partners, increased VNRC headquarters advocacy, or a change in management. Secondly, the results of an OD/CB intervention are often much less tangible compared to a sector-defined programme, e.g. to a water and sanitation project, which usually involves construction of hardware, improved water quality etc. Thirdly, some impact indicators have changed over time, which makes it difficult to compare across the V3, V4 and V7 project.

The NRC support is making a link between strengthening organisational capacity of VNRC and an increase in service delivery targeting local and vulnerable beneficiaries, and ultimately the aim is to change the status and living conditions of the local population in the targeted areas. It is generally recognised that OD/CB interventions require a rather long time horizon to produce measureable impact, but impact understood as positive changes experienced by communities brought about by the project can be detected. E.g. the number of RC service model as well as the total value of support to vulnerable people has increased according to the available project documentation and information from key informants and stakeholders. Also refer to **Annex 6-8**. The project’s M&E systems have not consistently involved consolidated reporting on total number of indirect beneficiaries, but all the branches visited reported an increase in relation to this.

The indicators differentiate between humanitarian and development services. However, activities still seem to be predominantly focusing on charity and/or immediate and short-term humanitarian support, as opposed to facilitating more long-term solutions involving more genuine empowerment and participation of local communities including ethnic minorities. This finding is not meant to undermine the very impressive achievements, which can be detected. Compared to the low levels of RC activity - or indeed in some cases almost complete inaction - which characterised most of

the participating RC branches prior to the commencement of the OD/CB support, it is quite extraordinary what has been achieved and the current RC support is very highly valued by beneficiaries. Also there are many examples of RC branches conducting successful advocacy vis-à-vis local authorities to ensure higher access to public services of vulnerable people such as ethnic minorities. However, considering the maturity and proficiency of some of the participating chapters/branches it is suggested to increasingly supplement this type of assistance with more long-term development models. There currently appears to be a tendency to view local community members more as recipients of support, as opposed to drivers of their own development, and the evaluation team therefore recommends considering how the project could more explicitly address the capacity of local communities/local community members. The majority of beneficiaries consulted did not receive consistent support from VNRC, but maybe a visit a few times per year involving e.g. a small amount of money, rice or something else. The same issue was raised by e.g. the chairperson of one of the chapters consulted, who requested for *“continued NRC support to help build the capacity of local community members”*.

To make the recommendation a little more concrete, e.g. in relation to disaster preparedness and response, community members could probably be involved more in relation to e.g. making a community risk analysis, developing a community contingency plan etc. Likewise in the area of health, it could be considered empowering to focus more on health promotion and e.g. provide local communities with more knowledge on how to prevent disease and improve health practices in the first place. Obviously, it would be difficult for the VNRC/NRC project to develop such community led and development focused approaches in many different sectors, but one way forward could be to link the OD/CB support more explicitly up to one sector, such as DRR or health/CBFA as also mentioned under the section on relevance above. This forms a key recommendation, which is also in accordance with the current VNRC Development Strategy, which states: *“Thus, in the years to come, the beneficiaries served by the Vietnam Red Cross Society are more and more increased and the demand for assistance requires higher and more comprehensive quality so that they can not only overcome short-term difficulties but also need basic elements and conditions to integrate into the community in a developed society”*.

Also, according to interviews conducted in the field, beneficiary selection appears to be not always exclusively based on vulnerability criteria, but also on other considerations, such as whether the beneficiary comes from a family that has “contributed to the country”, e.g. a family with veterans or sacrificed soldiers, which in line with the governments preferential policies for “people with meritorious services to the nation”.<sup>22</sup> According to interviews with a variety of stakeholders the practice of following instruction from local authorities in relation to who qualifies for support is still very prevalent, and it appears that non-vulnerability related criteria, e.g. membership of “Fatherland Front” sometimes play a key role in this regard. Requests for support usually require approval by the RC Commune Executive Committee, whose members include local government as well as members of other mass organisations such as the Fatherland Front, Women Union etc. In some places, e.g. some districts of Thai Nguyen, the RC is restricted to providing support to AOVs, despite a wish to be able to assist all vulnerable independently of reason behind vulnerability. The evaluation team acknowledges that complete RC independence in relation to beneficiary selection is not realistic in the near future, but to contribute towards a progressive realisation of vulnerability guided beneficiary selection it is recommended that trainings in vulnerability and community assessment be organised (same recommendation also mentioned in section on “Effectiveness” above).

In relation to vulnerability, it should also be mentioned that the selected branches appear not to be from the most vulnerable parts of the country, and furthermore within the chosen provinces, it appears that the most remote, and hard-to-reach communes are not yet well targeted by the

---

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam: “The Five Year Socio-economic Plan 2005-2010”, p. 44.

VNRC/NRC intervention. According to information from VNRC headquarters and NRC staff, the selection criteria for participating chapters and branches have changed over time, and when selecting new chapters for the V7, it was deliberately decided not to select the weakest areas, as the risk of failure was considered too big. If it is decided to scale down from the current 7 provinces, it would hopefully enable a stronger focus on some of the more to hard reach places within the remaining provinces/chapters. This supplements the seventh recommendation below.

To facilitate a sharper focus on impact it can also be recommended to review the current indicators, especially the programme goal indicators. Five out of six of the current programme goal indicators relate to the internal structures and functioning of branches and support from local authorities, while there is only one indicator relating to end beneficiaries, namely *“75% of interviewed beneficiaries (gender disaggregated) are satisfied with the humanitarian and development services delivered by the RC branches at provincial, district and commune level in the seven provinces”*. It is recommended to shift the focus more to the output/service delivery side, and thus include additional indicators focusing more on local communities as opposed to specific individual beneficiaries, e.g. *“Needs of vulnerable communities are satisfied in terms of e.g. FA/DRR/other relevant areas”* and as a means of verification conduct a *“client”* survey in some form preferably involving a random sampling method to measure if vulnerable communities perceive specific NS services to be relevant and of good quality.<sup>23</sup> This forms a key recommendation.

It is also felt that some of the current programme goal indicators do not really measure impact at all. E.g. not much information would be lost if the indicator *“The authorities at provincial, district and commune have increased their attendance at RC events in the seven provinces”* was dropped. Likewise, the indicators for the expected results also deserve a review. E.g. the indicator *“Number of resource mobilisation events is increased annually in the seven provincial chapters”* merely reflects whether a certain type of activity has been conducted, but not to what extent the expected result, *“By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have secured strong and stable financial resources for humanitarian/development work”* has been achieved.

## 5.5 Sustainability

*“We received projects with the funds equivalent to billions VND, but when these projects finished, our staff did not know how to do the project. The project funded by NRC is different as it builds up our working capacity. Thanks to that we have gained a lot of achievements in RC activities”* (RC Chairman of Binh Dinh chapter).

*“In 2007, The District RC had no fund. In 2008, it raised 80 million VND, in 2009 the total fund raised increased to 200 million VND. In the first half of 2010, the fund raised by the District RC was more than that of the last year, at 240 million VND”* (RC Chairman of Binh Xuyen district branch).

The partnership/project is assessed against the following criteria:

- To which degree have the chapters/sub chapters been able to/have capacity to replicate the programme to new areas and to sustain the activities in the target area?
- What are the opportunities to ensure the sustainability of programme operations through internal funding mechanisms?

### **Replication of the programme to new areas and sustaining activities in the target areas**

As explained above the field visits only involved three of the seven chapters targeted by the ongoing V7 project. From a sustainability perspective, the validity of the findings would have been

---

<sup>23</sup> Should the recommendation of linking the OD/CB support more explicitly to a sector be adopted this should also be reflected in the more specific phrasing of the indicator.

higher if time and resources had also allowed a visit to Khanh Hoa province, which has already been phased out of the OD/CB support.

The main sustainability challenge appears to be related to staff rotation or what could be called the “person factor”. As explained above, recruitment of RC staff at chapter/branch level is very much a government responsibility, and unfortunately there are already examples from some chapters (namely Tuyen Quang and Yen Bai, which were not visited by the Evaluation Team) of how new a new senior management at chapter level can have very negative consequences for the progress achieved, especially as the OD/CB support has to be channelled through the chapter according to VNRC regulations. Bearing in mind the external constraints, and being realistic about what is achievable, it is recommended that VNRC headquarters continue its advocacy efforts towards local authorities and party leaders to ensure that new chapter chairpersons are genuinely motivated and engaged. This forms a key recommendation.

With the above caveat in mind, it can be mentioned that several important measures have been taken to ensure sustainability. E.g. helping chapters and branches to diversify their funding sources and to increase total resources mobilised is an important strategy of the project, and as described in the section related to effectiveness, some of the training efforts are directly addressing fundraising and proposal writing with great success.

