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<thead>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>FDRS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILOSTAT</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>Collective Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, including National Societies, International Federation, and the International Committee Non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOHCHR</td>
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<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGQ</td>
<td>Washington Group Questions for collecting disability disaggregated data</td>
</tr>
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Making sense of data: quality, diversity, and inclusion

We are 191 Red Cross and Red Crescent societies across the world, each working to help the most vulnerable in different ways and in different contexts. We are an extraordinarily diverse network.

With this new edition of Everyone Counts, we are able to zoom out and get a global picture: what do all these efforts add up to? what did our National Societies actually achieve? what challenges did they face?

Each National Society records its own efforts and achievements in different ways, and using different systems. It is an extraordinary accomplishment of the Federation-wide Databank and Reporting System (FDRS) to agree on and implement a standard set of the most important indicators that demonstrate the activities of National Societies. And of course there is even more happening than what is captured under the FDRS.

Now, in addition to reporting extraordinary results and achievements in different ways, and using different systems. It is an extraordinary accomplishment of the Federation-wide Databank and Reporting System (FDRS) to agree on and implement a standard set of the most important indicators that demonstrate the activities of National Societies. And of course there is even more happening than what is captured under the FDRS.

Now, in addition to reporting extraordinary results and numbers – such as our 13.7 million volunteers worldwide and the 100 million people worldwide reached directly by our Red Cross Red Crescent health programming – we can also take the pulse of the network and ask not only ‘how many?’ but also ‘how’ and ‘why?’.

Behind the numbers, there are millions of stories: stories about different Red Cross and Red Crescent programmes, stories about our diversity, and also stories about our people and the people they serve. This Everyone Counts report begins to tell some of these stories.

For instance, it describes how more than 40 National Societies have collected disability disaggregated data to make humanitarian responses more effective, and to leave no one behind.

We also tell stories about how we as an organisation practice inclusion. Organisations that strive for gender equality are more dynamic and effective, and we aspire to equality and diversity at all levels of our organisation. This report shows that while we have made progress in fostering gender equality, there is still a lot more that we can do.

We also challenge the reader to think critically when looking at the numbers. Having the data means that we can ask and potentially answer not only the questions that make us feel good, but also the questions that might make us feel uncomfortable. Having good data allows us to verify how inclusive the Movement is, and how the IFRC Network is reaching the most vulnerable people.

National Societies are organisations that deliver services to the most vulnerable, but they’re also places of work for millions of staff and volunteers. Is everyone in these workplaces treated equally? Do women have the same opportunities as men? How open are these workplaces for those with disabilities? How is this affecting their services? This report collates and presents the numbers on diversity and balance, within our organisations. It is beyond the mandate of this report to say whether this balance - or imbalance - is fair, but we have presented the numbers to help others make these interpretations. We expect that they will lead to much debate, and we hope that they can contribute to our continuing efforts to improve National Societies as effective local humanitarian organisations, as well as the quality of their work.

Elhadj As Sy, Secretary General
1. About the FDRS

The *Everyone Counts report* is a flagship publication of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). It is based mainly on data collected through the Federation-wide databank and reporting system (FDRS).
In this chapter, we introduce the FDRS. We look at what kinds of data are included in it and how to access and analyse it. We present some headline data like: how many people across the world were reached with health programming in 2017 by National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies? (p. 25) and report some recent successes and problems. In Chapter 2 we give an overview of achievements on the main FDRS indicators like numbers of people reached.

Later in this report we also go beyond these basic facts, using the data to answer some important questions about the IFRC global network. For example in Chapter 5 we ask: what is the proportion of women in National Society and IFRC governance?

In Chapter 3 we ask another important question: is this data reliable? That question leads us to the launch of the FDRS Quality of Data Index.

For this edition of Everyone Counts we have been inspired by the World Disasters Report 2018: Leaving No One Behind. We aim to show the power of disaggregated data as an inclusive tool: We demonstrate how to best use data which is disaggregated by sex, age and disability to accelerate the inclusion of the most vulnerable people (Chapter 4).

---

**Box 1: Dangerous interpretations**

Tables and charts can always be interpreted in different ways: some of them good, some of them dangerous. To encourage you to read this report critically, we have added some dangerous interpretations throughout the report, marked with a symbol. Beware: the interpretations of some of the tables and charts contain a trap: some of them are false. Readers should be alert to this and see if they can spot the mistakes. Our solutions to these puzzles are printed on the bottom of the same pages, sideways.

The first dangerous interpretation is here, on p. 11 [first infographic].
Achievements in overview

Figure 1: The IFRC at a glance, 2017

- **OUR PEOPLE**
  - 13.7 million volunteers
  - 190 number of national societies
  - 25.3 million people donating blood

- **OUR PRESENCE**
  - 32.9 million people reached with disaster response and early recovery programmes
  - 67.3 million people reached with long-term services and development programmes
  - 13 million people trained in first aid

- **OUR RESOURCES**
  - Income: CHF 32.9 billion
  - Expenditure: CHF 32.6 billion
  - 465,000 paid staff
  - 160,000 local units

**Dangerous interpretations**

Interpretations of Figure 1. Beware, one of these interpretations is dangerous (see box Dangerous interpretations for explanation and foot of page for solution).

1. In total we reached 33 million people + 67 million people = about 100 million people in 2017
2. In 2017 National Societies had about 465,000 paid staff.
Everyone Counts report and FDRS timeline

National Societies have been contributing data to the FDRS since 2012. Even in the very first year, all except two National Societies (187 of IFRC’s 189 member societies in 2012) contributed at least some data; by 2013, all National Societies were doing so. The coverage and quality of the data has been improving every year since then.

Figure 2: FDRS timeline

- **2012**: Started the first data collection
- **2014**: Published first report
- **2015**: Published second report
- **2017**: Wide consultation and expansion of indicators, including more data disaggregation
- **2018**: Added governance gender distribution
- **2018-2019**: Created a new back end system
- **2019**: New visuals for the web application (http://data.ifrc.org/fdrs)
- **2017**: Published third report
- **2018**: Fourth report
The previous three reports

To date, the IFRC has published three Everyone Counts reports:

- **Everyone Counts 2014**: the report included a descriptive analysis of the first complete dataset of National Society data from 2012.
- **Everyone Counts 2015**: the report included and analysed data from different areas of work (FDRS, health, disaster management, disaster risk reduction, human resources and more) and aligned with IFRC’s Strategy 2020 by setting out the broad achievements in signature areas: managing and reducing disasters, tackling disease, and promoting health and a culture of non-violence and peace.
- **Everyone Counts 2018**: the report included a deep statistical analysis of the FDRS 2012–2016 longitudinal dataset. It offered insights into trends such as spontaneous volunteering and on how volunteer numbers rise and then stabilise following a major disaster. There are also chapters on National Society “per million” indicators, and on the importance of disaggregating data by sex and age.

Benefits of the FDRS

- Provides National Society and IFRC staff as well as partners, researchers and other stakeholders with immediate and engaging access to data about National Societies worldwide.
- Allows better understanding of the true scale and scope of Red Cross and Red Crescent humanitarian assistance.
- Promotes greater awareness of the capacities, services and potential of National Societies.
- Facilitates monitoring and reporting of National Society performance in a consistent, transparent and accountable manner.

The FDRS is designed around a small set of main indicators guided by IFRC’s Strategy 2020. There is a constitutional requirement for National Societies to report to it annually.

The FDRS team wants to hear from you

The FDRS team consists of three full-time staff members in IFRC Headquarters and regional offices, as well as a number of data analysts who cover IFRC’s five regions.

They are keen to hear from you:

- with suggestions and ideas for the next FDRS report
- to ask more questions about National Society capacity and response
- for help with analysing data.

The team are also happy to provide on request the original data files and statistical code files which produced all the tables, graphs and analyses; they also welcome your ideas.

Contact the FDRS team at fdrs@ifrc.org.

How to work with the FDRS data

The easiest way to find out more about National Societies worldwide or in a particular country is to use the FDRS web application.

THE WEB APPLICATION: OVERVIEW

The web application (http://data.ifrc.org/fdrs) was launched in February 2017. Users can visualise the data using maps and tables. So far, more than 18,000 users from almost every country in the world have used the FDRS website.

THE WEB APPLICATION: NATIONAL SOCIETY PROFILES

The FDRS web application also shows data for each individual National Society. Users can go directly to http://data.ifrc.org/fdrs/societies.
The FDRS web application provides maps and tables for the most important National Society indicators and shows profiles for each National Society.
Limitations and things to consider when using and interpreting FDRS data

Individual sectors, mappings (e.g. the 2017 Disaster Risk Reduction Mapping) and other initiatives such as the CashHub often have their own data systems which may contain more detailed data on particular themes. This kind of data is mostly project focused and is normally reported by National Societies’ technical focal points. The FDRS team is working together with different working groups to align data collection processes and timelines. We also work to standardise definitions across technical departments and FDRS to ensure that the data is complementary and not contradictory.

The FDRS is ambitious and wide reaching. Data quality is improving all the time, but there will always be some problems and things to bear in mind when using and interpreting the data. Here are some points to consider.

1. **Missing data**: Data is not available for some indicators for some National Societies in some years. The National Societies that did provide data may not be typical and so analyses and summaries of this data may not be valid for all National Societies.

2. **Missing disaggregation**: In particular, sex and age-disaggregated data can be a challenge to collect, so there are still many National Societies which do not provide it. This means when breaking down FDRS data by sex and age, the number of National Societies covered by the data might be smaller than expected and these National Societies might not be representative of all. Also, “other” or “unknown” sex (and age) were not considered in this year’s analysis, which means that sometimes the totals for sex or age disaggregated data may be less than for the same indicators when they are reported without disaggregation.

3. **Standardisation and regularity of reporting**: Every National Society has its own ways of recording data, which may also change over time. It is a big achievement of the FDRS to provide a set of definitions of key data which are clear and not too difficult to use. But it has taken some years for National Societies to gradually adopt the FDRS definitions. When comparing countries or years, there are still some limitations on the comparability of data due to the different methodologies of data collection, sample sizes, definitions and frequency of reporting.

4. **Time lag**: The availability of definitive figures can depend on internal processes which are tied to a particular cycle, usually annual, which might not coincide well with the FDRS data cycle. This means data for one year is usually published in the FDRS a year or more later. For example, data on income and expenditure is constrained by the availability of the most recent audited financial statements. This is due to varying fiscal years, and corresponding planning and reporting cycles of the National Societies.

