

## IFRC Evaluation Management Response

### IFRC Management Response to Recommendations for the OCAC evaluation

#### Background information:

- **Date and duration of evaluation:** July – October 2019

#### Evaluator/s:

- **Lead external consultant:** Mark Shepherd
- **Team members:** Julius Kejo, Nia Burtikashvili
- **Evaluation Management Team members:** Christine South, Heather Corrie, Vivien Walden
- **Background Information:** The final report has been received on 15 October 2019

#### Summary of Management Response:

The evaluation has identified that, while OCAC's first objective has been well secured, there is a need to both modernise and accelerate the OCAC initiative. The NSD unit fully supports these findings.

The process to address such recommendations will start at the beginning of 2020. It will look at OCAC in the context of wider National Society Development processes in NSs, the vision for NSs of the future in S2030, and agreed mechanisms for planning of NSD notably having "one NSD plan" at country level and alignment of NSD support in the NSD Compact.

The recommendation to reframe and communicate OCAC as part of a wider NSD processes in NSs rather than as a "tool" or one-off approach will be pursued. Similarly, the professionalisation of OCAC (facilitators' skills, packaging, clear roles and responsibilities) will be tackled with during the first part of 2020.

Finally, a few of the recommendations point at systemic issues that go beyond OCAC itself, but that are preconditions of success of OCAC and the wider NSD support to NSs. This implies decisions that go beyond the NSD unit, but that are necessary in order to effectively support our member NSs.

**Recommendation 1: The OCAC process needs to be explicitly reframed, re-designed and expanded as a tool for supporting National Society change and development.**

*This reframing is necessary to affect a shift away from NSs seeing the process as one of leading to an award as an end in itself i.e. towards certification. A key advantage in this reframing is that the process could then be viewed and used as one to support ongoing organisational development with NSs undertaking as many OCAC assessment exercises without the need to engage in the Phase II process and/or seek certification. The OCAC acronym could be retained by revising the title to Organisational Capacity Assessment and Change process. (See further Recommendation 4 for suggestions to improve the methodology.)*

*Within this reframing process, IFRC Secretariat leadership should clearly articulate a vision for how the IFRC will move the OCAC process forward to its next level (Generation II). This should involve:*

- i. an expression of the importance of OCAC to the IFRC (and ICRC)*
- ii. explicit IFRC leadership commitment to the process*
- iii. an outline vision of how the process will be used in future (clarifying the roles of GVA and the ROs – see Recommendation 2)*
- iv. the aspirations for the IFRC from using the process*
- v. how it will be resourced, and the main changes between the original OCAC process and the revised (Generation II) version*

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p><b>Accepted</b></p>	<p>There is a need for OCAC to be much more explicitly linked to the overall NS ongoing development process, and to be more explicitly articulated as a process in itself.</p> <p>It would be important to communicate a clear vision for the future OCAC process and develop a shared understanding of it and commitment to it – these will help ensure implementation and resourcing of the process.</p>	<p>The NSD unit will define a process to design the OCAC “generation II”, involving Regional Office, CCST/CO and other key stakeholders. Recommendation to redefine the OCAC as a development process should be developed along with other recommendations, most notably recommendation #2, recommendation #4 related to the revision of the tools and methodology, and recommendation #7 which calls for a rethinking of the certification process.</p> <p>Definition of the OCAC “generation II” process and methodology</p>	<p>January 2020</p> <p>March 2020</p>	<p>NSD unit</p> <p>NSD unit</p>

		First draft of the revised OCAC process and methodology, to be discussed by the GB Working Group.	April 2020	NSD Manager
		Finalisation of the revised OCAC process and methodology, to be approved by the Governing Board.	October 2020	NSD Manager
		Dissemination to Geneva technical departments, Regional Office, CCST/CO offices.	November 2020	NSD unit

**Recommendation 2: Following Recommendation 1, OCAC process and accompanying methodology should incorporate an underlying change management strategy**

*To ensure the future OCAC process fully embodies the notion of supporting NSD change, aspects of a suitable change management strategy (e.g. Kotter’s 8-Step Change Model) should be identified and used as an overarching approach to support the entire process. A supporting dimension of this approach is for the IFRC to appoint suitably qualified change/OD advisers who can support NSs through the necessary NSD transformational processes.*