In relation to volunteers, who form the backbone of any NS, it has been deliberately chosen not to introduce financial incentives in the form of e.g. per diems that cannot be sustained after project funding ends. Further to this, the volunteer model promoted by the project makes it clear to volunteers that humanitarian commitment is the key requirement. The building of pride and RC spirit among volunteers is another key component of the sustainability strategy, which involves the volunteer team model<sup>24</sup> and training in volunteer management. Further, volunteers are largely expected to use their own creativity to raise the required resources to conduct their activities. E.g. members of motorbike volunteer teams receive a first aid kit after they have completed first aid training, but are responsible for the replenishment of this kit. In this vein, in Vinh Phuc province, the motorbike/FA volunteer team of Binh Xuyen district have entered into a partnership with a private pharmaceutical company, who provides a continuous supply for FA kit replenishment. There are also numerous examples of volunteer teams contributing their own money to enable a continuation of activities.

The training strategy including the use of a training of trainers (ToT) approach is another example of how sustainability concerns have shaped the project design. Currently, the vast majority of trainings<sup>25</sup> are facilitated by staff at province and district level, which means they can be continuously replicated within a province at a rather modest cost at least as long as the trainers stay in their position. There are also examples of volunteers, in the form of retired doctors, providing FA training to staff and volunteers.

From a sustainability perspective it is also positive that the general administration support to chapters is comparatively low as this prohibits the development of a dependency syndrome or the establishment of parallel structures that cannot be sustained when project funding ends. In 2009, five of the seven participating chapters thus received less than 1000 USD per year to support general administration costs, while VNRC headquarters received approximately 5,000 USD.

There are several examples of components of the OD/CB projects being adopted by VNRC headquarters and/or replicated beyond the immediate project areas. E.g. the training curriculum on

---

<sup>24</sup> The mid-term review of the V4 project provides a detailed description of the 7-step volunteer team model promoted by the projects.

<sup>25</sup> As an example, in 2009 only one out of nine types of trainings was facilitated by external trainers.

Communication & Fundraising, which was originally developed for projects areas only, is now part of the VNRC standard curriculum, and staff members of the project areas, e.g. Binh Dinh chapter, are now used as national trainers in provinces all over the country in relation to FA, social work and CBDRM. The youth RC camps, which were initiated by the V3 project, is another example of an activity that has been replicated beyond project areas. VNRC headquarters staff explained that the NRC project has contributed to VNRC addressing the crucial issue of volunteers. The previous VNRC statutes did not mention volunteers, but only referred to staff, members and youth, whereas the revised statutes of 2008 consistently mention volunteers. Furthermore, NRC also had an important input in relation to the VNRC Volunteer Management Guidelines adopted by VNRC in 2008. According to VNRC headquarter staff, the NRC support has also contributed to VNRC headquarters becoming more effective in assisting chapters with advocacy vis-à-vis local authorities, e.g. in relation to provision of office and salary support.

Looking at the OD/CB intervention from an overall VNRC perspective, it could though be argued that the key to sustainability requires embedding the intervention more solidly within the VNRC headquarters to promote that the learning from the projects can be cascaded more widely throughout the VNRC chapters and branches. This requires focusing not on VNRC branches only, but also more widely on VNRC headquarters with a view to: a) Ensuring that the relevant departments (e.g. Youth & Dissemination Department and Red Cross Training Center) increasingly play a role in the branch support, and b) if there is “space” for it, and in coordination with the IFRC, provide technical capacity to VNRC headquarters to support more overall VNRC OD/CB processes that would ultimately be required for sustainable branch development on a wider scale.<sup>26</sup> This forms a key recommendation. Similarly, it is recommended that the lessons learned from the OD/CB projects are fed into the strategy development process, which will result in the next VNRC overall development strategy and vision document for the next 10-year period. This also forms a key recommendation.

### ***Sustainability of programme operations through internal funding mechanisms***

As already mentioned in the section about *effectiveness*, the participating chapters have generally experienced a significant increase in resources mobilised since joining the CB/OC project. However according to more detailed information received during the field visits, the reported increase cover big differences in funds raised at the different levels of organisation, and fundraising at provincial level is thus generally much stronger than that at District and Commune level where fundraising still relies mainly on support from the People’s Committees and from traditional, and mostly small-scale, donations from local people, despite the fact that it is at the grassroots level where the action is supposed to take place.

It should also be noted that most of the resources mobilised come with strings attached. According to VNRC, private donations are e.g. 100 % earmarked for beneficiaries as per government decree, and it is thus not possible for VNRC to fund e.g. salaries, training costs, office running costs, or even relief distribution associated costs, such as fuel, from private donations. It is therefore worth to repeat recommendation 7 and 11 of the V4 mid-term evaluation, which stress that advocacy efforts towards authorities should address the budget needs for development of RC staff especially at district and commune level, and that resource mobilisation should be extended to cover expenses for capacity building. To add to those, it is also recommended that VNRC headquarters intensify its advocacy efforts on those issues, as the main barrier appears to be government policy. This is a key recommendation.

---

<sup>26</sup> The 2010 IFRC budget for OD is only USD 47,250.

**6. An assessment of the justification for continuation of the partnership/existing projects beyond the current time frame (2009-2012) and recommend revising the programme activities and indicators to further ensure relevance, quality assurance and sustainability.**

The analysis conducted in section 5 also generally provides the main basis for assessing the justification for continuation of the existing project beyond the current timeframe as well as recommendations regarding any revisions.

The VNRC/NRC partnership appears to be in a good state in terms of all the dimensions covered by the “RC/RC Code of Good Partnership” and the tool developed for assessing the partnership re RC/RC 8 NS Africa Initiative which in turn is based on the RC/RC Code of Good Partnership (Refer also to the VicHealth ‘Partnership Analysis Tool’). In the following a very brief analysis of the partnership will be conducted in relation to the themes of 1) relevance; 2) equality and respect; 3) integrity; 4) transparency; 5) ownership, and 6) harmonization.

**Relevance** is about how this partnership adds value and meets the needs of vulnerable people. It includes the commitment of VNRC and NRC to the RC Principles. As described in section 5.1 above, the partnership and associated projects are very relevant to the organisational mandates and priorities of VNRC and NRC. The projects have been developed based on a joint assessment and joint monitoring takes place. As already discussed above, the evaluation team does, however, recommend adopting an approach to OD/CB that increasingly focuses on increased and improved output of the chapters and branches. In this vein it is recommended to put more emphasis on supporting chapters and branches in initiating and implementing development services to better meet the needs of vulnerable people.

**Equality and respect** is about feeling being *equal* partners and honouring each other’s right or decision to act in certain ways and respecting the choices made. For example, do VNRC and NRC treat each other in the same way using the same standards, or do they have different standards that they apply to each other. Respect also implies being accountable and ensuring that decisions are based on all aspects of the partnership model. The VNRC/NRC partnership appears to be characterised by a high degree of equality and respect. E.g. both VNRC and NRC have access to appropriate levels within their partner’s National Society, and VNRC’s direct access to and interaction with NRC headquarters was something, which was clearly appreciated. There also seemed to be a very productive collaboration between VNRC headquarters and the NRC project office, with both respecting each other’s respective roles and responsibilities, and e.g. the VNRC Secretary General stressed how the NRC project office was very good in sharing experiences. Also in discussions with NORAD, NRC facilitates the involvement of VNRC, which makes VNRC feel like an equal partner.

**Integrity** means both partners do what they say they will do and that they work in open, transparent and accountable ways. The partnership appears to be faring well in this regard. Obligations that have been agreed upon are generally respected and carried out by both partners. Furthermore, when problems and/or disagreements arise, they generally appear to be subject of an open and objective discussion, and the highest levels of VNRC headquarters have proved ready to intervene in relation to problems faced at chapter level though not always with success due to factors beyond their control.<sup>27</sup>

**Transparency** is about openly sharing information that is important for effective work. For example, sharing budgets, financial statements, records, and other plans that affect the

---

<sup>27</sup> E.g. VNRC headquarters have not always been able to mitigate the negative consequences of staff turnover as also described in section 6. It could also be mentioned that NRC has apparently faced some difficulties with the start-up of the DRR project, which were not immediately addressed by the VNRC headquarters, but as mentioned this project falls outside the scope of this evaluation.



partnership (e.g. other PNS plans for working in Vietnam or NRC plans for increasing/reducing funding). VNRC appears very transparent about the constraints faced as well as partnerships with other movement/non-movement partners. Unfortunately VNRC is still not in a position to produce overall (for the whole organisation) work plans, consolidated budgets and audits, which would be very useful from a transparency perspective, but this appears to be an issue related to capacity constraints more than anything else. Should it be decided to include a VNRC headquarters OD/CB component in the future in line with the recommendation in section 5.3 and 5.5 above, this is one of the challenges that could be looked at.