5. **Reporting bias**: The data submitted through the FDRS is self-reported information by each National Society, which is the owner and gatekeeper, and responsible for accuracy and updating. The FDRS team tries to triangulate the data provided by the National Societies with previous data and other data in the public domain. However, it is always possible that a National Society might try to provide data which is not accurate, for example because it wants to present itself in a better light.

6. **Knowing the data**: Context is important. Although the numbers in the FDRS are now quite reliable, it is still important to think carefully about the context of the particular National Society and the meaning of the indicators in each context before interpreting the data. For example, when a country experiences disasters in a given year, that will strongly affect the National Society’s operations and this will be reflected in the data, even in the following years.

7. **Data management systems**: despite technological advances, data collection is still a big challenge for some National Societies due to lack of systems in place, even for their own core activities. The new FDRS Quality of Data Index is beginning to take these factors into account (see Chapter 3).

---

3 British Red Cross Society (2019).
8. **Indicators are recorded in the country where activities take place:** This sometimes confuses National Societies which are assisting other National Societies. For example, suppose a National Society from Europe is supporting another in the Americas and recording project data disaggregated by disability, although the European National Society may not disaggregate their home country activities in this way. They then notice that the FDRS does not show their National Society as reporting data disaggregated by disability. To understand this, they should remember that as with other indicators in the FDRS, it is the National Society in the country where the activities take place which should report the information, whether it is an indicator like *people reached* or one like using this kind of disaggregation.

---

**How to download and use the data**

At [http://data.ifrc.org/fdrs/data-download](http://data.ifrc.org/fdrs/data-download), users can download the complete FDRS dataset for free and without needing to register. It is provided as a file which can be saved on the user’s computer and opened in a spreadsheet programme such as Microsoft Excel. Alongside identifying columns like *country* or *year*, most of the columns in the spreadsheet represent one indicator each. So most National Societies have several rows, one for each year, containing data on many indicators. Other columns such as *population*, which are not officially part of the FDRS, have been provided. These have been merged into the spreadsheet by the FDRS team from other datasets like those of the World Bank. They can be very useful in helping to understand and use the FDRS data, for example the *Global Gender Gap Index* is used in this report in Chapter 5.

The column headings in the spreadsheet are quite short and may be hard to understand, so a codebook is also provided at [http://data.ifrc.org/fdrs/data-download](http://data.ifrc.org/fdrs/data-download), which explains what they mean in more detail.

---

2. National Society achievements in 2017 and over the last six years, through the lens of the FDRS

2017 is the sixth year of FDRS data collection. In this chapter, as well as presenting the main FDRS indicators and some National Society achievements in 2017, we also look at how things are changing over time.
The main indicators in the FDRS

National Societies send data annually to the FDRS team in Geneva on a small set of main indicators.

Box 2: The main indicators in the FDRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people reached: People reached are people who receive (from the reporting National Society in the reporting year) tangible goods and/or any of a range of activities offering protection and assistance, including a positive change or support in knowledge, skills, awareness, attitudes, behaviour, and physical and psychosocial well-being and who can be counted or at least estimated with some degree of reliability.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People volunteering their time: people who have given their time voluntarily to support the delivery of services of the reporting National Society for at least four hours during the reporting year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid staff: people who are contracted by the reporting National Society for a minimum of three months in total during the reporting year and are either remunerated for their work or are interns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People donating blood: people who have donated blood at a blood donation centre/blood bank or similar, owned or run by the reporting National Society at least once during the reporting year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People trained in first aid: people who have completed at least one first aid course led or facilitated by the reporting National Society (at any level, either online or face to face) during the reporting year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local units: any National Society physical offices that work directly with communities – these can include local chapters, subdivisions, branches, regional and intermediate offices and headquarters (existing and active at the end of the reporting year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income: the fiscal value of money, material goods and services received by the reporting National Society during the reporting year, from any source, excluding internal transfers within the reporting National Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure: the fiscal value of money, material goods and services which the reporting National Society spends during the reporting year, excluding internal transfers within the reporting National Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no single indicator for people reached. Instead, there are two sets of people reached indicators. One set is for people reached by different types of programme:

- disaster response and early recovery programmes
- long-term services and development programmes

and the other set is for thematic areas. These indicators count people reached by programming for:

- disaster risk reduction
- shelter
- livelihoods
- health
- water, sanitation and hygiene
- migration
- cash transfer
- social inclusion and building a culture of non-violence and peace.

For example, someone might be counted once under type of programme: disaster response and early recovery, and once under thematic area: shelter and perhaps thematic area: health. This is useful information about the different programmes and is not double counting because each indicator stands alone; these indicators should never be added together.

These indicators are also disaggregated to record whether people are reached directly or indirectly as well as by sex and age.
Some of the key indicators are also disaggregated in different ways.

- Indicators for people (people reached, people volunteering, paid staff, people donating blood, people trained in first aid) are broken down by sex and age group\(^6\) (see Chapter 5).
- Total income is broken down by source of income.

There are some additional indicators too:

- whether the National Society has accident insurance coverage for staff and volunteers
- names of other National Societies giving support to the National Society or receiving support from it (see Chapter 2, p. 32)
- number of staff and volunteer deaths on duty
- sources of income (see Chapter 2, p. 30)
- additional financial information, in particular, whether the National Society accounts are audited.
- the age and gender information of the National Society governing board (see Chapter 5)
- two questions asking about the use of disability-disaggregated data (see Chapter 4).

The FDRS User Guide includes detailed definitions and examples for each indicator.

---

\(^6\) The age groups are aligned with SPHERE’s core standard 3 (SPHERE Association Handbook 2018). These can be further disaggregated by National Societies to meet their own reporting requirements without interfering with the SPHERE age brackets for reporting to the FDRS. For example, the age bracket 0–12 months can be introduced into the programming and still be integrated with the sphere age bracket of 0–5 years used for FDRS reporting. On the other hand, age brackets which cross or overlap the SPHERE boundaries such as 0–10 years are discouraged. Incompatible age brackets are one of the causes of lost data, and difficulties in reporting to the FDRS.
National Society achievements since 2012

Figure 5 presents the total achievements on the main FDRS indicators since 2012, including the number of people reached with disaster response and early recovery programmes, and with long-term services and development programmes.

**Figure 5:** Total scores on the main FDRS indicators since 2012. Missing values for individual National Societies are replaced with estimates before totals are calculated (CHF = Swiss francs)

- We ignore the indicator people trained in first aid, as it has only been available since 2016
- National Societies changed the way they reported the numbers of people volunteering during this time period. This can lead to fluctuations in apparent numbers of people volunteering over time which are hard to understand. So in this report, we also provide alternative and more stable totals for people volunteering, marked “corrected”.
- We have estimated missing values, see p. 22.

Readers should remember that totals can be, and usually are, dominated by a few National Societies with high numbers. Fluctuations over time will mainly be due to fluctuations in the largest National Societies, especially if they have experienced a large disaster in a given reporting year.

- Income and expenditure fell in 2016 but recovered in 2017, mainly because of Europe and Central Asia.
- Numbers of paid staff and local units have stayed relatively stable.
- Numbers of people reached have dropped a little in total since 2016.

These totals exclude data from National Societies which had changed the way they reported the numbers 2012-16 and which reported volunteer numbers more than 25% different from the previous year. These are the National Societies in Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Cambodia, India, Maldives, Mongolia; Armenia, Cyprus, Russian Federation, Slovakia. This procedure is described more fully in Everyone Counts 2018.
• The number of people donating blood in Asia Pacific is high and rising – but this is mainly due to a big increase in Indonesia; the median tells a different story (Figure 7).
• The figures for numbers of people reached vary quite a lot over time, reflecting changing needs and funding status.
• Numbers of paid staff have stayed relatively constant in all regions, in spite of a large drop in income and expenditure in Europe and Central Asia in 2016.

The best way to make a summary which is not dominated by larger National Societies is to use medians rather than totals, as in Figure 7. This shows the key indicators for a typical National Society in each region for each indicator – one which is in the middle when the scores are listed (on that indicator in that region) in order of size. However, no method is perfect: the typical National Society in the Americas region is quite small, and so the median figures are quite low.

Figure 6: Total scores on the main FDRS indicators since 2012, by region. Missing values for individual National Societies are replaced with estimates before totals are calculated (CHF = Swiss francs)
Figure 7: Median scores on the main FDRS indicators since 2012, by region. Missing values for individual National Societies are replaced with estimates before totals are calculated (CHF = Swiss francs)

This figure tells a rather different story from Figure 6.

- Although the total number of people donating blood actually increased in Asia Pacific between 2012 and 2016 (see Figure 6), Figure 7 shows a drop in the median, due mainly to a substantial reduction in the figures for several National Societies in the middle range for blood donations.\(^8\)
- Most National Societies have been experiencing an increase in income and expenditure.
- The typical number of people reached with long-term services and development programmes has been dropping in most regions.
- The typical number of people volunteering in National Societies in Europe and Central Asia and Asia Pacific increased from 2016 to 2017.

---

\(^8\) This reduction is partly the result of advice that only National Societies which run their own blood banks should report on this indicator. Hence many National Societies reported 0 because they collaborate with state blood banks by promoting voluntary non-remunerated blood donation.
Dealing with missing values

Providing total and average scores over several years is not as simple as it sounds.

The FDRS adopts good practice in recording data as missing when there is some doubt about a data point. But this means that some fluctuations can be illusions: trend lines can drop for a given year when there is missing data and some National Societies are excluded from the total and then appear again in another year. So it is necessary to do something about those missing values. The approach followed in this subsection is to replace them with estimates – scores from other years. This approach is described in more detail here.

For every combination of one National Society and one main indicator:

- If a value is missing for a particular year, but there is at least one non-missing value in a later or an earlier year, replace the missing value:
  - option 1: looking at the years after this one, take the earliest non-missing value (if there is one)
  - option 2: looking at the years before this one, take the latest non-missing value (if there is one)
  - if both option 1 and option 2 result in a number, take the lowest of the two
  - if just one of option 1 and option 2 result in a number, take that one.
- If there is more than one missing value in the series of years for a particular combination of indicator and National Society, repeat this procedure for the other missing years too.
- If all the values for every year between 2012 and 2017 are missing, ignore this National Society for this indicator.

