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Executive summary

The 2022 statutory meetings, i.e. the General Assembly (GA) of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and the Council of Delegates (CoD), were held from 19 to 23 June 2021. For the first time, these meetings were held in a hybrid format, to ensure participants’ safety in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Given that a new meeting model was tested, and with a view to assessing attendees’ satisfaction and identifying good practices for the future, a post-meeting survey was conducted online through the SurveyMonkey platform of both in-person and virtual participants.

Feedback from the survey was very encouraging, with 97% of respondents rating the meetings from “Satisfactory” to “Excellent”. Communications prior to the CoD were also seen positively, with 96% of respondents rating them from “Satisfactory” to “Excellent”. In-person participants positively reviewed specific aspects of the meetings, such as the “Venue, Networking opportunities” and “Simultaneous interpretation”. Online participants appreciated the “Video, Audio and Interpretation”. The areas with the greatest potential for improvement, according to both the in-person and online participants, were the “Opportunities to actively participate in sessions” and “Voting for the GA”.

Most respondents, 76%, had attended at least one of the online “Journey to the CoD” workshops organized from January to May 2022, and the average was four of the nine. A large majority of respondents, 83%, found them useful in preparing for the CoD.

In their detailed feedback, attendees highlighted the “opportunity to network with colleagues during the meeting”. Among their main challenges were the “limited time for participants to discuss all the items in the agenda”, and finding it “too packed”. COVID-19 restrictions and safety were also regarded as a challenge. For the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (Movement) to remain relevant, attendees suggested “having more coordination and communication within the Movement” and “involvement of youth”. Ways that attendees said they would ensure the Movement has an impact were “take action with their communities, implementing resolutions and trainings” and “working with the youth”. In their final comments, 51 respondents thanked the organizing team for the meeting.

Most of the respondents attended the statutory meetings in person and were members of a National Society. All regions were represented in the survey.

The hybrid meeting was successful and can be considered as an option for future meetings. Future agendas, however, should not be so packed but instead have fewer items to allow for more discussion and networking opportunities. Finally, the mechanisms for following up with National Societies on the implementation of resolutions should be strengthened.
Introduction

Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, the statutory meetings of 2022 (i.e. the GA and the CoD) were held for the first time in a hybrid format. From 19 to 23 June 2022, 504 official representatives were on-site attending both the CoD and the GA. A further 20 official representatives participated in both meetings via Zoom, and 230 Movement staff followed the procedures online through the Virtual Platform.¹

Considering that a new format was being tried for these meetings, a survey, open to all participants, was carried out to evaluate participants’ virtual and in-person experience. This feedback complements the survey carried out on the nine “Journey to the CoD” online workshops that took place from January to May 2022. (Annex B).

Objectives

The purpose of this report is to present participants’ feedback on the content, format and execution of the 2022 statutory meetings and to summarize the key lessons so they can guide future statutory meetings and preparations for the 34th International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (International Conference) in 2024.

Methodology

The survey consisted of 13 questions and was available throughout the meetings and for two months afterwards. The questions covered the preparation process, technical aspects during the meetings, activities outside the official programme, and more, and also included statistics from the attendees’ profiles. The survey was carried out in four languages to improve accessibility. To read the survey, see Annex A.

It was accessible through the Virtual Platform (Swapcard) and directly through SurveyMonkey. The Virtual Platform sent notifications to guests to fill out the survey. In addition, to reach the greatest number of attendees, the chairperson invited guests to fill out the survey, posters were hung on-site, a reminder was posted on the CoD daily bulletin, and emails were sent regularly up to two months after the meetings.

There was, however, limited time for participants to respond to the survey during the meetings, as there were no coffee breaks during the CoD ² and lunch breaks were just one hour long. Moreover, as the COVID-19 pandemic limited in-person interaction and this was the first in-person meeting since 2019, it is assumed that participants were eager to network in the small windows available.

¹ Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, participation in the 2022 CoD was limited to three delegates per National Society (including a youth delegate) and ten delegates each from the International Committee of the Red Cross and the IFRC.
² The survey was conducted during the COD.
Findings

A. Profile and mode of participation

Q.1 How did you attend the 2022 Statutory Meetings?

In all, 754 people attended the statutory meetings: 504 in person and 250 online. Of the 211 survey respondents, 164 participated in person and 47 online. In other words, 33% of in-person participants responded and 19% of online participants.

Although most attendees were able to participate on-site, many viewed the remote access positively. According to one respondent, “The ability to attend virtually, especially being unable to travel, was great in itself.” Another said, “Given the challenge for some National Societies to travel abroad due to COVID-19, it was good that the Statutory Meetings of 2022 was a hybrid meeting.”