**Ownership** is concerned with how much partners invest in and care about the work they do together. For example, fully participating in the planning, design and implementation of a new programme would suggest *high* ownership. Whereas, just being given a project to do without consultation would suggest *low* ownership. As already discussed, the partnership is characterised by a high degree of VNRC ownership. E.g. VNRC takes the lead in the planning and implementation of the OD/CB projects, and that a lot of time is invested despite the relative modest project budgets. However, it must be stressed that VNRC headquarters complain about being over-stretched, and unless this is addressed, it could jeopardize the current situation.

**Harmonisation** is the shared acceptance of a common framework of operation objectives and indicators, standards, formats, systems, and procedures. In relation to this it can be mentioned that NRC has generally not imposed any parallel structures or standards and that VNRC's standards are leading, e.g. in relation to use of cost norms, salaries, per diems etc. In the cases where the NRC support has led to new types of OD/CB interventions, e.g. a new type of training with external facilitation, VNRC headquarters has been closely involved, and some of the inventions of the project, e.g. training manuals have been adopted by VNRC. However, to avoid the development of a few well-performing "little empires" in selected parts of the country, it is recommended to also include a project component addressing VNRC headquarters OD/CB needs in the future.

It is recommended that NRC continues the partnership with VNRC partnership/existing projects beyond the current time frame (2009-2012) based on the generally very healthy state of the partnership as well as the significant results that have been achieved with relatively little input (refer to section 5). However, to ensure increased relevance, quality assurance and sustainability it is advised to implement the recommendations arising from the analysis in section 5 in a continuation of the partnership (these include recommendation 1- 14 below). It is furthermore believed that some of the recommendations could already be addressed in connection with the next funding period (2011-2012) of the current timeframe (2009-2012). This forms a key recommendation.

## 7. Recommendations

This section identifies the recommendations that arise from the findings and lessons learned during the evaluation. They are presented in the order identified in the report narrative.

The *first recommendation* relates to avoiding approaching OD/CB as a stand-alone process, and instead approaching it as a vehicle towards the development of a programmatic area and improved service delivery. At the end of the day, spending on trainings, workshops, exchange trips, knowledge sharing etc. can only be justified if it results in increased output and service delivery of a branch. In line with this more effort should be made to combine the OD/CB support with tangible benefits for vulnerable communities to better ensure that OD/CB will eventually lead to sustainable better, broader, and more relevant services etc. One strategy for doing this could be to link the OD/CB support more explicitly to a sector such as DRR, which is an area where VNRC/NRC have already commenced a separate project, or primary health, and in line with this more funds could be

earmarked to support volunteer teams in carrying out activities in this sector. Currently, a very insignificant proportion of project funds are allocated to facilitate volunteer activity. From a CB perspective this should also involve more explicit training of staff and volunteers in community assessment methodologies and techniques, to provide a better analysis of the needs of local communities and ensure a more vulnerability guided beneficiary selection.

The *second recommendation* relates to developing an overall log frame for the V7 project illustrating how outcomes/programme goals are linked to specific objectives, how these are linked to outputs/expected results, how outputs/expected results are linked to activities, and how activities are linked to inputs. In addition, it also appears that the level of outputs/expected results, understood as concrete results of project activities, is missing. The development of such a log frame is strongly encouraged, as it would facilitate a 'tightening' of the rationale for achieving the project objectives, provide a good structure on which to build a professional project, and provides clarity on what the project wants to achieve and how to make it reality. Similarly it is advised that an overall consolidated budget and action plan is developed corresponding with this log frame, and that project chapters budget, plan and report according to a standardised templates.

The *third recommendation* relates to looking into how widespread "forced donations" are, and try to address this issue, e.g. through ensuring that the fundraising/advocacy trainings have a component regarding ethical dimensions of different fundraising strategies.

The *fourth recommendation* relates to working out a common understanding of the concepts of RC member, RC active member and RC volunteer. When talking to RC staff in the field, it appeared that they were often confusing the different categories, and sometimes imposing very demanding standards in terms of time contributed to be considered a volunteer. It is recommended to adopt a common definition of a Red Cross Volunteers across provinces and provide more specific and uniform guidance from VNRC headquarters in this regard. If there is a wish to keep the distinction between members and active members, it is also recommended to adopt a standardised definition of what constitutes the latter. It would be very useful if more attention could be directed at putting the VNRC volunteer management guidelines of 2008 into practice, and if relevant revise these guidelines to provide clear direction.

The *fifth recommendation* relates to developing more in-depth FA training courses and some kind of formalised testing of FA volunteers, e.g. members of safety motorbike teams and volunteers working in FA spots, to ensure they are equipped with the necessary skills. It must also be ensured that FA volunteers at least have protective gloves to ensure their own safety.

The *sixth recommendation* relates to developing more detailed records for trainings, networking/events and workshops providing information according to the dimensions of: a) Types of trainee, i.e. staffs, volunteers, local authorities or community members; b) "Level" of trainee, i.e. province, district, commune or hamlet; and c) Geographical area in terms of province. In addition the records should specify duration of training, who delivered the training and total cost, and for workshops and networking/events it would be useful if the records could summarize the objective. This will give a much better picture of where the capacity building effort is being concentrated as well as the methodology and objective of a given activity. Refer to **Annex 9** for a proposed template.

The *seventh recommendation* relates to reducing the number of chapters involved in the project in connection with entering into the next funding period (2011-2012) to address the current capacity constraints of VNRC headquarters and to enable a stronger focus on OD/CB needs at commune level in the remaining provinces preferably in some of the more hard to reach and vulnerable places. A more in-depth analysis should be carried out to decide which provinces to phase out from, but it is advised to consider factors such as vulnerability/needs and potential for change in

chapters/branches. Simultaneously it is advised to enter into discussions with VNRC about how the current capacity constraints can be addressed in the next funding period, e.g. through secondment of additional staff or involvement of other VNRC departments in the management of the project.

The *eighth recommendation* is very much a continuation of the preceding recommendation, as it relates to expanding the VNRC central Project Management Board to include representatives of additional departments of VNRC headquarters e.g. the Youth & Dissemination Department and/or the Red Cross Training Centre to ensure that the lessons learned from the project are more easily replicated by VNRC, but also to ensure that relevant VNRC norms, standards operating procedures, approaches and strategies are applied in the project areas.

The *ninth recommendation* relates to directing the OD/CB support more explicitly towards nurturing sustainable development models. Currently the vast majority of branch activities are constituted by immediate and short-term humanitarian support, which definitely represent a great achievement compared to the situation prior to the OD/CB support, and is highly appreciated by beneficiaries. However, considering the maturity and proficiency of some of the chapters/branches it is recommended to increasingly facilitate longer-term solutions involving more genuine empowerment and participation of local communities. One way of achieving this could be through linking the OD/CB support more explicitly up to one sector, such as DRR or health/CBFA as also mentioned in the first recommendation above.

The *tenth recommendation* relates to introducing more indicators measuring service delivery to further facilitate an increased focus on impact. All but one of the current programme goal indicators is concerned with the internal structures and functioning of branches and support from local authorities.

The *eleventh recommendation* relates to VNRC headquarters continuing its advocacy efforts towards local authorities and party leaders to ensure that new chapter chairpersons are genuinely qualified, motivated and engaged. As evident from above, the “person factor” can make or break any OD/CB attempts, but the issue of employing the “right” persons at chapter/branch level currently appears to be beyond the control of the NRC funded project.

The *twelfth recommendation* include a VNRC headquarters OD/CB component in the next funding phase of the project to embed the intervention more solidly within the VNRC headquarters to promote that the learning from the projects can be cascaded more widely throughout the VNRC chapters and branches and to avoid the development of separate standards. This could involve: a) Ensuring that the relevant departments (e.g. Youth & Dissemination Department and Red Cross Training Center) increasingly play a role in the branch support (also refer to the eighth recommendation above) and b) if there is “space” for it, and in coordination with the IFRC, provide technical capacity to VNRC headquarters to support more overall VNRC OD/CB processes that would ultimately be required for sustainable branch development on a wider scale. Areas where needs have been identified include improving volunteer management guidelines and tools, the development of a volunteer policy, and support for overall reform in relation to finance development and HR.

The *thirteenth recommendation* is to ensure that the lessons learned from the OD/CB projects are fed into the strategy development process, which will result in the VNRC overall development strategy and vision document for the next 10-year period.