Example: Indicator for number of local units, Nolandia® National Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing values are replaced like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Indicator for number of paid staff, Nolandia National Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing values are replaced like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers of people reached in 2017 according to thematic area of programming

Since 2016, additional indicators are gathered on people reached by programming in different thematic areas. The results for 2017 are presented in Figure 8.

National Societies are also asked to provide additional figures for the even larger numbers of people reached indirectly. However, this data is not yet comprehensive and is inherently less reliable, so is not shown in the figure.

What we can learn from Figure 8:

- National Societies make enormous contributions to people’s health all over the world, with nearly 102 million people reached directly.
- Health dominates National Society programming numerically, especially in Asia Pacific.
- Europe and Central Asia have substantial programming in livelihoods, and also in social inclusion and building a culture of non-violence and peace.
- Cash transfer programming is directly reaching around three million people as reported by 141 National Societies.

9 This name is fictitious.

10 This figure is substantially lower than for 2016, but almost entirely because in that year, one programme in one country addressed a great number of people.
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Figure 8: Numbers of people reached by programming in different thematic areas, 2017. Numbers cannot be added up column-wise because this would lead to possible double counting (one person might receive/participate in more than one programme or service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Americas</th>
<th>Asia Pacific</th>
<th>Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Middle East and North Africa</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>6,635,262</td>
<td>207,489</td>
<td>2,414,118</td>
<td>2,019,098</td>
<td>4,629,087</td>
<td>15,905,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion</td>
<td>1,201,199</td>
<td>161,599</td>
<td>5,770,871</td>
<td>2,631,773</td>
<td>1,172,880</td>
<td>10,938,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>167,204</td>
<td>1,862,273</td>
<td>557,149</td>
<td>51,933</td>
<td>6,615,475</td>
<td>9,254,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>2,299,232</td>
<td>233,028</td>
<td>521,134</td>
<td>409,384</td>
<td>137,298</td>
<td>3,600,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>1,037,040</td>
<td>372,347</td>
<td>581,614</td>
<td>4,805,713</td>
<td>6,932,932</td>
<td>13,729,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22,717,615</td>
<td>13,521,406</td>
<td>42,904,689</td>
<td>6,935,605</td>
<td>16,887,360</td>
<td>102,966,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>2,844,652</td>
<td>2,612,685</td>
<td>3,140,120</td>
<td>1,319,092</td>
<td>2,673,540</td>
<td>12,590,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Transfer Programming</td>
<td>332,239</td>
<td>380,115</td>
<td>230,854</td>
<td>1,887,280</td>
<td>147,506</td>
<td>2,977,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 3: Cash transfer programming with the Lebanese Red Cross

The Lebanese Red Cross, together with the British and German Red Cross, has been implementing a successful E-voucher project using Red Rose’s Cash Payment Solutions technology in Saida to provide hygiene items in informal tented settlements to 500 Syrian refugee households. The project participants met criteria for having basic hygiene needs. They appreciated the approach of the project as there were no predetermined criteria to spend the money: participants were free to choose what they needed. One participant said “I was going to take my child out of school because I could not afford the cost of transport. With the E-voucher project, I am able to keep him in school as other expenses are taken care of with the support of the Red Cross”. The Lebanese Red Cross’ procurement and finance teams worked together to create and adapt procedures to deliver the project. The National Society was also satisfied with the intervention because it supported local markets and businesses, making hygiene products more accessible to populations in need. This project is a successful example of a National Society building its capacity in partnership with other Movement partners to develop cash preparedness.

Lebanese Red Cross – Cash Transfer Programming

Photo credit: Lebanese Red Cross, Cash Hub

Radice, for the Lebanese Red Cross Society (2018).
Indicators for people, disaggregated by age

The FDRS team is now asking National Societies to disaggregate all the indicators for people by age. Table 1 shows the numbers of National Societies which submitted age-disaggregated data in 2017.

Disaggregating by age as well as sex is a lot of work, so in this subsection we provide some first examples of how valuable this kind of disaggregation can be.

| Table 1: Numbers of National Societies providing age-disaggregated indicators in each region, 2017 |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Governing Board                                   | Africa                                            | Americas                                         | Asia Pacific                     | Europe and Central Asia          | Middle East and North Africa    |
| People Volunteering their Time                    | 45                                                | 34                                               | 36                               | 51                               | 16                              |
| Paid Staff                                         | 27                                                | 17                                               | 17                               | 20                               | 7                               |
| People Donating Blood                             | 30                                                | 21                                               | 18                               | 30                               | 10                              |
| People Trained in First Aid                       | 30                                                | 24                                               | 7                                | 27                               | 9                               |
| People Reached by Cash Transfer Programming       | 22                                                | 16                                               | 13                               | 13                               | 5                               |
| People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes | 31                                                | 18                                               | 4                                | 20                               | 5                               |
| People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes | 19                                                | 16                                               | 6                                | 17                               | 4                               |
| People Reached by Disaster Risk Reduction         | 17                                                | 17                                               | 7                                | 10                               | 3                               |
| People Reached by Shelter                         | 24                                                | 18                                               | 7                                | 17                               | 4                               |
| People Reached by Livelihood                      | 26                                                | 18                                               | 7                                | 20                               | 8                               |
| People Reached by Health                          | 23                                                | 17                                               | 4                                | 18                               | 8                               |
| People Reached by WASH                            | 18                                                | 16                                               | 8                                | 11                               | 5                               |
| People Reached by Migration                        | 22                                                | 14                                               | 7                                | 19                               | 6                               |
| People Reached by Social Inclusion                | 23                                                | 17                                               | 5                                | 13                               | 9                               |
| People Reached by WASH                            | 23                                                | 17                                               | 7                                | 13                               | 6                               |
Figure 9 shows the typical age profiles of people reached for the two programme areas, disaster response and early recovery, and long-term services and development programmes. Here are some highlights:

- **Dangerous interpretations**
  
  Beware! One of these interpretations is dangerous (the others are correct):

  1. In Europe and Central Asia, proportionally more older people are reached with long-term services than in other regions, whereas in the Americas, numbers drop off quickly after the age of 30 and the largest proportion are under 18.
  2. More people in the 18–29 age group are reached in the Middle East and North Africa region for both disaster response and early recovery and long-term services than in any other region.
  3. In Africa, as many as 20% of the people reached with programming for disaster response and early recovery are under 18.
  4. In the Middle East and North Africa, the dominant age group is 18–29 for both disaster response and early recovery and long-term services.

---

Note: The age category 0-5 was not included in these figures for easier comparability with other age-disaggregated indicators.
• People in the 18–29 age group donate the most blood in all regions; donations drop steadily after this age in all regions, although donations recover again in the 50–59 age group in Europe and Central Asia.
• The only regions with some blood donors under 18 are Asia Pacific and Europe and Central Asia.
• The ages at which people are trained in first aid differ markedly between regions. In the Middle East and North Africa, over 10% of people trained are under 13, whereas in Africa nearly all trainees are over 18 and the age group which receives the most training is 30–39.

Chapter 5 looks once more at disaggregated data, this time focusing on disaggregation by sex.

**Figure 10:** Typical age profile for people donating blood and people trained in first aid, 2017. These profiles show the typical, average age profile across the National Societies in each region. Numbers may not add to 100% because of missing data.
Sources of National Society income

In 2016, National Societies started to report more information about their sources of income. This is useful to get a picture of the different ways in which National Societies finance their activities.

Different sources of income vary widely between National Societies and even within regions. One National Society might have almost exclusively one source of income, while its neighbour has a variety of different sources. For this reason, analysing the sources region by region is not helpful. Instead, we have divided National Societies across the globe into income bands with roughly equal numbers of National Societies in each band. These are the rows in Figure 11.

- Home government is an important source of income in each income band.
- Income from the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement (IFRC, International Committee of the Red Cross and other National Societies) is of similar importance in all income bands except the highest.
- The National Societies in the lowest income band together receive over a quarter of their income from the UN. This source of income is not larger than 8% for the other income bands.
- Except those in the lowest income band, National Societies receive quite significant income from services (e.g. running hospitals).
- In the highest income band, service income is by far the largest source of income. This is mainly due to the Japanese Red Cross Society, whose service income reached nearly 11 billion Swiss Francs (these figures are regional averages and so this large number has a strong effect).
- Income-generating activity (e.g. running retail shops) provides between 5 and 12% of income in all income bands.

Figure 11: Sources of income for different National Society income bands, 2017. The National Societies are sorted into eight bands according to their total income. The numbers in each row are the average percentages, for that income band, of income received from different sources (CHF = Swiss francs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>&lt;350,000 CHF</th>
<th>350,000 -1 million CHF</th>
<th>1-2 million CHF</th>
<th>2-4 million CHF</th>
<th>4-9 million CHF</th>
<th>9-40 million CHF</th>
<th>40-250 million CHF</th>
<th>&gt;250 million CHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of National Societies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Government</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Government</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Income</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Generating Activity</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>25.12</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12 presents the most important of the various sources of income for each National Society on a map.

Each National Society is unique in the way it funds its activities; but some patterns emerge across regions.

- Funding from home governments is most important in many countries in Europe and Central Asia.
- In Africa and in Asia Pacific, the Movement is frequently the most important source.
- In the Americas, the most important source differs from country to country, but service income and income-generating activity are the most frequent.
The National Society social network

The FDRS dataset contains a wealth of data that can be used to investigate and present National Society activities across the world, beyond the simple maps provided in the web application. For example, each National Society is asked to list the other National Societies which provided support to it (whether financial, technical or human), and to which it provided support, during the previous year. This allows us to look at the support links between National Societies, capturing both givers and receivers of support. There are close to 700 such links, giving evidence of the extraordinary depth of the support network between National Societies across the world.

In Figure 13, we visualise them on a map. There are other ways to look at these links, for example as a kind of social network between National Societies. Figure 14 presents the same data using software for analysing social networks. This procedure tries to do two things. First, it places National Societies together which belong together in terms of support links. Second, it tries to position those with more giving links at the bottom and more receiving links at the top. The final placements are a compromise between these two principles. The names of those countries whose National Societies have less than seven links are not shown. The results are quite striking.