Q.12 Where are you based? Q.13 Who are you affiliated with?

Of the 211 respondents, 93% were from National Societies and 6% from Other (GA observers, guests, etc.). 59 respondents were based in Europe (including Geneva), 52 in the Asia-Pacific region, 41 in Africa, 35 in the Americas, and 24 in the Middle East and North Africa region.

B. Overall satisfaction

Q.10 How do you rate overall this meeting?

97% of respondents provided positive feedback about the meetings, with an overall rating of 4.12 out of 5. The respondents could rate the meetings from one to five stars (with one being Very poor and five being Excellent).  

3 Respondents could choose from one to five stars, with one being the lowest score and five the highest.
A respondent said the following: “Many thanks for the excellent preparation and organization of these statutory meetings in close consultation with the National Societies. Despite the difficult sanitary conditions, the Movement was able to adopt important decisions on how to better respond to contemporary humanitarian challenges and improve the way it operates. The participatory and inclusive approach was particularly appreciated. An approach to be repeated for the statutory meetings of 2024.”

There were several new elements for this edition of the statutory meetings. There was a new venue – the Palexpo Exhibition and Convention Centre – instead of the International Conference Centre Geneva. It was also the first time the statutory meetings were held in a hybrid format and, owing to the pandemic, social distancing and sanitary measures were taken.

One respondent shared the following observation: “More time to be allocated for comments from the floor, less agenda items/resolutions put forward to allow more flexibility in the agenda and planned half day for delegates to visit the museum and another half day for formal networking, so this doesn’t need to be on the side of the plenary and the plenary can have more focus. Every session should include follow up on the women in leadership progress and updates/interventions from societies as well as integrity management and working according to the fundamental principles today. Another suggestion is to have the youth design more of the sessions, to bring more of a humanitarian passion to the discussions.”

C. Satisfaction with the preparation and engagement process

Q.5 How would you rate the communications (emails, newsletters, and consultative feedback on documents prior to the CoD) of respondents gave positive feedback. The average rating for communications and consultative feedback on documents was of four out of five stars. One respondent said, “Congratulations for the organization and the communication before, during and after”.

4% of respondents rated the communications as two stars (Poor) or one star (Very poor), leaving room for improvement in information-sharing. One respondent stated, “The main issue was the lack of information before and during the event and the venue itself was not the best.”

D. Execution and logistics

Q.2 Remote participants, how would you rate: Video, Audio, Opportunities to actively participate in sessions, simultaneous interpretation, Voting (GA Only)

Figure 3 Online participants’ rating of execution and logistics
Remote participants found that the audio and video during the meetings worked well, with 92% of respondents rating the video as Excellent or Good, and 90% of respondents rating the audio as Excellent or Good. Simultaneous interpretation was rated as Excellent or Good by 85% of respondents. Voting was rated as Excellent or Good by 67% of respondents.

The area with the greatest potential for improvement was opportunities to actively participate in sessions, with only 55% of respondents rating them as Excellent or Good. One person wrote that “Remote participation still lacks the dynamicity and effective communication of the in-person participation, however it offered an opportunity to follow”. Another made the remark that, “participating online was a good offer taking in consideration the limitations to participate in person but is not close to the same experience of participating in person.”

**Q.2 In-person participants, how would you rate: Venue, Networking Opportunities, Opportunities to actively participate in sessions, Simultaneous interpretation, Voting (GA Only)**

![Bar chart showing in-person participants’ rating of execution and logistics](image)

80.47% of respondents rated the venue as Excellent or Good. Networking opportunities were rated as either Excellent or Good by 78% of in-person participation respondents.

On the “Voting process” (GA Only), 77% of participants thought it was Excellent or Good.

One participant commented that: “… to me the venue was better than when SM are organized in the CICG. There was more space (especially for the COVID prevention matters), the location was great for majority of NS I met, as they did not need taxi or busses to get to the center, the venue had all equipment we needed.”

The area with the greatest potential for improvement was opportunities to actively participate in sessions, with just 55% of respondents rating them as Excellent or Good. In their feedback, some individuals said they struggled to find their way around the venue and thought the plenary room was too big. One respondent shared that it was a challenge “feeling connected to what’s happening on the stage. The facility while fabulous in its own way, it does not auger well to remain consistently connected when you are at the furthest end of the room”. Some guests found the venue was not easily accessible and that more preparation was needed for the voting process. Additionally, some participants found that the text on the screens was too small to be legible.
E. Events outside the programme

Q.3 Did you participate in the online workshops organized prior to the CoD?