The *fourteenth recommendation* relates to VNRC headquarters in collaboration with chapters/branches intensifying its advocacy efforts to increase the government funding for CB and staff development and to increasingly enable chapters and branches to spend a certain percentage

from private donations on administration related costs including CB and staff development as well as equipment.

The *fifteenth recommendation* is to continue the partnership beyond the current time frame (2009-2012) based on the generally very healthy state of the partnership as well as the significant results that have been achieved with relatively little input, but to consider the recommendations above, in particular:

- a) Promote an OD/CB approach focusing more explicitly on service delivery.
- b) Link the CB/OD support more explicitly up to some type of sector support. In this vein it could be considered to create stronger links between the CB/OD intervention and the newly started DRR project.
- c) Introduce a stronger VNRC HQ support component.
- d) Focus more on vulnerability when selecting chapter and branches to be targeted by the project, and concentrate more on the commune level in the OD/CB efforts.

## 8. Conclusions

In conclusion the VNRC/NRC partnership is highly relevant to the needs of VNRC chapters and branches, and also consistent with VNRC and NRC strategies and priorities. To increasingly consider the needs of the vulnerable communities served by VNRC, it is recommended to increasingly approach CB/OD as a vehicle towards the development of a programme area/improved service delivery and less as a stand-alone process.

In relation to effectiveness it is found that the project activities have largely contributed/is largely contributing to the immediate project objectives being met, namely ensuring strong and stable resources for humanitarian/development work; creating a strong human resource at all levels and a wide volunteer network and providing adequate office facilities and a better working environment. A consistent message from all consulted chapters and branches was that their organisation had been transformed from existing in name only to becoming an active, well known and respected entity. This is a very significant achievement.

In terms of efficiency the partnership/projects can be considered good value for money when comparing the relatively modest financial input to the immediate results in terms of e.g. increased resource mobilisation and increased numbers of volunteers and members. However, it is felt that resources are spread too thinly in the current V7 project, and that the number of involved chapters/branches should be reduced to ensure proper quality control. Such a reduction would also facilitate a greater focus on strengthening OD/CB at the commune level preferably in the more hard-to-reach places.

In relation to impact, understood as positive changes experienced by communities as a result of the OD/CB support, progress can be detected. E.g. the number of RC service models has increased as has general volunteer activity levels, but most of the activities seem to be predominantly focusing on charity and short-term humanitarian support as opposed to more long-term development oriented models. It is believed that linking up the OD/CB support more explicitly up to a sector programme could help address this and result in more tangible benefits for end beneficiaries.

In terms of sustainability, many good and sound measures have been taken to ensure that positive results can be sustained after project funding ends. However, it should be stressed that sustainability is particularly vulnerable to what can be termed the "person factor", as illustrated by the current V7 project where staff turnover has had a very negative impact in some otherwise well-performing project areas. This is however considered to be largely beyond the control of the

project, but nonetheless it should be mentioned that having the right persons in the senior management at chapter level is a necessary (but not sufficient) pre-condition for success. To ensure that the positive lessons learned from the project are more easily replicated beyond the immediate project areas and to counter the current “over-stretched” capacity of VNRC headquarters it is furthermore recommended to include a VNRC headquarters OD/CB component in the future.

In relation to the VNRC/NRC partnership this appears to be very strong and healthy in terms of key dimensions of the RC/RC “Code of good partnership” such as equality and respect, integrity, transparency and ownership, and provides a solid foundation for a continuation of the collaboration.

Based on the above factors it is recommended to continue the partnership beyond the current phase, but with modifications as per the recommendations above some of which can already be implemented in the next funding cycle (2011-2012).

## Annex 1: Terms of Reference

### IMPACT EVALUATION CAPACITY BUILDING, ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND DISASTER PREPAREDNESS PROJECT IN VIETNAM FUNDED BY THE NORWEGIAN RED CROSS

#### Background

Vietnam, with a population of 86 million people, has been experiencing steady economic growth in the last 8 years. The average income per capita was 850 USD in 2007, however, there are still 12.6 million people (14.7% population), living under poverty line (\$1/day).

Vietnam is among the most natural disaster-prone countries in the world. Due to global warming and climate changes, disasters in Vietnam during the last five years have become increasingly unpredictable, frequent and destructive. Every year, Vietnam is hit by 7-12 storms, and about one million people need emergency assistance.

Two of the main causes for poverty of Vietnam include (i) the limited resources of the poor, and (ii) the impact of natural disasters and hazards. To achieve poverty reduction and socio-economic development by 2010, the National Development Strategy of Vietnam stressed on (i) development of the social security network for the poor and vulnerable people; and (ii) effective disaster preparedness and emergency relief to enable poor people to manage and cope with emergency situations.

**Vietnam Red Cross (VNRC)** is a leading humanitarian agency in Vietnam with an extensive network of up to 200,000 active members & volunteers in all 63 provinces and 95% communes. Vietnam Red Cross is best known for its effective assistance to disaster victims, to the poor, the disadvantaged, war victims, those with sudden misfortunes; first aid, blood donor mobilization and communication with the public in time of disasters and disease outbreaks. Most of VNRC activities are carried out through its network down to the grassroots level; therefore strengthening organisational and operational capacity at grass-root branches is the key factor to ensure VNRC effectiveness towards improving the living standard of the needy people.

**Norwegian Red Cross (NRC)** has been in partnership with Vietnam Red Cross since 1995. Three Capacity Building and Branch Development projects, namely the V3 Project (2002-2005), V4 Project (2006-2008), and an the ongoing V7 project (2009-2010/2012), covering 7 provinces have so far been implemented. The improvement in these Red Cross Chapters' operation and management capacity has led to the positive change in the life of many poor and disadvantaged people.

**V3 Project:** During 2002-2005, NRC provided the support to 3 provinces in Central Vietnam, namely Binh Dinh, Phu Yen and Khanh Hoa. These provinces had a large disadvantaged population of ethnic minorities, disabled, and poor people. The region is also prone to natural disasters such as typhoons, storms, floods, etc., and as a result disaster management and emergency assistance in the provinces was prioritised. The American war also left behind a high number of chemical and landmine victims.

**V4 Project 2006-2008:** include 3 provinces in the North – Yen Bai, Tuyen Quang and Vinh Phuc, together with the continuation of the capacity building intervention in Binh Dinh. Yen Bai and Tuyen Quang, located in the northern mountainous area of Vietnam, were among the poorest provinces, often hit by natural disasters as flash floods, hails, land slides, and forest fire. A major

proportion of the population in these provinces are ethnic minorities. Many households were living in very difficult circumstances and in need of outside support.

In the past, the 3 Chapters in the north mainly focused on direct post-hazard emergency assistance. Their assistance was “symbolic” rather than a long-term intervention that could help people to make change in their life. Red Cross organisational structure and human resources capacity were insufficient to meet the expectations of communities. There were very few active members/volunteers. There were no regular activities except for some gift-giving events.

**The V7 Project** includes 7 chapters, 5 of which were under V3-V4 projects (Binhdin, PhuYen, Vinhphuc, Yenbai, Tuyenquang) and two new chapters of Phutho and Thai Nguyen.

**Binhdin** Red Cross has in the 9 years developed many advanced model of activities such as volunteer clubs, donor clubs, long-term partnership with major donors such as Embassies, INGOs, Government Agencies, private businesses, religious organisations, etc; promotion of Red Cross through public media & events. The Chapter has established a strong image and an effective management system with democracy, transparency, participation and delegation of tasks. This made staff, volunteers, donors and Government very happy.

Binhdin Red cross also contributed in developing “Organisation Development/Capacity Building national strategy” of Vietnam Red Cross, including writing training manuals in Fundraising, Communication, and Volunteer management. Binhdin facilitators are often invited by VNRC HQs and other Red Cross chapters, Government and International NGOs to deliver trainings, consultations or to facilitate major events.

**Vinhphuc** Red Cross has made the most progress among the three Northern provinces. Red Cross network has been strengthened at all levels with increased number of staff, volunteers and active members. The volunteers show genuine enthusiasm, creativity and confidence in Red Cross work. Vinhphuc Red Cross work has become increasingly popular in the communities. Being located in an industrial province with many businesses, Vinhphuc chapter has the best potential to raise more funds from businesses and could become financially self-reliant in the coming years.

**Yenbai and Tuyenquang** province Red Cross are making reasonable progress, though less than Vinhphuc. In some provincial and commune branches, there are very good volunteer teams who take great initiatives, show enthusiasm and dedication to serve the community in genuine Red Cross spirit. Motivated by Red Cross mandate and with little support from Project, they initiated a wide range of activities, and delivered many new services to local communities in a sustainable way.