- Asia Pacific (blue), on the right of the diagram, is largely a world to itself, except for Nepal, which receives links from different National Societies right across the world.
- Australia and New Zealand concentrate more narrowly on the National Societies closer to them.
- China, Japan and South Korea at the bottom give assistance not only in Asia Pacific but also more globally.
- Japan and South Korea, like Canada, have exclusively giving links and no receiving links.
- Of the countries in Europe and Central Asia, Spain stands out as having strong connections to countries in the Americas.
Figure 13: Map of National Society support network, 2017. The sizes of the circles representing each National Society are proportional to the number of other National Societies which that National Society supports. The lines are coloured according to the sending region.
**Figure 14:** Support links between National Societies, visualised as a social network, 2017. Support flows upwards. Larger text means more links (incoming and outgoing).
3. Data quality matters: Launching the FDRS Quality of Data Index
Why a Quality of Data Index?

In this edition of *Everyone Counts*, we are proud to launch the new FDRS Quality of Data Index. The index gives us an objective way to:

- compare the quality and completeness of each National Society’s data between National Societies and from year to year
- identify where certain National Societies might need more support and capacity development, within and across regions
- measure progress on capacity development for data collection across National Societies and regions
- provide extra motivation for National Societies to go the extra mile in improving data quality
- identify specific areas in which FDRS procedures could be improved
- base programmatic decisions on the best evidence, by giving a stronger weight to data from National Societies with the highest quality of data score
- identify National Societies with strong data collection capacity to participate in future programmatic activities involving data collection.

How the index is constructed

The index gives a single number (0–100) for the data quality provided by each National Society in each year. This number is the total of scores on several components, plus a correction for country-specific conditions. Details of the index are given in Appendix 3.

1. Components

**Number of main indicators**
Purpose: To measure the completeness of all the main indicators (see page 91).

**Age/sex/disability disaggregation**
Purpose: To measure the extent to which the five indicators for people 

**People reached completeness**
Purpose: To measure completeness of the people reached indicators reported by National Societies.

**Documents**
Purpose: To measure how many of the key documents required by the FDRS have been submitted.

**Time to respond**
Purpose: To measure timely reporting from National Societies. It is given a small weight (5%), because it is not meant to encourage faster reporting at the expense of higher quality reporting.

**FDRS Focal Point**
Purpose: To record whether the National Society has appointed a dedicated FDRS Focal Point, with the aim of encouraging institutional knowledge on FDRS processes and supporting consistent data collection in each National Society over time.

---

13 Number of people volunteering, Paid Staff, number of people donating blood, number of people trained in first aid, and number of people reached.
2. Correction for country-specific conditions

Purpose: to correct for the country-specific conditions that may make it more difficult to collect data. This adds a fixed amount which reflects difficulty of communications in the country in which the National Society operates. We use World Bank data on the number of mobile phone subscriptions per 100 people as a proxy indicator for the difficulty of collecting data in different conditions.

Table 2: Summary of Quality of Data Index Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of main indicators</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>FDRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/sex/disability disaggregation</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>FDRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People reached completeness</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>FDRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>FDRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to respond</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>FDRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDRS Focal Point</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>FDRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction for country-specific conditions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>World Bank(^{14})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the scores on the Quality of Data Index in 2017, and have they improved since 2016?

Even though the index was only launched in 2019, it is possible to reconstruct quality of data scores for 2016 as well, which allows us to look at how data quality has changed over the past couple of years\(^{15}\).

- Scores have been quite similar across regions overall, with the highest scores in Europe and Central Asia.
- The Middle East and North Africa has improved substantially since 2016.
- Data quality has dropped in the other regions, most substantially in the Americas.

![Figure 15: Quality of data scores in 2016 and 2017, averaged over all National Societies in each region. Only National Societies with valid scores in both years are included.]

During the past two years, Jordan Red Crescent has focused on upholding accountability and transparency across its programmes. To the Jordan Red Crescent, the FDRS provided a key motivation to identify data collection standardisation as a priority in line with the general directives from the leadership. The disaggregated data has helped us to improve our reporting standards to meet the ones supported by the FDRS and therefore it has helped us improve our reporting quality overall.

Rania Suafian, Head of Organizational Development, Jordan Red Crescent

---

\(^{14}\) World Bank Indicators (2019). Mobile Cellular Subscriptions (per 100 people).

\(^{15}\) Because data on disability disaggregation was first collected in 2017, the corresponding quality of data score was set to 0 for 2016. This means that the theoretical maximum for the whole index in 2016 was only 95 (compared with a theoretical maximum of 100 in 2017, and assuming a maximum of 5 on the correction for country-specific conditions).
Overall the distribution of scores is quite stable, but there is a fall in the number of National Societies with very high scores.

The main source of the improvement in the Middle East and North Africa is on the sub-scores for people reached indicators.

For three of the regions, lack of documents combined with a lower number of main indicators reported is the source of the biggest drop in 2016 and 2017.
Box 4: The FDRS team asked Kuwait Red Crescent Society

The FDRS team asked Kuwait Red Crescent Society to tell us what they did to improve data collection and reporting quality in the past year.

Answer: A strong commitment by management was taken to develop and adapt our existing reporting systems to FDRS standards to be able to showcase the data from our efforts on the national level rather than focus only on international efforts in relief and emergency.

We used the previous year’s FDRS modules to try to identify gaps in our reporting system for local activities in an attempt to capture a clearer image of the reality of the efforts made and the impact achieved on the ground. Kuwait Red Crescent Society has a strong auxiliary role as the only civil society represented in the national civil defense emergency cluster, in partnership with civil defense teams in emergency and relief inside of Kuwait. We also implement integrated programs in the fields of community services through youth and volunteering, first aid training, medical services and humanitarian assistance and education.

These are the main factors driving our commitment to improving our data collection systems:
- A higher level of community engagement and accountability which led to an increase in the numbers of people reached
- A strong vision to remain relevant and increase transparency and accountability towards the people we serve
- More cohesion by using standardized data collection processes
- Enhanced program reporting to ensure global positioning and influence

Conclusion

- The Quality of Data Index will be a useful way for National Societies and the FDRS team to track progress and isolate difficulties over time.
- Improvements in data quality in the Middle East and North Africa, thanks to dedicated work from the National Societies and the regional office, will help ensure National Societies in the region can participate in the benefits of reliable FDRS data.
- The biggest challenge for National Societies seems to be to provide up-to-date documents each year, as this can be tied to a cycle which does not coincide with the FDRS annual data cycle.
4. Disaggregating data according to disability

Disaggregating data, for example disaggregating the number of people reached by sex and age, is useful for many reasons (see Chapter 5). National Societies globally collect disaggregated data, and many of the indicators they send to the FDRS are likewise disaggregated. On disability, the FDRS has started to collect metadata about whether National Societies record data disaggregated by disability, without yet collecting the disaggregated data itself. This chapter looks at the challenge and the results.
Why should we do it?

FOLLOWING THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

The Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement are an expression of its values and practices, and they guide everyone in the Movement. All programmes and activities need to be aligned with the fundamental principles, including Impartiality, which states that National Societies provide humanitarian support without discrimination. To ensure that we uphold these principles, our Movement resources and the numbers of people reached must be recorded and reported appropriately to ensure there is transparency and accountability to affected people and to verify that we are not discriminating against, or denying services to, groups who need humanitarian support. FDRS data disaggregation responds to these demands.

In 2015, the Council of Delegates of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement adopted the Strategic Framework on Disability Inclusion. It is recommended that all components of the Movement report their progress and achievements in ways outlined by the strategic framework.

DESIGNING MORE INCLUSIVE PROGRAMMING

Disability-disaggregated data enables us to better respond to the needs of persons with disabilities and design appropriate programmes – above all when designing general programming as well as programmes which are specifically aimed at persons with disabilities.

RESPONDING IN CRISSES

Persons with disabilities are not inherently vulnerable to disasters. There are a range of levels of vulnerability as well as capabilities.

“Indeed, there is considerable evidence of persons with disabilities acting as an important resource for their families and communities, particularly during times of crisis. There are, however, factors associated with disability that can increase vulnerability to the impact of disasters and other crises. Reduced mobility, diminished employment opportunities, chronic health conditions, discrimination and other factors may put persons with disabilities more at risk during times of crisis.” – World Disasters Report, 2018.

Identifying and mitigating the vulnerabilities experienced by persons with disabilities is part of an essential and inclusive response effort. However, humanitarian actors often do not have enough information even on how many persons with disabilities are affected in a given crisis. They are described in the World Disasters Report 2018 as “people out of the loop”: people we unintentionally exclude. There is a shared need for appropriate tools to collect disability data across the humanitarian sector.

The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities adopted by the UN in 2006, mentions humanitarian response in emergencies. When state parties are not able to take over their responsibilities in case of humanitarian emergencies, it is the duty of National Societies to take over this responsibility and ensure the protection and safety of persons with disabilities. Each National Society operates in its own national context, and the ratification of the convention by the state can have an impact on how National Societies collect disability-disaggregated data.

---

16 IFRC (2015).
19 ibid, Article 11.
Box 5: National Societies help the FDRS team understand some of the difficulties of collecting disaggregated data

The FDRS team members have two-way communication with National Societies and are always on the lookout to support National Societies in good data collection and reporting. The team also promotes how having disaggregated data can benefit the National Societies and the people they help. In 2017 the FDRS team visited eight National Societies in Asia Pacific to understand their views and issues around collecting and reporting data on sex, age and disability.

There were face-to-face meetings, video conferences and a one-day workshop with one of the National Societies. These were held with various departments at headquarters level, local level and with sister National Societies such as the American Red Cross, Australian Red Cross, Danish Red Cross and Swedish Red Cross, which support this work in the region.

The National Societies provided important examples of challenges they face in counting people. These insights were then integrated into the Technical Note on Counting People Reached. Their feedback has helped in the expansion of the FDRS indicators including the age and disability components and also in creating new communication and training material around disaggregation including a video.

What are some of the challenges of collecting disability-disaggregated data?

Some National Societies have told the FDRS team: “look, collecting data disaggregated by disability is hard”. For example:

- Disability, especially mental health disability, is a more sensitive topic to ask people about than their age and sex.
- There are many different types of disability with no clear categories.
- Common definitions are a work in progress.