![Figure 5: Number of Workshops Attended Per Respondent](image)

Nine workshops were held ahead of the CoD (from January to May). From the data collected throughout the different workshops, the top three most attended CoD workshops were “Counterterrorism measures and sanctions regimes and their impact on principled humanitarian action”, “Protection in the Movement”, and “Investing in Communications: No risk, big returns”.

76% of respondents attended at least one workshop. The graph illustrates how many workshops respondents attended. For instance, 29 respondents had attended all nine workshops. A large majority had attended at least one workshop. The average was four, meaning that the average respondent had attended nearly half the nine workshops held prior to the CoD.

For more information, please refer to the workshop survey report annexed to this document (Annex B).

Q.4 Were the online events (workshops, preparatory meetings, expert groups…) useful to you for your preparation for present and future Movement statutory meetings (CoD, International Conference)?

![Figure 6: Usefulness of Online Events (As a %)](image)

The nine workshops already referred to were the highlight of the online events held outside the CoD programme. 83% of respondents felt that events in preparation for the CoD were useful. 3% responded found them not so useful or not at all useful. 13% responded not applicable.
F. Detailed feedback

Q.6 Describe ONE GREAT EXPERIENCE you had in attending the CoD

This question received 155 answers and was skipped by 56 survey respondents. Getting to interact with other delegates was the highlight for most participants. The words that were repeated the most were “networking”, “colleagues” “face to face”, and “people” which demonstrates the importance of on-site meetings. A participant made the comment that they enjoyed “meeting up old and new colleagues after a long break because of the COVID19 situation”.

“Youth” was often mentioned as well. One participant shared that “Since there was a Youth delegate, youth participation was included 100% which shows that as young people we can speak out what is on the table, we have that right.”

Q.7 Describe ONE CHALLENGE you may have experienced at the CoD

This question received 152 responses and was skipped by 59 individuals.

The main challenges identified were COVID-19 restrictions and restricting the number of attendees to three delegates per National Red Cross or Red Crescent Society. Others mentioned that on the CoD agenda were “many substantive issues tightly packed in limited time”. Another challenge was related to the limited space for more interaction: “More real discussion – meaning a real exchange between interventions from the floor and the panel would make the sessions more interesting to follow. A skilled facilitator could be helpful.” Some people also mentioned lack of time dedicated to networking as a challenge.

Q.8 Further to your participation in the CoD, what is the ONE ELEMENT that will help the RCRC Movement remain relevant in the humanitarian realm?

This question was answered by 153 survey respondents and skipped by 58. “Cooperation and coordination”, “one Movement” and “the Seville Agreement 2.0” were mentioned as elements that will help the Movement to remain relevant. It was also suggested to have “a stronger and systematic network for sharing information and best practices of all NSs.” “Involvement of youth” was acknowledged as well, with a respondent expressing that “Continuously encouraging youth participation and engagement” will help the Movement remain relevant in the humanitarian realm.

Q.9 What is the ONE MAIN ACTION you plan to take after this meeting to ensure that the RCRC Movement continues to have a positive, collective and sustainable impact for the people and communities most in need?

In the responses, the word “communities” and “community” were used 18 times. A respondent shared that they want to “concentrate on developing national volunteer network, opportunities and strengthen their relation to local communities”. “Resolutions” were mentioned, usually in the context of implementation and integration into existing National Society programmes. Another respondent suggested the “creation of a humanitarian week to raise awareness on themes with humanitarian implications (climate and sustainable development, emergency, gender and volunteering, etc.)”

Q.11 Any other comments to share?

51 respondents praised the organization of the conference and thanked the organizers. Someone commented: “Many thanks for all the effort you as a DREAM team put in organizing this year’s SMs and keep up your high standards!”
Others shared that they thought that the statutory meetings were a good opportunity for cooperation. The hybrid format of the meetings was also appreciated: “We may have hybrid mode for GA, COD and International Conference (or at least some parts) in the future (...) that will accommodate more people to join who are not able to join the meetings in person due to different reasons.”

A respondent suggested “For both conferences together: Perhaps less resolutions and more time for real discussions”. Another respondent shared an idea for a way to follow up on resolutions, “Put in place a simple mechanism for monitoring/evaluating our and our partners’ progress on implementing the resolutions and fulfilling our commitments (mid-term review). Then a second evaluation just before the next statutory meetings.”