**Phu Tho and Thai Nguyen** joined the Project in 2009. Phu Tho and Thai Nguyen which are adjoining provinces are situated about 90 km North of Hanoi with a population of 1.2million and 1.1 million respectively. The poverty rate is 30% and 20% respectively. 27% of the total population belongs to one or another ethnic group and most of them live in remote mountainous area with limited income, poor infrastructure and social services. Phu Tho is also particularly vulnerable to floods from Red River. Both chapters have strong support from the Government, good leadership and good number of dedicated staff & volunteers who sincerely desire to change. These two chapters have potential to make good progress and become strong Red Cross branches in the North of Vietnam.

## 1. Objectives

This impact evaluation will be conducted to verify the overall efficacy and sustainability of the long-term partnership between the Nepal Red Cross and Norwegian Red Cross. This will likewise form the basis to determine the next stage of the partnership.

- To evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the partnership between the Norwegian Red Cross and Vietnam Red Cross in general and the programmes/projects in particular.
- To evaluate the justification for continuation of the existing projects beyond the current time frame (2009 - 2012) and recommend revising the programme activities and indicators to further ensure relevance, quality assurance and sustainability
- Should the conclusion be not to continue beyond the current time frame, to recommend modifications in modus operandi of the programme for the remaining time frame (2011 - 2012) in order to secure sustainability in the programmes.

## 2. Scope of Work

The evaluation shall examine the following key areas in the programme implementation:

### **Relevance:**

- Review to what extent the programmes are based on needs
- Assess the training courses provided to the staff and volunteers in terms of relevance and application in VNRC

### **Efficiency**

- Review to what degree the resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) are converted to results/outputs?
- Review the coordination process between NRC, VNRC HQ and Provincial Chapters.
- Identify good practice or lack of the same in the partnership of NRC and VNRC in the implementation of the programme.

### **Sustainability**

- To review to which degree the VNRC Provincial Chapter /Sub Chapter has been able / has capacity to replicate the programme to new areas and to sustain the activities in the target area.
- Assess opportunities to ensure the sustainability of programme operations, which should focus on internal funding mechanisms.

### **Impact:**

- Review whether programme implementation methodologies have contributed to enhanced participation, accountability, non-discrimination and empowerment of different ethnic groups in the target area.

## 3. Method of Work / Methodology

Prior to the evaluation, the consultant(s) will study relevant materials of the programme. A practical and participatory approach shall be applied throughout the exercise. During the field-visit, interaction and interview with the beneficiaries should be an important source of collecting information.



The following (though not limited to), key resource persons should be interviewed by the evaluation team:

- VNRC Secretary General
- VNRC Project Manager
- NRC programme Coordinator
- Project Management Board members in Binhdin, Vinhphuc and Thai Nguyen
- Government representatives in selected provincials & communes
- Red Cross staff and volunteers in selected provincials & communes
- Beneficiaries and donors in selected provincials & communes.

Field visit will be made to:

- Binhdin province
- Vinhphuc province
- Thai Nguyen province

#### **4. Time Frame**

- The in-country mission will be a total of (16) days and will take place from 15 Aug. 2010 till 29 Aug. 2010, a total 21 days including domestic travel, preparation and reporting.
- The final report will be submitted to the NRC and VNRC not later than 06 October 2010.

**Annex 2: Programme of the evaluation mission**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>16/8/2010 Monday</b>	9:00 – 10:00 (60')	Meeting V7/N project Management Board, VNRC NHQs	VNRC office, 82 Nguyen Du
	10:00 – 11:30 (90')	Meeting Norcross Coordinator	15 Thien Quang
	11:30 – 13:30 (120')	Lunch, packing	
	13:30 – 14:30 (60')	Leave Hanoi to Vinh Yen city Evaluators: Anna, Thu Ba VNRC: Lan NRC: Duy, Giang	
	14:30 – 16:00 (90')	Working with Vinhphuc Chapter	Vinh Yen city
	16:00 – 17:00 (60')	Meeting with Red Cross volunteer team, Vinh Phuc provincial chapter	Vinh Yen city
<b>17/8/2010 Tuesday</b>	7h00 – 7:45 (45')	From Vinh Yen city to Lap Thach district	Lap Thach district
	8:00 – 11:00 (180')	Working in Laphach district: - Lap Thach Red Cross district - Thai Hoa Red Cross commune - People's Committee of the commune - Vocational training for disadvantage people	
	11:00 – 13:30 (150')	From Lap Thach back to Vinh Yen city Lunch	
	13:30 – 14:30 (60')	Meeting at Red Cross of Vinh Yen city - Red Cross branch's staff and volunteers	Vinh Yen city
	14:30 – 15:15 (45')	Meeting with Vinh Yen authorities	Vinh Yen city
	15:15 – 16:00 (45')	Meeting with Tich Son commune	Vinh Yen city
	16:00 – 17:00 (60')	Interview with beneficiaries, supported by local Red Cross	Tich Son commune, Vinh Yen
<b>18/8/2010 Wednesd ay</b>	7:00 – 7:45 (45')	From Vinh Yen to Vinh Tuong district	Vinh Tuong district
	8:00 – 9:00 (60')	Meeting with Vinh Tuong Red Cross district	Vinh Tuong district
	9:00 – 11:00 (120')	Meeting with Thuong Chung Red Cross commune, Meeting with People's Committee of Thuong Chung commune Meeting with volunteers (model of humanitarian assistance) and beneficiaries	Vinh Tuong district

	11:00 – 13:00 (60')	Back to Vinh Yen Lunch	
	13:15 – 15:00 (105')	Meet one FA volunteer team along highway II	Binh Xuyen district
	15:00 – 16:30 (90')	From Binh Xuyen to Hanoi	
<b>19/8/2010 Thursday</b>	6:00 - 9:30 (150')	Flight from Hanoi – Quy Nhon	
	9:30 – 14:00	Check-in hotel Lunch	
	14:00-17:00 (180')	Working with Binhdin Chapter	Binh Dinh chapter
<b>20/8/2010 Friday</b>	6:30 – 8:30 (120')	Meeting with Vinh Thanh branch	Vinh Thanh district
	8:30 – 9:20	From Vinh Thanh district to Vinh Thinh commune Working with Vinh Thinh commune: Participate in DP exercise (30' – 40')	Vinh Thinh commune
	9:20 – 11:30	Go to M2 village, Vinh Thinh commune: - Meeting with local authorities of Vinh Thinh commune (60') - Rice donation charity boxes activities & Meet with Red Cross volunteers (80')	M2 village, Vinh Thinh commune
	11:30 – 13:00	Leave from Vinh Thinh commune To Binh Hoa commune Lunch	
	14:00-17:30	Working in Binh Hoa commune: - Observe on social activities of volunteers (20 – 30') - Observe on first aid demonstration activities of volunteers (20 – 30') - Meeting with volunteers (30') - Meeting with local authorities and Red Cross commune (30') From Tay Son district back to Quy Nhon city (60')	Tay Son district
<b>21/8/2010 Saturday</b>	7:00-11:30	Working in My Loi commune (community health care)	Phu My district
	14:00-17:00	Volunteer activities in district hospital (60') Meeting with volunteers club (60')	Tuy Phuoc district
<b>22/8/2010 Sunday</b>		Travel back Quynhon- Hanoi	
<b>23/8/2010 Monday</b>		Thu Ba Off Consolidation of information	

<b>24/8/2010 Tuesday</b>	7:00 – 9:30	Travel to Thai Nguyen: 150'	Thai Nguyen Chapter
	9:30 – 10:50	Meeting with Thai Nguyen RC chapter (70')	
	10:50 – 11:30	Meeting with Red Cross volunteers/youth club	
	11:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
	13:30 – 14:00	From Thai Nguyen to Phu Luong district (60')	Phu Luong district
	14:00 – 15:00	Meeting with Phu Luong Red Cross (30') Meeting with 01 leader of People Community of Phu Luong district (30')	Phu Luong district
	15:00 – 15:45	Meeting with Red Cross volunteers (Safety Motorbike Team and First Aid spot) of Phu Do commune, Phu Luong district (45')	Phu Do commune
	15:45 – 16:30	Meet with Red Cross of Phan Me commune	Phan Me commune
	16:30 – 17:30	Interview 2 – 3 beneficiaries, assisted by Red Cross. 20' each beneficiary. From Phu Luong district, back to Thai Nguyen city	Phan Me commune
<b>25/8/2010 Wednesday</b>	7:30-8:30	From Thai Nguyen city to Vo Nhai district (60')	Vo Nhai district
	8:30 – 9:30	Meet with Red Cross of La Hien commune (60')	La Hien commune
	9:30 – 10:30	Meet with Red Cross volunteers of First Aid spot and Safety Motorbike team	La Hien commune
	10:30 – 11:30	Interview 2 – 3 beneficiaries, assisted by Red Cross. 20' each beneficiary.	La Hien commune
	11:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
	13:30 – 14:00	To Dong Hy district	Dong Hy district
	14:00 – 14:45	Meet with Red Cross of Chua Hang town	Chua Hang town
	15:00 – 15:30	Interview Chairman of People Committee of Chua Hang town	Chua Hang town
	15:30 – 16:30	Meet with Red Cross volunteer of First Aid spot in Chua Hang town	Chua Hang town
	16:30 – 17:00	Interview beneficiaries, assisted by Red Cross. 15' each beneficiary.	
	<b>26/8/2010 Thursday</b>	7:30 – 8:10	From Thai Nguyen to Pho Yen district
8:10 – 9:30		Meet with Red Cross of Pho Yen district	
9:30 – 10:30		Interview 2 – 3 beneficiaries, assisted by Red Cross. 20' each beneficiary	
10:30 – 11:30		Meet with Red Cross volunteers of First Aid in Trung Thanh commune	Trung Thanh commune