- Different kinds of communication can present different kinds of challenges in collecting the data. For example, collecting data from and about people who are blind is a different kind of communication challenge for a National Society compared to collecting data from people with learning difficulties.

The question which guides this chapter is: collecting data disaggregated by disability is surely important, but is it worth the extra effort? The first part of the chapter puts this doubt into context, and the second part tries to answer it through two case studies which highlight some benefits and some of the problems.

How should National Societies collect data disaggregated by disability?

One solution is to use the questions suggested by the Washington Group on Disability Statistics.

The Washington Group questions are a tool to collect internationally comparable disability statistics, and to help actors better identify persons with disabilities. Because the word “disability” is not well understood, asking “do you have a disability” leads to underreporting. The Washington Group Questions ask instead about difficulties in doing some everyday activities. A study conducted by Humanity & Inclusion about the use of the Washington Group questions by the humanitarian sector demonstrated that the Washington Group questions can successfully identify the prevalence of disability and can help to design inclusive programming.

There are three different sets of questions:

- short set of disability questions
- extended set of disability questions
- child functioning set of questions.

IFRC (2018, October). Sex Age Disability Disaggregated Data. [Video File].

However, although a lot of work has been done to make the questions easy to use, National Societies still need to invest time and effort to adopt them. It requires raising awareness and training volunteers and staff, as well as adapting data collection systems and more.

How the FDRS captures the use of data disaggregated by disability

For the 2017 FDRS data collection (which took place in 2018), to understand to what extent National Societies are serving the diverse needs of their communities, two questions on disability were introduced for each indicator related to people:

- Is your National Society capturing disaggregated data based on disability for this indicator, i.e. the number of persons with disabilities? (Yes or No)
- If you answered yes, is your disability-disaggregated data in accordance with the Washington Group questions? (Yes or No)

The 14 indicators related to people are ten indicators for people reached, and four more. This data on the use of disability-disaggregated indicators is reported by the National Society on whose national territory the activities are conducted, not for example by a sister National Society from another country which might also be involved (see point 8 in the section Limitations and things to consider when using and interpreting FDRS data in Chapter 1).
How well are we doing?

OVERALL

After this first year of collecting information on data disaggregated by disability, how are we doing?

Globally, 42 National Societies disaggregate at least some indicators by disability. Of these, ten use the Washington Group questions.

Figures 19 summarises whether National Societies disaggregate any data by disability, but it does not tell us how many indicators are involved. Figure 20 answers that question.

A closer look shows that the more indicators a National Society disaggregates by sex and age, the more indicators it disaggregates by disability. This may be because having disaggregation systems in place makes it easier to collect another type of disaggregation.

Figure 19: Number of National Societies disaggregating data by disability, and using the Washington Group questions for at least one indicator, 2017
Dangerous interpretations

One of these interpretations is dangerous!

1. At least ten National Societies (those with red bars) disaggregate data for at least one indicator using the Washington Group questions.
2. National Societies which do not appear on this list do not disaggregate any data according to disability.
3. The Samoa Red Cross Society and the Nepal Red Cross Society are the two National Societies which disaggregate data by disability on the largest number of indicators.
4. The National Societies in Africa and Asia Pacific which do collect some data disaggregated by disability, collect on average a larger number of such indicators than in the Americas, Europe and Central Asia or Middle East and Central Asia.
5. Those National Societies which use the Washington Group questions tend to be those which disaggregate a larger number of indicators: none of the 17 National Societies which report only one indicator disaggregated by disability is using the Washington Group questions.

Solution to dangerous interpretation 2 is incorrect. It is possible that for a given indicator like the number of people, some local units for some projects do record this information, but not all do. It is possible for a given National Society to disaggregate indicator X by a number of categories but only in some of its projects. And so at the national level the answer for whether this indicator is disability disaggregated is no. It is also possible that a National Society simply did not reply to this question to the FDRS, so this meta-data is missing. Or, it could be that the National Society collects a lot of data disaggregated by disability but not indicators covered by the FDRS.
Figure 21: Number of National Societies disaggregating data by disability on indicators for people volunteering, paid staff, people donating blood and people trained in first aid, by region, 2017

- **Paid Staff** is the indicator disaggregated by the largest number of National Societies, maybe because it is easiest to do. It is particularly frequently recorded in Asia Pacific.
- Data on people donating blood is rarely broken down by disability.
- Globally, each indicator is disaggregated by at least some National Societies.

Figure 22: Number of National Societies disaggregating data by disability on the ten people reached indicators, by region, 2017

- **People reached by long-term services** is disaggregated by more National Societies than people reached by **disaster response programmes**. This might be because it is easier to set up a proper and comprehensive data collection system for long-term services than in emergency response.
- Every indicator is disaggregated by at least one National Society.
- **People reached by migration programmes** and **people donating blood** are the indicators which are disaggregated by the smallest number of National Societies.
- The indicator on **people reached by health programmes** is the one disaggregated by the most National Societies, especially in Africa. This could be due to the nature of the service. It is followed by **social inclusion programmes** and **livelihoods**.

**WHICH INDICATORS ARE DISABILITY DISAGGREGATED BY THE MOST NATIONAL SOCIETIES, AND HOW DOES THIS DIFFER ACROSS REGIONS?**

- **Paid Staff** is the indicator disaggregated by the largest number of National Societies, maybe because it is easiest to do. It is particularly frequently recorded in Asia Pacific.
- Data on people donating blood is rarely broken down by disability.
- Globally, each indicator is disaggregated by at least some National Societies.
Table 3: Top 2 indicators per region (most frequently disaggregated by disability) compared with top 3 thematic areas per region (largest totals of people reached), 2017. WASH = water, sanitation and hygiene promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Top 2 indicators per region (most frequently disaggregated by disability)</th>
<th>Top 3 thematic areas per region (largest totals of people reached)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Health, WASH</td>
<td>Health, WASH, disaster risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Health, cash transfer programming</td>
<td>Health, disaster risk reduction, shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
<td>Disaster risk reduction, social inclusion</td>
<td>Health, social inclusion, disaster risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Livelihoods, social inclusion</td>
<td>Health, livelihoods, social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>Shelter, livelihoods</td>
<td>Health, WASH, livelihoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 suggests a reason for the regional patterns revealed in Figure 23: National Societies are more likely to record data disaggregated by disability in thematic areas which are also the most important in their region (measured by the total numbers of people reached). For all regions, either one or both of the indicators which are most frequently disaggregated are for one of the biggest three thematic areas. This could be because bigger programmes mean better logistics and capacity to collect data.

Successes and challenges in collecting data disaggregated by disability: case studies from Guinea Red Cross and Nepal Red Cross

Guinea Red Cross and Nepal Red Cross Society were highlighted as two National Societies which record a particularly large number of indicators disaggregated by disability. They provided additional information to the FDRS team to help illustrate the benefits and challenges of this work.

SOME SUCCESSES

Both National Societies have substantial programmes designed to identify and support persons with disabilities. For example, Guinea Red Cross volunteers conducted an analysis to try to understand what the needs of persons with disabilities are. They found that beyond the impairment, it is mainly the context and barriers to access the few existing services that tend to make persons with disabilities particularly vulnerable. On the basis of this study they identified a number of assessment questions that are adapted to the realities of life as a person with disability in Guinea and to the capabilities and strengths of the Guinea Red Cross. They have been conducting annual assessments since 2010; these help persons with disabilities to be included in specific programmes.

In 2016, Nepal Red Cross Society, in partnership with the Danish Red Cross and Hong Kong Red Cross, conducted a comprehensive needs assessment in Tanahun and Lamjung districts, which included collecting and analysing sex- and disability-disaggregated data on persons with disabilities. This data has informed the selection of people for training and livelihoods activities in the Disability Inclusion pilot project. District focal points provide detailed reports on the numbers of persons with disabilities participating in meetings and training sessions, disaggregated by sex and type of disability, to Nepal Red Cross Society and Danish Red Cross colleagues in Kathmandu who are responsible for higher levels of reporting. The National Society’s disability data system is well aligned with the Government of Nepal’s system, which makes it more compatible and facilitates access to government assistance and benefits for persons with disabilities.

Nepal, Lalitpur district, Jawalakhel. 06 June 2015. Red Cross staff discuss with members of the Independent Living Center for People with Disabilities who are staying in the Jawalakhel camp to identify their needs and conditions. After the earthquake that destroyed their homes, over 50 disabled individuals from different parts of Nepal have come to stay in makeshift tents in the football field of Jawalakhel, Lalitpur district.

Photo credit: Ly Nguyen/IFRC
SOME CHALLENGES

The Nepal Red Cross Society reports that the number of households of persons with disabilities reached with activities, and their type of disability, are referenced in reports, but this is not disaggregated by age or sex – illustrating that it can be quite a challenge to disaggregate by age, sex and disability simultaneously. Both National Societies mentioned that data which is disaggregated by disability at field level does not always stay disaggregated at higher levels of reporting. Review of reports also showed that finding the right government classifications of types of disability can be a challenge: different government classifications may be in use in different kinds of programming. Focus group discussions in Nepal also highlighted that there is still some confusion among the self-help group members about these different government classifications.

Both National Societies told us that while they use data disaggregated by disability to identify people to include in existing programming, it is still difficult to use this data at the programme design stage to ensure well-adapted programs.

Finally, both National Societies are aware of the need to extend data disaggregation by disability beyond disability-specific programming into general programming – a bigger step but one which they believe would bring further benefits.

Conclusion

The FDRS does not (yet) collect data disaggregated by disability, only the metadata about whether National Societies do. Collecting this metadata is a new achievement for the FDRS and for 42 National Societies across the globe, many of which are not from high-income countries. Looking more closely at the metadata shows that National Societies are more likely to disaggregate by disability in their larger programmes and if they already have experience with disaggregation. The case studies point to some benefits of implementing disaggregation by disability but also some important challenges in rolling it out across National Society data gathering and in making wider use of it.

Should the FDRS take this next step of requiring the people indicators which National Societies submit to be disaggregated by disability as well as age and sex? The FDRS team (fdrs@ifrc.org) would like to hear your comments.
5. Inequality in reach and relevance? The percentage of women in the IFRC network, and among the people we reach, and the links between the numbers
This issue was raised by the Red Cross Red Crescent Magazine of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement nearly 30 years ago. What has happened since then? Are women engaged in our governance, activities and reach? Are they taking the lead in decision-making?