Another participant highlighted the need for more dialogue with states: “I believe that even though states do not attend the Council of Delegates, we need to share the outcomes of the meeting with them through the National Commissions on IHL and, insofar as possible, persuade them to embrace the objectives”.

Conclusion

A successful meeting Despite having to quickly adapt to an unprecedented context, the 2022 statutory meetings were able to safely reunite the Movement for the first time since the start of the pandemic. The organizers’ duty of care to safeguard attendees’ health and well-being was exercised through a hybrid format and restricted attendance policy. In the new format, the meeting was well-organized, receiving good feedback on aspects such as the venue, audio, video and simultaneous interpretation.

Hybrid format worked The “Journey to the CoD” and its nine online workshops pioneered a good practice that is here to stay. Although in-person participation was preferred, the hybrid format should be considered for future meetings. Restricted participation was not viewed favourably. Event organizers could provide additional technical support to remote participants to bridge the digital divide.

Networking opportunities needed The responses underlined the importance of interaction among delegates and demonstrated the need for coordination and cooperation among the Movement members. In the future, the agenda of the meetings could be less dense to favour more dynamic exchange among attendees.

Stronger follow-up mechanisms needed Closer collaboration with National Societies is needed: they need to be informed, and a solid follow-up plan needs to be made for working together on the adopted resolutions.

---

4 Translated from the French: “Mettre en place un mécanisme de suivi/évaluation simple (mi-mandat BOARD) sur l’évolution dès la mise en œuvre des résolutions et de respect de nos engagements, nous et nos partenaires. Puis une deuxième évaluation à la veille des prochaines réunions statutaires.”

5 Translated from the Spanish: “Creo que aunque los Estados no estén presentes en el Consejo de Delegados, es fundamental compartir con ellos, a través de las Comisiones Nacionales de DIH, los resultados de la reunión y, en la medida de lo posible, persuadirles para que compartan los objetivos.”
Annex A: Survey questionnaire

We would like to invite you to participate in this online survey

Background: This survey will be used as part of the evaluation for the 2022 Statutory Meetings taking place remotely and in person in Geneva from 19 to 23 June 2022 and in particular the Council of Delegates meetings (CoD). It will complement the evaluative initiatives which have also been carried out for the CoD online workshops which were carried out from January to May 2022.

Aim: This survey is related to the organization and the plenary session of this year’s hybrid sessions informing the next CoD and the 34th International Conference.

Instructions: This survey will take about 5 minutes to complete. It is made up of 13 questions. You can go back and forth to review your answers in the survey by pressing the buttons at the bottom of the page.

Data Use and Confidentiality: We appreciate your time and your responses will be used to help us learn more about how the statutory meetings lived up to the expectations of the participants and how we can improve future meetings. This survey is completely ANONYMOUS and any reports or publications based on this research will use only group data and will not identify you or any individual.

We thank you in advance for your time.

1. How did you attend the 2022 Statutory meetings:
   - Remote participation
   - In person participation

2. How do you rate the quality of (Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Poor, Very Poor):
   Remote participation
   - Video
   - Audio
   - Opportunities to actively participate in sessions
   - Simultaneous interpretation
   - Voting (General Assembly only)

   Additional Comments:

   In person participation
   - Venue
   - Networking opportunities
   - Opportunities to actively participate in sessions
   - Simultaneous interpretation
   - Voting (General Assembly only)

   Additional Comments:

3. Did you participate in the online workshops organized prior to the Council of Delegates meeting (CoD)? (Put in a slide bar that goes 0 to 9)
4. (Were the online events (workshops, preparatory meetings, expert groups...) useful to you for your preparation for present and future Movement statutory meetings (Council of Delegates, International Conference)?

   Extremely useful
   Very Useful
   Somewhat useful
   Not so useful
   Not at all useful
   Not applicable

5. How would you rate the communications (emails, newsletters, and consultative feedback on documents) prior to the CoD? (Use Stars for rating)

6. Describe **ONE GREAT EXPERIENCE** you had in attending the CoD?

7. Describe **ONE CHALLENGE** you may have experienced at the CoD?

8. Further to your participation in the CoD, what is the **ONE ELEMENT** that will help the RCRC Movement remain relevant in the humanitarian realm?

9. What is the **ONE MAIN ACTION** you plan to take after this meeting to ensure that the RCRC Movement continues to have a positive, collective and sustainable impact for the people and communities most in need.