	11:30	Travel back Hanoi, consolidation of information	
<b>27-29 August</b>		Consolidation of information Debriefing Drafting report	

### **Annex 3: List of people consulted by the evaluation team.**

#### *Vietnam Red Cross Society*

- Mr. Doan Van Thai, Vice President cum Secretary General, VNRC.
- Ms. Luong Hong Thuy, Deputy Director, International Relations and Development Department, VNRC.
- Ms. Ha Thi Lan Anh, Project Officer, International Relations and Development Department, VNRC.
- Ms. Tran Thi Ngoc Chau, staff of Personnel Department, VNRC.

#### *Norwegian Red Cross*

- Mr. Gideon Tesfai, Programme Coordinator for Asia, NRC headquarters.
- Mr. Nguyen Xuan Duy, National Coordinator in Vietnam, NRC.

#### *IFRC*

- Mr. Bhupinder Tomar, Head of Delegation, IFRC Vietnam.
- Ms. Lan Nguyen, OD Manager, IFRC Vietnam.

### **Vinh Phuc Province**

#### *VNRC representatives:*

- Mr. Ha Dinh Kinh, Chairman of Vinh Phuc Red Cross & Head of the Project Management Board (PMB).
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Minh Nguyet, chapter staff.
- Mr. Duy, chapter staff and member of the PMB.
- Ms. Lan, chapter staff and member of the PMB.
- Ms. Phy Phuong Anh, staff in Communication & Volunteer Management Department and member of PMB.
- Dr. Nguyen Phuc Dinh (Mr.), Chairman of VNRC Lap Thach district branch.
- Chairperson of VNRC Thai Hoa Commune branch, Lap Thach district (female).
- Mr. Thang, Chairperson, VNRC Vinh Yen city branch.
- Ms. Du, Chairperson of VNRC Tich Son ward branch.
- Mr. Ta Tat Thang, Chairman of VNRC Vinh Tuong district.
- Mr. Vu Hong Duy, Vice-chairman of VNRC Vinh Tuong district.
- Mr. Nguyen Van Be, former chairman of VNRC Vinh Tuong district (had retired one month previously).
- Mr. Tran Ba Kien, Chairman of Binh Xuyen District Red Cross.

#### *Authorities:*

- Vice-chairman of People's Committee, Thai Hoa Commune (male).
- Deputy Secretary of Communist party communal committee, Thai Hoa Commune (male).
- Mr. Oanh, President of People's Committee of Vinh Yen city.
- Mr. Luu Van Hung, Chairman of Tich Son ward, Vinh Yen city and Secretary of communist party.
- Mr. Bui Minh Hong, President of the Vinh Tuong District People's Committee.

#### *Red Cross Volunteers*

- 6 volunteers at province level (all retired medical doctors; 5 male/1 female).
- 4 volunteers from Lap Thach district (3 male/1 female).
- 6 volunteers from Thai Hoa Commune (3 head of VNRC at hamlet level; 5 male/1 female).
- 3 volunteers from Vinh Yen city (2 male/1 female).
- 1 volunteer from Vich Son ward (1 male/0 female).

- 2 volunteers of Binh Xuyen district (2 male/0 female).

*Beneficiaries*

- 3 beneficiaries from Ngoc My commune, Lap Thach District (2 agent orange victims/1 veteran; 3 male/0 female).
- 3 beneficiaries from Tich son ward (1 agent orange victim; 3 male/0 female).

*Donors:*

- 1 donor from Ngoc My commune, Lap Thach district (male, entrepreneur creating jobs for persons with disabilities; male).
- 1 donor from Tich Son ward (male working in a local temple).

**Binh Dinh province**

*VNRC representatives*

- Mr. Dao Duy Chap, Chairman of the VNRC Binh Dinh Province chapter
- Mr. Ngo Vinh Khuong, Deputy Chair person of VNRC Binh Dinh province chapter.
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Duc, Head of Foreign Affairs of VNRC Binh Dinh province chapter.
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Lanh, chapter staff and member of the Executive Committee of VNRC Binh Dinh province chapter.
- Mr. Tran Dinh Ky, chapter staff and standing member of the Executive Committee of Red Cross at provincial level
- Mr. Nguyen Huu Thanh, staff at Health care department of VNRC Binh Dinh province chapter.
- Chairman of VNRC Vinh Thinh Commune branch, Vinh Thach District (male)
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Thuy, Vice-chairman of VNRC Tay Son District branch.
- Ms. Phan Thi Anh Nguyet, administration staff of VNRC Tay Son District branch.
- Huynh Van Ngo, Chairman of VNRC Binh Hoa Commune branch, Tay Son District.
- Mr. Vo Le Thi Van, Chairman of VNRC Phu My District branch.
- Mr. Dang Dinh Ba, Chairman of VNRC My Loi commune branch, Phu My district.
- Mr. Do Van Trang, head of the Health Clinic of the commune, Vice Chair person of VNRC My Loi commune branch, Phu My district.
- Mr. Dang Xuan Anh, Chairman of VNRC Tuy Phuoc District branch.

*Local Authorities*

- Deputy chairman of Communist party, Vinh Thinh Commune, Vinh Thach District (male).
- Deputy chairman of Peoples' Committee, Vinh Thinh commune, Vinh Thach District (male)
- Mr. Tu Van Man, secretary of the communist party, Binh Hoa commune, Tay Son District
- Mr. Phan Van Muu, Vice Chairman of the People's Committee, Bin Hoa commune, Tay Son District.
- Mr. Ha Van Hai, Secretary of the Communist party of My Loi Commune, Phu My district
- Mr. Huynh Van Khiem, Vice president of the People's Committee of My Loi commune, Phu My district
- Mr. Dao Xuan Luan, Chair person of the Fatherland Front of My Loi commune, Phu My district
- Mr. Huynh Van Khai, member of the People's Committee of My Loi commune, Phu My district.

*Red Cross Volunteers*

- Approximately 10 volunteers of Vinh Thinh commune, Vinh Thach District.
- 1 volunteer, Binh Hoa Commune branch, Tay Son District (0 male/1 female)
- 4 Volunteers from My Loi commune, Phu My district (1 male/3 female)

- 6 volunteers from Tuy Phuoc District (2 male/4 female)

#### *Beneficiaries*

- Approximately 20 local community members of Colok (M2) village of Vinh Thinh commune, Vinh Thach District.
- 1 stroke victim, Binh Hoa Commune, Tay Son District (male).

#### **Thai Nguyen Red Cross**

##### *VNRC Representative*

- Mr. Nguyen Minh Tien, President of the Provincial Red Cross.
- Mr. Le Ngoc Due, Vice President of the Provincial Red Cross.
- Mr. Son, Vice President of the Provincial Red Cross.
- Ms. Huong, accountant of the Provincial Red Cross.
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Duong, member of Department for Social Affairs.
- Ms. Luong Thi Dung, Vice-chairman of VNRC Phu Luong district branch.
- Mr. Nguyen Ben Cat, Vice-chairman of VNRC Phu Do Commune branch, Phu Luong district.
- Mr. Pham Duc Loi, Chairman of Phane Me Commune branch, Phu Luong district.
- Mr. Hoa Minh Toan, Chairman of the VNRC Vo Nhai District branch.
- Ms Nguyen Thi Ha, Chairperson of the VNRC La Hien Commune branch, Vo Nhai district.
- Mr. Hoang Ngoc Anh, Vice-chairman of the VNRC La Hien Commune branch, Vo Nhai district.
- Mr. Nguyen Dinh Ninh, Vice-chairman of VNRC Dong Hy District branch.
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Nang, Chairperson of VNRC Chua Hang town branch, Dong Hy district.
- Ms. Ha Thi Minh, member of the Executive Committee of VNRC Chua Hang town branch, Dong Hy district.
- Mr. Tran Van Quac, Chairman of the VNRC Pho Yen District branch.
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Phuong Thuy, Administration staff of VNRC Pho Yen district branch (in charge of volunteers groups).
- Ms. Nguyen Thi Thanh, staff of VNRC Pho Yen district branch (in charge of Health Care).
- Mr. Nguyen Quy Duong, staff of VNRC Pho Yen district branch (in charge of Social Affairs).