Collecting and analysing data that gives us information about balance in representation and the diversity of our workforce is complex and has many layers. One problem is the categories we use to collect the data: “sex” or “gender”? Do we need other words apart from “male” and “female”? "Sex" or “gender"? This chapter looks at FDRS data on people collected according to the categories “male” and “female”, with a third option of “other/not given”. What should we call this category? National Societies already use different distinctions for collecting sex-disaggregated data (some might have a category “sex”, others might have a category “gender” or something else) so consolidated FDRS data unfortunately must mix these very different concepts. In English, “sex” refers to biological distinctions, whereas “gender” concerns roles and identity: social constructs. In this report, and in the actual FDRS questionnaire, we use the word “sex” to keep things simple, but we should remain aware that this is mixing together at least two different categories.

“Female”, “male” and ....? Neither sex nor gender are binary values. Biologically there are more human sexes than males and females and many cultures have more genders than “men” and “women”. The FDRS provides a third category “other/not given”. Most National societies only collect data for the two categories “male” and female”, but some use this third option too. But even this single third option is not ideal to reflect all the different individuals we represent or the diversity we want to see. Not given has a different meaning than other and perhaps it is time to ask how we could revise sex-disaggregation options to be more relevant and inclusive.

Even allowing for these limitations, the data provides some striking information about inequality in our organisation.

This chapter looks at two questions about the percentages of women across National Societies and the secretariat.

**Question 1: Staff and governance: Are we ahead of the curve or behind it?**

We ask what is the percentage of women in governance and staff in National Societies and the IFRC secretariat and how does this compare with similar organisations?

**Question 2: Are we reaching enough women?**

We ask what is the percentage of women among the people we reach? What can we say about these percentages given what we know about the specific vulnerabilities of women in different contexts and given our mandate?
Question 1: Percentages of women in staff and governance of the IFRC network: Are we ahead of the curve or behind it?

Why do percentages of women (in our governance, staff, volunteers and people reached) matter?

FIRST, WE HAVE AN INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT.

The IFRC Strategic Framework on Gender and Diversity Issues, which is aligned with Strategy 2020 and with the 1999 Gender Policy, represents the institutional commitment of the IFRC to “provide specific, strategic direction to the IFRC to ensure that its actions are non-discriminatory towards people of all ages and to promote gender equality and respect for diversity throughout all of its work. The strategic framework applies to the IFRC secretariat and all Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies.” Improving the gender and diversity composition at all levels of IFRC (governance, management, staff and volunteers) is the second main outcome in the strategic framework.

SECOND, THERE ARE STRONG REASONS FOR THIS COMMITMENT.

One big caveat: in this report, we are only presenting the numbers. There is a lot more to gender equality, and to a fair, productive and happy organisation, than percentages of women. This discussion is beyond the scope of this report; our task here is simply to present to date the most comprehensive report of the percentages of women in our network and among the people we reach, to inform that deeper discussion.

Gender equality is critical for the ongoing progressive development of humanity – it is a fundamental human right... Gender inequality remains a global challenge; it negatively impacts human development and economic growth. It contributes to discrimination and exclusion from access to resources, public services, education, healthcare services and employment, and to gender-based violence. Gender inequality takes many forms and is rooted in unequal power relations.

Box 6: The FDRS team started collecting data

The power of sex-disaggregated data. In June 2018 the FDRS team started collecting data on the composition of the governing boards in National Societies. This was in response to a General Assembly decision taken in 2017. The aim was to analyse the gender imbalances in the top positions in all National Societies and across different regions. So now, thanks to the efforts of National Societies around the world actually doing the work of disaggregating their data, we can start to deliver on the promise of using the FDRS data to highlight this balance, or imbalance, within the organisation and its work.
The glass ceiling. In the next few pages we are particularly concerned with the so-called glass ceiling in management and governance: when there are fewer women in positions of more power in relation to lower-level positions. This trend is present in different sectors: civil service, politics, private sector and probably also in the humanitarian sector. **We want to know if there is a glass ceiling in the National Societies and the secretariat too.**

Why do glass ceilings matter to us? Is it just because we have a general commitment to gender equality? Or are there other reasons?

- **Efficiency:** Studies from industry and the public sector show that more diverse management boards have better general performance.

- **Cascade effect:** Different studies have shown the importance of having women as leaders because they can highly impact policies and practices in favour of gender inclusion. “Putting women in leadership positions is an effective way to promote gender parity in employment because female top managers may quickly modify cultural attitudes, unspoken and unconscious norms and the working procedures in favour of gender inclusion...”

However, glass ceilings can be complicated to understand. For example, an investigation at Médecins sans Frontières Holland found that “Women made the transition to management less rapidly than men, even when controlling for factors like age, previous work experience, and nationality. However, gender differences were completely explained by occupation.

Those employees in female-dominated occupations (in this case: medical personnel such as nurses) had a lower promotion to management rate than those in male-dominated occupations (in this case: non-medical personnel such as financial officers), irrespective of their gender.” It seems likely that this effect plays a role in National Societies and the secretariat too to some extent. This leaves open the question of how much any glass-ceiling effect at the IFRC can be understood as due to imbalances in the whole system – women being more frequently employed in occupations which have fewer opportunities for promotion – and/or as due to differential behaviour of or treatment of individuals.

**HOW MANY NATIONAL SOCIETIES HAVE A WOMAN AS PRESIDENT?**

- Just 21% of the 184 National Societies that reported this information to the FDRS have a female president.
- None of the regions has over 30% of National Societies with women presidents; the highest is the Americas with almost 29%.
- On the other hand, the Middle East and North Africa has 12.5% of National Societies with female presidents.

**Figure 23:** Percentage of National Societies with a woman as president, 2017. Overall (left) and by region (right)

---

**Notes:**

30 Most National Societies provided gender-disaggregation on most of the indicators in this section, as follows. Sex of president: 184 (96%); Sex of secretary general: 176 (92%); Percentage of women on governing board: 180 (94%); Percentage of women among paid staff: 135 (71%); Percentage of women and girls among people volunteering: 116 (61%).


34 ISPI (2012).

HOW MANY NATIONAL SOCIETIES HAVE A WOMAN AS SECRETARY GENERAL?

- 31% of the 176 National Societies which reported this data to the FDRS have a woman occupying the post of secretary general.
- The share of women and men is more balanced in the secretary general position than among presidents, especially in the Americas and in Europe and Central Asia.
- In the Middle East and North Africa region, there are only two female secretaries general in all 16 reporting National Societies.

**Figure 24:** Percentage of National Societies with a woman as Secretary General, 2017. Overall (left) and by region (right)

HOW MANY NATIONAL SOCIETIES HAVE WOMEN AS PRESIDENT AND/OR SECRETARY GENERAL?

The president and the secretary general play different and complementary roles in a National Society, but these roles may also differ between National Societies. It is not possible to say which is more important. We need to consider both roles, as in Figure 25.

- Globally, just 5.9% of the 186 National Societies that reported this data to the FDRS have a woman occupying both positions.
- No region has more than 10% of its National Societies in which both president and secretary general are women. For example, in Asia Pacific 5.6% of the National Societies have both posts occupied by women. Yet in the same region 38.9% of the National Societies have at least one woman in one of these two positions.

**Figure 25:** Percentage of National Societies in which both president and secretary general are women, one of them is a woman, and none of them are women, 2017. Overall (left) and by region (right)
WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN ON NATIONAL SOCIETY GOVERNING BOARDS?

The average percentage of women on National Society governing boards is 31%. Regionally, Middle East and North Africa has the lowest share, with, on average, 13.7% female members. The Americas and Europe and Central Asia have the highest female participation with around 43% and 36% respectively.

1. Of the 180 National Societies that reported their governing board composition to the FDRS, 34 have 50% or more women.
2. Of the same 180 National Societies, 21 (11.7% of the total) have more than 50% women on their governing board; 7 (3.8%) have more than two-thirds.
3. Regionally, in Africa three National Societies out of 45 have 50% or more women on the governing board; in the Middle East and North Africa none do.
4. There are four National Societies (one each in Europe and Central Asia, Asia Pacific, the Americas and Africa) which have exactly 50% women on their governing boards.

Figure 26: Average percentage of women on the governing boards of National Societies, 2017. Overall percentage (left) and distribution of the percentages (right)

Figure 27: Percentage of women on governing boards by region, 2017. The bars show regional averages. Each dot represents a National Society. The dots are semi-transparent so darker dots indicate several National Societies with the same percentage of women. E.g. in Africa eight National Societies have 33.3% women on the governing board while just one has 30% of women on the governing board; this is why the corresponding dot is more transparent.
Figure 28: Map of National Societies showing percentages of governing board members who are women, 2017 (short form country names are used for visualization purposes)
Figure 29: Average percentage of women among paid staff of National Societies, 2017. Overall percentages (left) and distribution of the percentages (right).

Figure 30: Percentages of women among paid staff by region, 2017. The bars show regional averages. Each dot represents a National Society. The dots are semi-transparent so darker dots indicate several National Societies with the same percentage of women.

**WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN AMONG THE PAID STAFF AND VOLUNTEERS OF NATIONAL SOCIETIES?**

- 40 National Societies have between 40% and 60% women among their paid staff.

- The percentage of women among paid staff is almost exactly 50% on average.

- The percentage varies strongly from country to country.

- There are even three National Societies with 100% women staff.

- The Americas and Europe and Central Asia have around 60% women.

- Although the averages for the Middle East and North Africa and Africa are low, there are some National Societies in those regions with over 50% female paid staff.
• The percentage of volunteers who are women and girls differs quite widely but is most frequently between 50 and 60%.

Figure 31: Average percentage of women among volunteers of National Societies, 2017. Overall percentages (left) and distribution of the percentages (right)

SEX VOLUNTEERS

48% Male

52% Female

Figure 32: Percentage of volunteers who are women or girls by region, 2017. The bars show regional averages. Each dot represents a National Society. The dots are semi-transparent so darker dots indicate several National Societies with the same percentage of women.