*This requires appointing more senior, experienced individuals to facilitate and assess the OCAC process (within NSD Geneva and/or ROs). These individuals should possess strong skills in OD, NSD, change management and capacity building. They may be identified from both within and outside the Movement. This does not preclude more junior people from engaging in the process as these individuals could usefully be mentored by the more experienced facilitators/assessors.*

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
Partially Accepted	Better linking the OCAC process with the wider National Society Development process taking place in the NS is needed as mentioned in recommendation #1. The design of the OCAC process requires review and revision in the light of current thinking and experience on effecting organizational change and OCAC’s place within the NS overall development process. In line with this the selection	The revision of the OCAC process (mentioned in the recommendation #1 management response) will allow to define ways to better incorporate OCAC within the overall NS development processes and ensure it reflects OD and change management principles. For the OCAC methodology revision process, please refer to recommendation #1 for specific actions, timeframe and responsibilities.		

	<p>and scope of the training of the OCAC facilitators will be revised to equip facilitators to support NSs in change management and organizational development processes.</p>	<p>Revision of OCAC facilitators competences framework and process to upgrade their knowledge and skills in supporting organizational development.</p> <p>Revision of the OCAC facilitators training content and methodology to include wider organizational development competences.</p>	<p>March 2020</p> <p>March 2020</p>	<p>NSD unit</p> <p>NSD unit</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 3: The IFRC Secretariat needs to re-orientate and strengthen its existing Geneva and Regional Office (including CCSTs and COs) NSD human resources to better support the OCAC process and wider National Society Development.</b></p> <p><i>In enacting this recommendation IFRC need to clarify who does what within the OCAC process and redefine the various roles and responsibilities of the IFRC in GVA, IFRC ROs and NSs. The thrust in this recommendation is towards NSs taking more ownership for the OCAC process, particularly in relation to sourcing and securing their own resources (both human and financial) - to the extent that they are able - for engaging in the process and linking more effectively with the supporting IFRC Regional Offices. This shift would ideally lead to IFRC GVA being seen as the knowledge hub for OCAC rather than a resourcing one, which given the devolved nature of funding responsibly to the ROs makes sense.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically, there is a need to re-orientate the role of the IFRC Secretariat and NSD Team; the role of the ROs (specifically CCSTs and COs); and the roles of the NSs themselves. There should be more direct strategizing between the CCSTs/COs, and the NSs that they support (drawing on the NSD GVA Team to provide knowledge and technical support as and when required). The ROs should also take responsibility for compiling data within their regions that relate to NSD trends, NS strengths and weaknesses, and determining and strategizing how best to leverage potential NS peer-to-peer support for the OCAC process. This information should be fed to the NSD GVA Team to aid with global trend analysis and development.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of the NSD GVA Team role, this role should be primarily concerned with OCAC process and tool development/alignment; quality control; providing knowledge and technical support to the ROs (not directly to the NSs unless exceptional circumstances dictate); and undertaking global trend analysis and development as a means of ensuring a joined-up Federation-wide approach to implementing OCAC.</i></p>				
<p><b>Management Response</b></p>	<p><b>Decision Rationale</b></p>	<p><b>Action/s to be taken</b></p>	<p><b>Timeframe</b></p>	<p><b>Responsibility</b></p>
<p><b>Accepted</b></p>	<p>The recommendation is valid well beyond OCAC alone. A clear redefinition of roles between the RO and Geneva is urgently needed. The caveat on this recommendation is threefold:</p>	<p>Revision of the JD of the NSD OCAC focal point in Geneva.</p> <p>Support to the revision of the competence framework and JD of the 5 Regional NSD coordinators.</p>	<p>March 2020</p> <p>August 2020</p>	<p>NSD Manager</p> <p>NSD manager, HR &amp; RO offices</p>



Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p><b>Partially Accepted</b></p>	<p>The OCAC tool methodology and accompanying guides will benefit from a revision.</p> <p>In specific to the 6 sub-recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The flexibility to better link and connect the present phase I and II will be considered as part of the revision of the methodology and process (see above, recommendation 1). In addition, an OCAC assessment should contribute to the NS “One NSD plan” as outlined in the NSD Compact.</li> <li>2. The recommendation for the OCAC to better incorporate gender and diversity, youth, compliance, integrity, protection against sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), accountability, corruption, sexual violence and harassment, and transparency will be studied as part of the revision process. It has to be noted that some of those dimensions are articulated in detail in specific tools for NSs. Their inclusion will need to ensure a</li> </ol>	<p>For the OCAC methodology revision process, please refer to recommendation #1 for specific actions, timeframe and responsibilities. This revision will include closer links with the follow-up process, and include a monitoring element.</p> <p>The recommendation on the tools (better inclusion of gender, PSEA, transparency; limiting the number of attributes etc.) will be initiated following the approval of the revised methodology as part of a revision of OCAC tools and supporting material.</p> <p>The packaging of the OCAC process will be conducted once the methodology and supporting tools, guides etc. have been revised.</p>	<p>December 2020</p>	<p>NSD unit</p> <p>NSD unit</p>

	<p>proper balance between OCAC and such additional tools, (OCAC providing the high level assessment which could then trigger a more in depth assessment using the appropriate tool) and ensure a linkage as an option for NSs that desire to go in depth on those aspects.</p> <p>3. OCAC and SAF: the option of merging these two processes will not be pursued as their focus, comprehensiveness, depth and methodology used are different. However, we will strengthen harmonised approaches and ensure that learning from one assessment feeds in the other assessment in order to limit duplication of efforts.</p> <p>4. Fully agreed that the packaging of OCAC shall be improved, focusing on the users (NSs), be clearer and expressly linked to NSD processes.</p> <p>5. Fully agreed. OCAC can be used before and during strategic planning.</p> <p>6. This will be analysed during the revision of the methodology and tool (see recommendation 1)</p>			
<p><b>Recommendation 5: The IFRC Secretariat should prioritise the resourcing of the OCAC process and National Society Development in general to ensure alignment with Strategy 2030</b></p>				

*If OCAC is to have a meaningful role to play in ensuring NSs continue to develop and grow as per Strategy 2030 expectations, there needs to be a clearer approach and prioritisation method to resourcing both the process itself as well as NSs that need support as a result of the OCAC process. There are clear indications that some of the ‘weaker’ NSs need support and funds should be ring-fenced from existing sources. One example could be to use the National Society Investment Alliance (NSIA) fund<sup>2</sup> and the Capacity Building Fund (CBF) to help kick-start regions that are falling behind with NSD initiatives (but not limiting resourcing to these pools). The outcomes of OCAC assessments should be used as a discussion point for partners to help support NSs in a structured way, and that these prioritised NSs are connected to peer NSs with relevant competencies and experience.*

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<b>Accepted</b>	<p>The recommendation has two aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better resourcing of OCAC processes itself: while a number of NSs either can fund their NSD processes including OCAC, and another number can count on other NSs’ support for it, a number of NSs cannot do so. Regular resources shall continue to be made available to regional offices for those NSs.</li> <li>• Better resourcing and better linking the outcomes of OCAC with NSD processes and the support by partners and others: peer-to-peer support can help in line with the NSD Compact and with other efforts such as the establishment of a Virtual Marketplace.</li> </ul>	<p>The NSD Unit shall continue advocate internally for the increase of allocation of regular resources to OCAC processes (for NSs that need so).</p> <p>The NSD Unit shall ensure access to regular resources for the revision of the competence framework of OCAC facilitators and for tailored trainings and accompaniment for them.</p> <p>Design of process and approach to develop a ‘One NSD plan’ at country level (part of NSD compact process)</p>	<p>Ongoing through 2020</p> <p>May 2020</p> <p>February 2020</p>	<p>NSD Manager</p> <p>NSD manager</p> <p>NSD Unit</p>

**Recommendation 6: The OCAC process needs to be modified to ensure aspects of National Society service delivery are more explicitly assessed and there is an appropriate focus on National Society relevance and community engagement and accountability**

*This recommendation is made as a means of improving relevancy and effectiveness. Refer to findings in Section 4.1.3.4.*

<sup>2</sup> See: <https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/national-society-investment-alliance/nsia-how-it-works/>