##### *Local authorities*

- Ms. Nguyen Thi Hoang, Vice President of the Commune People's Committee, Phu Do commune, Phu Luong district.
- Mr. Pham Van Dong, Vice-chairman of Commune People's Committee, Phan Me commune, Phu Luong district.
- Mr. Do Duy Hung, Vice-chairman of People's Committee of Chua Hang town, Dong Hy district.

##### *Volunteers*

- 9 members of youth VNRC volunteer group attached to Thai Nguyen VNRC province chapter (all from different colleges of the Thai Nguyen city; 5 male/4 female).
- 1 volunteer of VNRC Phu Do commune branch, Phu Luong district (also President of the commune Orange Agent Victims Association; 1 male/0 female).
- 7 volunteers of Phan Me commune, Phu Luong district (all members of motorbike/FA team; 6 male/1 female).
- 5 volunteers of La Hien Commune, Vo Nhai district( all members of "safety motorbike group"; 5 male/0 female).



- 3 volunteers of La Hien Commune, Vo Nhai district (all members of FA group; 1 male/2 female).
- 1 volunteer of Chua Hang town, Dong Hy district (head of the First Aid Spot; 0 male/1 female).
- 2 volunteers of Pho Yen district (working with FA; 2 male/0 female).

*Beneficiaries*

- 1 beneficiary of La Hien commune, Vo Nhai district (from poor family affected by HIV; 0 male/1 female).
- 2 beneficiaries of Chua Hang town, Dong Hy district (1 agent orange victim; 1 of poor family incl. relative with disability; 1 male/1 female).

*Donors*

- 2 donors supporting Thai Nguyen VNRC province chapter (1 male/1 female).

#### **Annex 4: List of documents reviewed**

##### *VNRC documents*

- Development Strategy of VNRC to 2010 and the Vision to 2020.
- Law on Red Cross activities (adopted by the National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in 2008).
- Statutes of VNRC (revised 2008).
- VNRC information pamphlet: "Each Organisation, Each Person helps one Humanitarian Address".
- Selected file records and documentation from VNRC chapters and branches

##### *NRC documents*

- NRC International Strategy 2009-2014
- Project Applications to NORAD for periods 2003-2005, 2006-2008, and 2009-2012
- NRC progress reports to NORAD for 2003-2005, 2006-2008, and 2009.
- NRC mission reports for missions conducted 20-30 October 2008, 20-30 October 2009 and 7-16 April 2010.

##### *Project documentation*

- Cooperation Agreements between NRC and VNRC.
- Project plan of action for V3, V4 and V7.
- Audit reports for the financial years 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009.
- Annual narrative project reports for 2005, 2007, 2008 and 2009.
- Six-monthly narrative project report for Jan-June 2010.
- Mid-term evaluation report of V4 project, 2009.

##### *IFRC documents*

- Strategy 2020.
- Characteristics of a Well-functioning National Society, 1995.
- A Common Approach to National Society Development, 2005.
- Code for Good Partnership, 2009.
- Discussion paper: "Understanding the cooperation model in Vietnam", 2010.

##### *Other documents*

- The Socialist Republic of Vietnam: "The Five Year Socio-Economic Development Plan 2005-2010".



Base 802750AI (C00082) 8-01

**Annex 6: Summary of NRC Funded Projects<sup>28</sup>**

	<b>V3 Project</b>	<b>V4 Project</b>	<b>V7 Project</b>
<b>Name of project</b>	Vietnam Red Cross Society Institutional Development & Disaster Preparedness	Capacity Building and Organization Development for 4 Provincial Red Cross Chapters in Vietnam	Building Organisational Capacity for Provincial Red Cross Chapters in Vietnam
<b>Time frame</b>	2003-2005	2006-2008	2009-2012
<b>Budget</b>	NOK 4,791,367 (According to Country Report 2003-2005)	NOK 4.500.000 (according to NORAD application)	Approximately USD 220,000 per year for 2009-2010. Budget for 2011-2012 not yet decided.
<b>Amount spent in Vietnam (both VNRC NHQs, chapters and Project Office)</b>	2003: NOK. 1.795.845 2004: NOK. 1.546.800 2005: NOK. 1.166.400 Total: NOK. 4.509.045	2006: USD 207,970 2007: USD 227,484 2008: USD 294,691 Total: USD 730,145	2009: USD 233,018
<b>Target areas</b>	Binh Dinh, Phu Yen and Khanh Hoa provinces  27 districts  408 communes (Binh Dinh: 159; Phu Yen: 109; Khanh Hoa: 140)	Yen Bai, Tuyen Quang, Vinh Phuc and Binh Dinh provinces  32 Districts (Vinh Phuc: 9; Binh Dinh: 11; Tuyen Quang: 6; Yen Bai: 9)  631 communes (Vinh Phuc: 152; Yen Bai: 180; Tuyen Quang: 140; Binh Dinh: 159)	Phu Tho, Thai Nguyen, Bin Dinh, Vinh Phuc; Yen Bai, Tuyen Quang & Phu Yen provinces  40 districts (Yen Bai: 5; Tuyen Quang: 4; Vinh Phuc: 5; Binh Dinh: 5; Phu Yen: 5; Thai Nguyen: 9; Phu Tho: 7)  358 communes (Binhdinh 40; PhuYen 30; Vinhphuc 40; Yenbai 58; Tuyenquang 30; PhuTho 70; Thainguyen 90)
<b>Key characteristics of project management set-up and project implementation</b>	Project plans and budget defined by VNRC NHQs and NRC Project Office. International NRC delegate.	International NRC delegate phased out. Bottom-up planning process introduced.	Only the districts/commune branches with most potential selected. Have deliberately chosen not to target the weakest chapters to

<sup>28</sup> The different documents reviewed, which form the basis for this table, do not always correspond in terms of e.g. figures measuring achievement and formulation of programme goals, indicators or targets for indicators. The information in this annex has been inserted and/or endorsed by VNRC and NRC.

<b>strategy</b>	Very limited focus on volunteers. NRC project office providing direct support/instructions to chapters.	More explicit focus on importance of building capacity of volunteers. Volunteers involved in planning process. Voice of staff, active volunteers is encouraged. Apply different models of RC activities in the field as well as duplicate into other areas. Introduce and advocate to VNRC NHQs as well as its leaders on volunteering activities models in order to develop the Volunteering Management Guidelines. Ownership from VNRC with technical advise and support from NRC, both in-country and out-country.	minimize risk of failure. Bottom up planning process continued. Focus on volunteers continued with intensified focus on developing volunteer teams at grassroots level. Focus on building resource persons in RC Movement, CBFA, Communication & Fund Raising Focus on Communication & Fund Raising.
<b>Target Group</b>	100% RC staff at all levels, and selected members.  Selected communities who benefitted from small-scale community projects	100% RC staff at all levels, selected volunteers and active members  Local communities as project's indirect beneficiaries	100% RC staff at participating branches, selected volunteers and active members  Local communities as project's indirect beneficiaries
<b>Development objective/project goal</b>	Improve the basic situation of the most vulnerable people in three Central Vietnam provinces and limit the negative effects of natural and man-made disasters	1. Increase the self-reliance and sustainability of local branches trough skills training in planning and reporting, financial systems development as well as policy development, which lead towards a democratic and transparent institution. 2. Develop and strengthen the human and material resources of the local branches through skills training in planning, reporting, financial systems development as well s policy development to address the	To strengthen the seven provincial RC branches to become democratic and transparent actors in civil society in order to deliver improved services (in quantity ad quality).