• The range is not so extreme as with paid staff but there is still a lot of variation.
• No National Society has less than 20% of women and girls among its volunteers.
THE IFRC: WOMEN IN GOVERNANCE 2005–2017

Let’s have a look at the IFRC. This data comes from an internal database (and is partially available on the IFRC website) and covers a longer period than FDRS data does on the National Societies, which means we can have a look at how the numbers are evolving. Elections for IFRC governance positions happen every four years, most recently in 2017.

The IFRC governing board is made up of the president, five vice-presidents, the secretary general, 20 National Society representatives and three chairs of commission.

Table 4: Percentages of women at different levels in the governing board of the secretariat, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women on IFRC governing board</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman president</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman secretary general</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
<td>0 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women among National Society representatives</td>
<td>6 of 20</td>
<td>6 of 20</td>
<td>3 of 20</td>
<td>3 of 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women among vice-president representatives</td>
<td>0 of 5</td>
<td>2 of 5</td>
<td>1 of 5</td>
<td>1 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women among chairs of commissions</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of women on governing board</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women on governing board</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLASS CEILINGS? WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN IN DIFFERENT EMPLOYMENT GRADES AMONG SECRETARIAT PAID STAFF?

The IFRC secretariat has global offices in Geneva, New York, Brussels and Dubai; regional offices in Nairobi, Panama, Kuala Lumpur, Budapest and Beirut; and country offices all over the world employing 1,527 staff in 2017, 545 of whom are on IFRC contracts.

- From grade B to grade G, the percentages of women drop steadily as employment grade increases.
- Grades E and F are dominated by men, whereas grade B is dominated by women.
- Figure 34 shows how the percentages of women at different employment grades has changed since 2013.
- Except for grade D (and grade H, at which there are only five employees), the percentages of women have not changed much since 2013. Of course, rapid changes in these kinds of percentages cannot be expected except in situations when organisations are expanding or contracting rapidly, or there is a high rate of employee turnover.

Figure 33: Numbers and percentages of women at different levels of employment in the IFRC secretariat (global and regional offices) and on IFRC contracts, 2017. H is the highest grade, A the lowest

Figure 34: Average percentage of women at the different levels of the secretariat (global and regional offices), 2013-2017
Table 5 shows average percentages of women across National Societies compared with the secretariat in 2017. The figure of 45% for IFRC paid staff includes all IFRC national and international staff in global, regional and national offices. The results of this comparison might seem quite surprising to some.

- The average proportion of women among paid staff across all 179 National Societies reporting is 50.5%. This proportion is actually higher than among IFRC staff.
- Apart from the secretary general, the governing board of IFRC are representatives of National Societies, elected by National Societies. This means that National Societies are much more likely to elect men to the IFRC governing board than to their own governing boards.
- Overall, there is a bigger percentage of women in the governance structures of National Societies than in the secretariat.

Figure 35 looks at the percentages of women in different roles in National Societies, broken down by region.

- For all regions, women are less represented in the more powerful positions.
- In regions with more women in the highest positions of president and secretary general, the percentages of women on governing boards is also higher. The same is true for percentages of women among paid staff and volunteers.
- The percentages of women among volunteers are most similar across regions: they are between 45 and 57% everywhere.

However it is important to note that in some National Societies, some people who are paid staff or volunteers may also occupy positions of considerable power, for example being the director of a blood bank.
CONNECTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS: HOW ARE PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN IN NATIONAL SOCIETIES CONNECTED TO ONE ANOTHER, AND HOW MUCH ARE THEY DRIVEN BY THE GENDER SITUATION IN EACH COUNTRY?

The Global Gender Gap Index

To measure the status of women in each country, we used the Global Gender Gap Index, which measures different aspects of women’s status in society and ranks countries worldwide. It combines measures of women’s economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and political empowerment. Scores vary between 0.5 and 0.9; higher scores mean more gender equality. Data is available for 142 of the countries in our dataset.

Figure 36: Correlation between percentage of women among paid staff and the Gender Gap Index, 2017 (Each dot represents one National Society)

Figure 36 shows a predictable result: the higher the Global Gender Gap Index score (that is, the more gender equality in a given country), the higher the percentage of women among paid staff. This correlation is statistically significant. Similarly, the probabilities of having a woman president and/or secretary general are higher in countries with more gender equality.

Connections between percentages of women in top management – secretary general, president and governing board

The percentages of women in different National Society structures influence one another in quite concrete ways. Often, the governing board and president are elected by delegates and the secretary general is appointed by the president (who also may represent the governing board). But this is not the case for every National Society. There are any number of possible causal connections like these which might be driving the numbers; and those numbers may themselves be affected by other factors like access to education, reproductive health, cultural traditions in a country, and much more. So even when we think we see a certain relationship between the percentages we should be careful interpreting it, because several different causal explanations may be compatible with the same raw percentages.

Looking further into the data, what does it tell us?

Figure 37 looks at the percentage of women on the governing board according to the gender of the president and secretary general.

1. We divide all National Societies into two roughly equal groups – those in countries with less gender equality according to the Global Gender Gap Index (in the top half of the figure), and those with more (in the bottom half).
2. We again divide all National Societies into three columns – the largest group in which neither president nor secretary general is a woman (on the left), those where one is a woman (on the right), and those where both are women (on the right).
3. Finally, we divide them again into two roughly equal groups – those with more than a third women on the governing board (red) and less than a third (grey).

Also, president and secretary general are usually themselves members of the governing board, so a small part of the correlation between these percentages of women is necessary by definition.

The FDRS does not collect data on the gender of these delegates.

Dividing the countries up like this allows us to investigate the relationship between the sex of the president and secretary general and the percentage of women on the governing board while (partially) controlling for the effect of the gender situation in each country. This means the connections are less likely to be just spurious effects of the gender situation.
The figure shows the very strong links between having a woman president or secretary general, or both, and the percentage of women on the governing board, and how this differs in countries with more or less gender equality.

- First, not surprisingly, we can see there is much more red in the lower half, i.e. there are far more National Societies with above-average percentages of women on the governing board in the countries with more gender equality.
- The largest (grey) rectangle represents those National Societies in countries with low gender equality, where neither president nor secretary general is a woman and the governing board has less than a third women.
- But we can see that in all countries, having a woman as either president or secretary general is associated with also having more women on the governing board. The effect is strong in countries with higher gender equality but stronger in countries with lower gender equality, where all the few National Societies where both positions are occupied by women are red, i.e. also have above-average numbers of women on the governing board.

In other words, if you consider a National Society where at least one of the president and secretary general, or even both, are women, you can guess that the percentage of women on the governing board is likely to be much higher, and vice versa – especially in countries with lower gender equality. If you consider a National Society in a less gender-equal country where neither president nor secretary general are women, you can be certain that the percentage of women on the governing board is low too.

Going beyond gender connections in governance structures, we can also look at the connections between percentages of women among paid staff and among volunteers. Figure 38 explores this connection.

Is having more women among paid staff connected to having more women volunteers?

- There is a strong positive relationship between the percentage of women among paid staff and among volunteers, and vice versa, even when allowing for the level of gender equality in each country: both lines trend upwards (trailing off at higher scores) except for the few National Societies with a very high percentage of women among paid staff.
- The additional effect of gender equality is strong for most National Societies with a medium percentage of women among paid staff: in countries with high gender equality, the percentage of women among volunteers is considerably higher.

Figure 37: Percentage of women on governing boards by the sex of the president and the secretary general, 2017

Figure 38: Percentage of women among paid staff against the percentage of women among volunteers, 2017
HOW ARE WE DOING COMPARED WITH SIMILAR ORGANISATIONS?

Table 6: Percentages of women among National Society paid staff compared with the labour force and service industries, by region, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Middle East and North Africa</th>
<th>Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia Pacific</th>
<th>Americas</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of female National Society paid staff</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
<td>62.10%</td>
<td>37.60%</td>
<td>50.50%</td>
<td>59.60%</td>
<td>49.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force, female (% of total Labour force)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women among those employed in service industries</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In all regions except Africa the percentage of women among National Society paid staff is higher than in the national labour force and also higher than the percentage of women among those working in service industries.

Table 7: Percentages of National Societies with a woman president or secretary general compared with percentage of private sector and public sector organisations with a woman as top manager, by region, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Middle East and North Africa</th>
<th>Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia Pacific</th>
<th>Americas</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages of National Societies with a woman president</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages of National Societies with a woman secretary general</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>32.40%</td>
<td>43.80%</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of private sector firms with a woman as top manager</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
<td>25.82%</td>
<td>19.16%</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women in top positions in the public sector (civil service)</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>25.10%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>30.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In nearly all cases, the percentage of women among National Society presidents and secretaries general is higher than among private sector top managers.
- However, the comparison with the public sector is more complicated. In every region, the percentage of women among National Society presidents is substantially lower than among public sector top managers, whereas looking at National Society secretaries general does not reveal a clear trend; the situation is different from region to region.

Turning now to National Society governing boards, the ideal comparison would be with the humanitarian sector (e.g. other international and local NGOs); however, there is little or no systematic data available for comparison, so instead we turn to the private and public sectors.

Table 8: Percentage of women in National Society governing boards compared with average percentage of women in parliament, by region, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Middle East and North Africa</th>
<th>Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia Pacific</th>
<th>Americas</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women on National Society governing boards</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
<td>35.80%</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>26.90%</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
<td>28.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women in parliaments</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The percentage of women on National Society governing boards is larger than the average percentage of women in parliament, except in the Middle East and North Africa.

---

42 ILOSTAT (2019).
43 See also footnote 36: this table focuses on secretaries general and presidents. Some paid staff and volunteers may also occupy comparably powerful positions, but they are not considered here.
44 World Bank Indicators (2019). Firms with female top manager (% of firms).
45 Proportion of women in decision-making posts in public administration. The latter is defined by the UN Development Programme’s Gender Equality in Public Administration, as "the agencies and actions of the executive branch of the state at the central/national, regional and local levels". Likewise, decision-making positions are defined as non-elected decision-making or leadership positions. Source: The Women in Public Service Project (2019).
46 World Bank Indicators (2019). Proportion of Seats Held by Women in National Parliaments (%).
Question 2: Are we reaching enough women?

What is the percentage of women among the people we reach? What can we say about these percentages given what we know about the specific vulnerabilities of women in different contexts and given our mandate?

As with all analyses based on disaggregated data, see point 2 on p 16, the National Societies which do disaggregate may not be typical of all National Societies. This is very important for the indicators in this subsection, for which only between 34 and 74 National Societies provided sex-disaggregated data. So the findings in this subsection must be treated as only very preliminary and would probably be different if the data were based on a larger number of National Societies.