10. How do you rate overall this meeting? (Use stars for rating)

11. Any other comments to share?

12. Where are you based?
   - Africa
   - Americas
   - Asia Pacific
   - Europe
   - Geneva
   - Middle East and North Africa

13. Who are you affiliated with?
   - National Society
   - ICRC
   - IFRC Secretariat
   - Other
Annex B: Workshop report

2022 Council of Delegates online workshops
Survey report

Background

Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Standing Commission of the Red Cross and Red Crescent decided in March 2021 to postpone the meeting of the Council of Delegates (CoD) from December 2021 to 2022. The Standing Commission also decided that the 2022 CoD would have a hybrid format combining a programme of online workshops with an in-person plenary meeting.

The following nine online workshops were held from January to May 2022 as a “Journey to the CoD” before the CoD’s formal opening in June 2022:

1. Counterterrorism measures and sanctions regimes and their impact on principled humanitarian action
2. Towards a Movement position on autonomous weapon systems
3. Movement approach to education
4. Protection in the Movement
5. Virtual Fundraising Hub 2.0 – A commitment to growth
6. What will it take to build an International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement free from racism, xenophobia and discrimination?
7. Increased local action: Investing in sustainable and strong National Societies
8. Strengthening integrity within the Movement
9. Investing in communications: No risk, big returns

The objective of this series of workshops was to complement the CoD’s agenda with exploratory and informal discussions on important and current humanitarian topics. They provided an opportunity for the components of the Movement to start a dialogue, showcase successful approaches to tackling humanitarian issues and learn and inspire each other. Key elements of the outcomes of the workshops were presented to the plenary meeting of the Council of Delegates and have been reflected in its summary record.

The workshops were open to all members of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. They were held twice on the scheduled day in English, with simultaneous interpretation in different language combinations (Arabic and Russian, Spanish and French).

A survey was conducted to gather feedback from attendees on the usefulness of the workshops. It consisted of seven questions, took one minute to complete and was available in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish, depending on the session. The answers were collected through Zoom, which automatically launched the survey right after the workshops.

Survey objective

The objective of the survey was to support continuous learning and improvement for future statutory meetings and to uphold accountability by providing an opportunity for the participants to give feedback. Because this series of workshops was a new way for the Movement components to engage in dialogue for the statutory meetings, the survey feedback has helped evaluate how useful they and their content are and determine whether similar events should be considered for future statutory meetings.

In addition, the results of the survey will be incorporated into the evaluation of the 2022 CoD, which was held remotely and in person in Geneva from 22 to 23 June 2022.

The following multiple-choice questions were asked:

1. Was the workshop agenda met?
2. Did you get the information you expected?
3. Do you know more on the subject?
4. Are you now more equipped to advice your organization on this matter?
5. Did the workshop have a clear conclusion?
6. Was there enough time for discussion?
7. Did technology allow for a good participation?

The response options ranged from Strongly agree to Strongly disagree.

Findings

There were over 1,300 different people registered to attend the workshops, and collectively, the workshops amassed over 2,200 attendees. In total, 142 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies registered: 30 from Africa, 30 from the Americas, 4 from Central Asia, 28 from the Asia–Pacific region, 38 from Europe and 12 from Middle East and North Africa. In addition, around 300 staff members of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) registered and 200 from the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC).

Attendance by region and the attendees’ profiles varied a lot from workshop to workshop. For instance, the workshop on integrity was attended by members of governing bodies and finance delegates. In addition, because the workshops were online rather than side events during the CoD, they were attended by personnel in the field who would not normally have access to this kind of information and discussions.

The workshop survey was filled out by over 400 attendees (18%).

The data indicate that:

- Participants were satisfied with the information received during the sessions. In fact, 88% strongly agreed or agreed that they had learned more about the subjects covered in the workshops they attended.
- 79% strongly agreed or agreed that after attending a specific workshop they could contribute to their National Society’s development activities in that area.
- Participants believed the workshops stayed on topic and the information shared was relevant. 85% of participants strongly agreed or agreed that they received the information they expected throughout the session.
- When asked whether there was enough time for discussion during the workshop, 64% agreed, 19% neither agreed or disagreed, and 15% of participants either disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- 80% of participants thought technology, such as Mentimeter, was employed in a useful way. For example, pre-recorded videos allowed guests to attend even when they could not be there live.
Lessons learned

Some of the lessons learned were:

- The online workshops attracted many different people, from volunteers to subject-matter experts to senior leaders within the Movement, which made them a unique space for dialogue between hierarchical levels.
- Although they were an informal part of the CoD’s official agenda, the online workshops were very well-attended and received positive feedback on their content.
- The workshops allowed for greater discussion among participants than the informative webinars that were held at previous CoDs to consult National Societies and foster engagement.
- Future surveys should include a free-response question.