		needs in the communities. 3. Reduce the impact of disasters on the people in the project area.	
<b>Specific project objectives</b>	1. Develop and strengthen human and material resources related to assisting the most vulnerable people in the communities 2. Strengthen RC capacity and material resources in disaster preparedness/response by consolidating existing activities and providing essential tools and equipment for RC provincial and district offices as well as disaster preparedness centres 3. Develop financial resources by income generating and fundraising projects in each province in order to have stable and sustainable funds.	1. The provincial RC in the four provinces have built a strong and sustainable institution and play a leading role in social relief and humanitarian services in their communities. 2. The RC branches in the four provinces have strategic disaster preparedness activities so that the impact of health hazards and disasters are reduced.	1. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have secured strong and stable resources for humanitarian work. 2. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have developed a strong human resource with sufficient and capable staff at all levels. 3. By the end of the programme each of the seven chapters will have established professional management systems and put them to effective use.
<b>Number of vulnerable people helped by the RC branches through the project</b>	The direct target group is RC staff and members. It was not requested to collect the data about vulnerable people helped by RC.	In 2006: 26,260 In 2008: 144,029	Data not collected.
<b>Number of RC staff, shock brigades and volunteers trained through the project</b>	20,263 people participated in workshops, trainings and exchange activities. 3,800 local people benefited from direct assistance such as: water systems, vocational training, kindergarten, house re-constructions	14,291 people received training, workshop, networking, exchange visits	9,436 staff, volunteers received training, workshop, networking, exchange visits (as of June 2010)
<b>Number of new volunteers</b>	1,875	4,085	659 (as of 31.12.2009)
<b>Number of new active RC members</b>	Not monitored	Not monitored	10,285 (as of 31.12.2009)
<b>Total value of support to vulnerable people (cash, kind, services,</b>	Base-line data not available. Within the project period, the total value of relief distributed by the 3 provinces	2008 figure / % change compared to 2006:	2009 figure / % change compared to 2008:

<p><b>or reference of donors to beneficiaries)</b></p>	<p>was at 4.1billion VND; health care &amp; services at 1.9billion VND, small-scale projects by external donors at 10billion VND; 10,400 blood units were collected; cash donations through Red Cross was at 1.16billion VND.</p>	<p>40.581 billion VND / 293 % increase  This overall increase covers increases in all participating chapters.</p>	<p>78.137 billion VND / 3 % reduction  The overall 3% reduction covers: a) Increases in Vinh Phuc (51%), Tuyen Quang (14%), Thai Nguyen (24%), Phu Tho (2%) and Binh Dinh (43%), and b) Reductions in Phu Yen (-41%) and Yen Bai (-65%)</p>
<p><b>New service delivery models introduced</b></p>	<p>No base-line data before project. At the end of project, these models were recorded: Relief distribution, rice collection &amp; distribution; house repairs/building; building water system, kindergarten; vocational training (sewing); wheelchair distribution; free health check and medicine; blood donor recruitment; first aid; disaster response and rehabilitation; direct reference of donors to beneficiaries.</p>	<p>Food distribution in hospital and to disaster victims; surgical rehabilitation; scholarship to poor students; first-aid motorbike-taxi and posts along highways; second-hand clothes distribution; commercial first aid to businesses; first-aid trainings to school teachers; home visits and care; funeral support; long-term/regular support to people in desperate situation; live blood bank; partnership with private clinics to provide free health services and materials; surgical rehabilitation; physical rehabilitation.</p>	<p>No new service models developed so far, but some models such as safe ferry and first aid by taxi drivers introduced into new/additional areas and continuation of existing models in “old” project areas.</p>

**Annex 7: Consolidated Impact Indicators of V4<sup>29</sup>**

No.	Activities	Binhdin		Vinhphuc		Tuyenquang		Yenbai	
		2006	2008	2006	2008	2006	2008	2006	2008
1	Total number of RC full-time staff (province/district/commune)	157	158	168	162	154	153	108	180
2	Total number of RC volunteer group which can be mobilized in every RC activities / total volunteer	141/ 2185	<b>161/ 2415</b>	20/594	<b>35/880</b>	20/360	<b>45/290</b>	26/208	<b>37/500</b>
3	Total number of working day which contributed by RC active volunteers	22,757	53,843	14,602	39,142	3,000	15,700	750	5,500
4	Total actual value (by cash, goods, working day, health check, present gifts, emergency relief, introduce address for donator...) that delivered directly to people (in million VND)/ total number of beneficiaries	6316.7 / 14,727	13,408 / 37,078	1,246 / 2,428	7,867 / 3,460	687/ 4,340	1,837/ 5,548	2,076/4,765	17,469/ 97,943
5	Total number of people who has received CBFA and recovered their life (in accident, natural disaster, diseases...) from RC	540	10,227	1,015	3,327	28	260	221	399
6	Total number of people who received free health check/ consultation/ physical rehabilitation service/ or have free surgery	954	9341	4,529	11,891	38,111	42,934	540	1168
7	Number of RC commune did active fundraising and contributed 3million VND for local people in yearly	94	118	50	105	28	49	45	123
8	Number of times that full-time staff/ volunteer participated/involved in RC exchange activities/sharing & exchange activities/or camp per year	2./56	16/ 668	36/1701	45/3140	2/392	34/850	2/663	5/.2865
9	Introduction of RC movement/ DP to Rep. from Government authorities / agencies (number of times)	0	11/ 269	0	13/390	3./99	15/621	2./98	0
10	Number of times that RC staff/volunteer participated in workshops/trainings (on RC movement/communication skills/fundraising/DP/ writing project proposal...)	7/223	23/ 252	14/391	80/2502	15/454	28/670	87/2393	10/320
11	Number of articles/news/program/documentary...on RC activities	190	248	458	865	36	78	80	390

<sup>29</sup> The information in this table has been generated from the M&E system of the project.



**Annex 8: Consolidated Impact Indicators of V7<sup>30</sup>**

		2008	2009	%
1	Job description for staff and departments	Yes	Yes <sup>31</sup>	
2	Code of conduct for staff, members and volunteers	No	No	
3	Percentage of staff in province, participating districts and communes who can explain the work procedures and the required knowledge for their work (RC principles, mandate, fundraising, communication, volunteer management, planning, report indicators...)			60%
4	No. of participating districts and communes who keep filing and database of needy people, donors, finance, volunteers, members and the results of their activities			60%
5	No. of interviewed beneficiaries who feel happy with the services of Red Cross			70%
6	No. of participating district & communes who have minimum 2 activities/services that are recognized and appreciated by local community	253	317	125%
7	Value of support (cash & kind) provided by Government to Red Cross	13,251,500,000	18,244,300,000	138%
8	No. of participation by Gov. leaders in Red Cross activities	388	520	134%
9	Total value of support to vulnerable people (cash, kind, services, or reference of donors to beneficiaries)	80,718,495,000	78,137,000,000	97%
10	No. of regular donors	420	551	131%

<sup>30</sup> The information in the table has been generated from the M&E system of the project. The figures in the table are aggregate figures representing all seven provinces.

<sup>31</sup> But according to findings of Evaluation team not proper job descriptions.

*Impact Evaluation Report: VNRC / NRC Partnership and Associated Projects*

11	No. of events organised by Red Cross in community	343	486	142%
12	No. of full-time paid staff	1016	1301	128%
13	No. of active RC volunteers	3851	4510	117%
14	No. of active members	232156	242441	10285
15	Percentage of female staff			40%
16	Percentage of female volunteers, members			
17	No. of working days contributed by RC volunteers & members	24870	31815	128%
18	No. of district branches communicate by email	39	42	79%

**Annex 9: Proposed template for training/workshop/exchange record**

<b>Type of training</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Participants</b> <i>Specify in terms of:</i> a) Staff and/or volunteers and/or members and/or beneficiaries b) VNRC HQ / province (P) /district (D) /commune (C) level c) Province: Binh Dinh (BD); Yen Bai (YB); Tuyen Quang (TQ); Vinc Phuc (VP); Phu Yen (PY); Phy Tho (PT), or Thai Nguyen (TN)	<b>Delivered by</b>	<b>Training cost</b>
		Example: 2 VNRC HQ staff; 1 P staff (VP); 1 D staff (BD); 15 C volunteers (TN)		
<b>Type of workshop/meeting</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Participants</b> <i>Specify in terms of:</i> d) Staff and/or volunteers and/or members and/or beneficiaries e) VNRC HQ / province (P) /district (D) /commune (C) level f) Province: Binh Dinh (BD); Yen Bai (YB); Tuyen Quang (TQ); Vinc Phuc (VP); Phu Yen (PY); Phy Tho (PT), or Thai Nguyen (TN)	<b>Facilitated by</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>Exchange Trips</b> <i>To where:</i>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Participants</b> <i>Specify in terms of:</i> g) Staff and/or volunteers and/or members and/or beneficiaries h) VNRC HQ / province (P) /district (D) /commune (C) level i) Province: Binh Dinh (BD); Yen Bai (YB); Tuyen Quang (TQ); Vinc Phuc (VP); Phu Yen (PY); Phy Tho (PT), or Thai Nguyen (TN)	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Cost</b>