*This recommendation does not imply that the self-assessment tool needs to contain service dimension attributes, but rather that the OCAC process - as the Movement’s holistic NSD tool – needs within its Phase I methodology to account for service delivery. This may be a separate tool within the process, distinct from the self-assessment tool, but importantly undertaken during the Phase I stage. Within this approach, there is a strong argument to start the process in the communities and work backwards towards the NS so as to ensure there is an appropriate focus on community engagement and accountability. It is suggested that key IFRC NSD staff determine how this may be done.*

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
Accepted	Better inclusion of service delivery at early stages of OCAC process will be included in the revision of the existing OCAC capacity self-assessment. The recommendation to start “the process in the communities and work backwards towards the NS” will also be included in the revision of the OCAC methodology.	For the OCAC methodology revision process, please refer to recommendation #1 for specific actions, timeframe and responsibilities.		

**Recommendation 7: The certification aspect of the OCAC process should be reviewed and reformed.**

*Some NSs view certification as a positive aspect of the OCAC process, while others see it as a product with limited value. There is also doubt as to its professed resourcing capabilities, which raises expectations among NSs that cannot necessarily be fulfilled. Such a division of opinion lessens the overall currency of the certificate, and raises the concern that the IFRC has a product that is not valued equally by all members. There are at least three options to consider:*

- 1. Revise the award criterion: award certification based on the NS plan developed following Phase I that commits the NS to monitored development rather than attaining minimum standards (which is clearly highly problematic for a number of NSs that are unable to meet minimum standards for ‘technical’ reasons). This would change the emphasis of the certification award from attainment to progression.*
- 2. Revoke the certification aspect of OCAC: while abandoning the certification process could be a potentially contentious issue for those that have been awarded it, only 3 NSs have attained it to date, and makes rescinding it potentially easier.*

*Introduce categories of progression for certification e.g. 25% of Phase I attributes met – category 1 NS; 25-50% of Phase I attributes met – category 2 NS etc. This would potentially help eliminate the contention raised in point 2 above as NSs already having secured certification could be awarded ‘category 4’ for example.*

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility

<p><b>Accepted</b></p>	<p>The certification process needs to be discussed further as part of the overall methodology revision process. While a number of options are available, the proposed third option (to include categories) does not seem appropriate per se.</p>	<p>For the OCAC methodology revision process, please refer to recommendation #1 for specific actions, timeframe and responsibilities.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation 8: The confidentiality aspects of the OCAC process need to be reviewed with a new focus on openly sharing National Society findings and assessment reports as a means of ensuring wider institutional synergies.</b></p> <p><i>The lack of sharing OCAC generated findings is inhibiting effective institutional learning and is negatively impacting the IFRC’s ability to create wider institutional synergies. A much more open approach to sharing of summarised reports needs to be agreed upon. One option could be to require a NS that wants future NSD partner support to indicate this on the self-assessment, which make explicit – and automatically triggers - a ‘willingness to share’ the findings report.</i></p> <p><i>The IFRC has potential to access a great deal of data that has been collected across a range of attributes, and while there has been some meta-analysis of data<sup>3</sup>, it has mostly focused on reporting of composite NS minimum organisational standard attainment (and correlation between country wealth NS capacity) rather than deep insights into NSs NSD functioning (that may be obtained through cross-case study comparative analysis for example).</i></p> <p><i>This data should be used to inform strategic NSD support across the regions, and be used to help inform other Movement work such as Field Assessment Coordination Teams (FACT). Associated aspects of this recommendation relate to: producing evidenced-based impact case studies as a means of contributing to organisational learning; providing opportunities for exchange of best practices and peer learning; publication of best NSD practices; and an online platform of best practices, NSD change/development tools etc</i></p>				
<p><b>Management Response</b></p>	<p><b>Decision Rationale</b></p>	<p><b>Action/s to be taken</b></p>	<p><b>Timeframe</b></p>	<p><b>Responsibility</b></p>
<p><b>Accepted</b></p>	<p>The recommendation to promote sharing of OCAC data and findings report has already been addressed by a ‘Voluntary Disclosure’ approach: NS have been asked if they are willing to</p>	<p>Communicate the approach to ensure understanding and encourage sharing by NSs</p>	<p>January 2020</p>	<p>NSD Unit</p>

<sup>3</sup> IFRC. (2017). OCAC Findings Report. Geneva.

	make all or part of the OCAC related information publicly available.			
--	--	--	--	--