Table 9: Breakdown of National Societies providing different levels of detail on sex-disaggregation of indicators for people reached, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>National Societies reporting sex-disaggregated data</th>
<th>National Societies reporting data, but not sex-disaggregated</th>
<th>National Societies reporting that they do not provide corresponding programmes or services</th>
<th>National Societies not reporting at all on the indicator</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Transfer Programming</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OECD Stat. (2019). The results of the two other sources indicated similar figures: 25% (Credit Suisse Research Institute (2016)) and 21% (Deloitte Global Center for Corporate Governance (2016)).

In addition, this subsection covers the numbers of women and girls donating blood (51 National Societies, 27%, reported disaggregated data) and trained in first aid (96 National Societies, 50%).
PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN IN KEY INDICATORS INCLUDING PEOPLE REACHED, PEOPLE DONATING BLOOD AND PEOPLE TRAINED IN FIRST AID

- There is much variation – for example there are quite a lot of programmes in Africa in which considerably more than 50% of people reached are female. The percentage of women in most indicators for people reached is slightly more than 50%.
- The proportion of women in migration programmes is very low in the Americas.
- The proportion of women in shelter programmes is very low in Europe and Central Asia.
- The proportion of women in livelihoods programmes is very high in the Middle East and North Africa compared with other regions.

Figure 39: Percentages of women and girls among people reached, by region, 2017. Each bubble, for each indicator, is a National Society. The bars show the averages for each indicator for each region.
Figure 40: Percentages of women and girls among blood donors and people trained in first aid, by region, 2017. Each bubble, for each indicator, is a National Society. The bars show the averages for each indicator for each region.

- Only about 35% of blood donors globally are women.
- The proportion of blood donors who are women is much lower in Asia Pacific, but is much closer to parity in the Americas.
- In Africa, there is a lot of variation between National Societies in the percentage of women trained in first aid.

IS THAT ENOUGH?

IFRC programmes should pay attention to those people in most need. In most parts of the world today, being a woman or a girl means facing discrimination and harassment, having less access to rights, services, mobility and opportunities, and being at high risk of gender-based violence. The IFRC global network must aim to reach those most in need and to adapt to the specific needs of women and girls, especially in countries where their status in society is undignified, unjust and unsafe.

An empirical study from the London School of Economics and Political Science reports:

- **Disasters**: on average they impact and kill more women than men. Further, the intensity of the disaster and the socioeconomic status of women interact to worsen the impact: where women hold a lower status, where discrimination is widespread, the impact of the disaster on women (deaths during and after the disaster) is stronger.

Does the IFRC reach more women than men in disasters? Disaster risk reduction programming reaches almost exactly the same numbers of women and men. But this result is based on only the small number of National Societies reporting disaggregated data.

Figure 41: Percentage of women and girls among people reached by disaster risk reduction programming, 2017

What about the other thematic areas?

**Water, sanitation and hygiene promotion**: Studies from the World Bank and other sources suggest that in most cases women are more affected than men by poor quality of water, sanitation and hygiene.

The percentage of women among people reached by water, sanitation and hygiene programming in 2017 is 55%.
Migration: “Around half of the world’s international migrants are women”\(^1\). Furthermore, women face more difficulties than men as migrants: sexual exploitation, trafficking, violence, discrimination for being a migrant and a woman, pregnancy and health problems.

The percentage of women among people reached by National Society migration programming in 2017 is 54%.

The very preliminary analysis in this subsection suggests there is more work to be done in ensuring we reach women. It tells us that there are many steps to be taken to ensure we are the inclusive, impartial and diverse organization that we strive to be. It guides us to many questions we should be asking in order to reach those who need it the most with support that is relevant to their specific needs.

The data presented here can help us better understand both our own organization, and the societies we work in. To better learn from the many mechanisms and cultural dynamics that form the unique identities of communities around the world, we can ask: Why is cash programming reaching more men than women? To learn how to improve our response we can ask; how are we monitoring these distributions, how are we targeting the service and how do we collect the data? We can ask why in MENA, migration programs have reached proportionately twice as many women as in the Americas – is it the way we do our programming or is it related to the push and pull factors of migration and the way gender affects mobility?

Either way, it all starts with us collecting this crucial data and ensuring we ask the right questions.

**JOINING IT UP: DO THE PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN IN STAFF AND GOVERNANCE MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE TO OUR SERVICES? DO THEY HELP US REACH MORE WOMEN?**

There is more data available for the percentages of women among people donating blood and people trained in first aid, but again the percentages of women in National Society structures do not seem to make any very substantial differences.

**Behind the figures: What are National Societies doing to ensure women are strongly represented in governance?**

Most National Societies are concerned about gender. This engagement can be verified in their annual reports and strategic plans and also in their operations. We asked three National Societies from Europe and Central Asia to tell us about their work on gender.

The Latvian Red Cross and the Norwegian Red Cross are among the 34 National Societies globally that have more than 50% of women on the governing board.

The Norwegian Red Cross in its National Assembly has adopted a policy to ensure gender-equal boards at national level and all other organisational levels. Each level of the Norwegian Red Cross has an elected/nominated committee, which is independent in its assessment and recommendation of candidates for various positions. The committee ensures diversity in the governing bodies – where no one occupies the same position for more than 3 years – as well as a balanced composition in terms of competences. “The composition of the board shall reflect the variety of activities and experiences in the organization. The minority background and the geographical and gender distribution of the candidates must be emphasized”.

In the case of the Latvian Red Cross, the governing board, where 65% of the seats are occupied by women, was appointed by local branches, who take into account previous experience, work and accountability. Gender has never been a priority; all candidates have equal rights. Additional measures to ensure a strong representation of women are not seen as necessary in Latvia. Like most other National Societies, programmes may be offered to support members but all training courses and activities are available for everyone interested and are not specifically targeted at women.

---

Another National Society that tries hard to ensure gender parity is the Austrian Red Cross. Its governing board is made up of the presidents of the local branches, the president and vice-president of the Austrian Red Cross and three external members selected by the board – two of whom are women. This is a deliberate decision to improve the representation of women in the National Society. As most of the governing board is formed by members of the regional branches, increasing the percentage of women on the board relies on local initiatives to address gender imbalances. “Austrian Red Cross is currently going through an innovation process in different departments. Gender equality is definitely an issue in these processes and will be... an item in new strategies and policies... at headquarter level these efforts are underlined by an increasing number of women as leaders of departments.”

Christine Weima Lager, youth director of the Norwegian Red Cross (left) and Dr Sinisa Trajkovic (right) leader of the Subotica Red Cross. In and around the old brick factory in Subotica many refugees stop to rest before they start the onward journey to the Hungary boarder. The local Red Cross branch distribute essentials, food and hygiene articles twice a day.

Photo credit: Olav A. Saltbones/Norwegian Red Cross
6. Beyond the numbers: Using storytelling to bring the data to life

Diverse people need diverse tools.
This chapter looks at the link between the basic FDRS data and the reality of the field. It tells the story of what happened when, together with the Cambodian Red Cross Society, we tried a richer method of data collection to explore one concrete area of National Society work: health programming.

Why we decided to take a closer look at health programming in Cambodia

Health is easily the biggest service of the IFRC global network, in terms of numbers of people reached. In 2017, over 95 million people were reached by health services provided by National Societies globally.

- Figure 42 shows a strong dominance of health programmes.

Health services are provided all over the world in all regions, as shown in Figure 43.

**Figure 42:** People reached globally by areas of focus, 2017

Global, regional and national statistics such as those provided by the FDRS are really useful. Global figures give us the big picture of the global network, to show that Red Cross and Red Crescent volunteers are reaching people all over the world. However, the diversity of the National Societies and the contexts they operate in make it hard to properly interpret some of these numbers. For instance, in some countries National Societies provide health services such as hospitals and ambulances that are provided by governments in other countries.

It is important to have data at different levels and of different types to have a deeper picture of what we are doing. Information from the FDRS has to be complemented by information from the communities, to hear from people first, especially at the programme design stage.

For this chapter, we take a closer look at the Cambodian Red Cross Society.

The distribution of people reached in Cambodia is not quite the same as globally. For example, programmes such as WASH and disaster risk reduction are proportionally more prominent than in most National Societies. This is mainly due to the country context and how the National Society has had to adapt its programmes and operations to cope with disasters hitting the country such as floods and typhoons.
Having data at the national level allows us to have a good understanding of the activities of the Cambodian Red Cross Society and its coverage of the national territory. These numbers are useful for strategy and advocacy purposes.

The next step is to dig for deeper data: to look at programmatic and secondary data at a local level to monitor and evaluate programmes and operations more precisely.

In Cambodia, 77\% of the population lives in rural areas. The country is prone to drought and floods, and the tropical monsoon climate promotes the spread of vector-borne diseases, in particular dengue fever and malaria. Water and sanitation-related diseases such as diarrhoea and typhoid are also common in households during the rainy seasons.

We decided to look closely at Tboung Khmum province, where the Cambodian Red Cross Society has been conducting community-based health and first aid (CBHFA) programmes. Although this province has a low average poverty rate, the Cambodian Red Cross Society was interested in three communes with relatively high poverty rates: Chirou Ti Muoy and Chirou Ti Pir in the Tboung Khmum district and Preaek A chi in the Krouch Chhmar district. Access to safe and clean water and adequate sanitation and hygiene facilities remain a challenge in the target villages, especially for families with no water coverage and/or access to latrines.

The Cambodian Red Cross Society is well aware of this lack of access to clean water and latrines and the impact these factors have on health, and has long experience of CBHFA. In September 2018, funded by Finnish Red Cross, it started implementing a revised version of CBHFA, called eCBHFA, in 12 rural villages in this province. eCBHFA comprises a comprehensive approach to primary health care, first aid and emergency health preparedness at the community level. The eCBHFA approach mobilises communities and their volunteers to identify existing issues and concerns within the community and use simple tools adapted to the local context to address the priority health needs of a community and to empower them by putting them in charge of their own development.

When implementing programmes, we should test our assumptions about their relevance of the programmes and frequently check if they are fitting the needs of the people we are reaching. It is not only about quantitative data but also about qualitative data. This should happen before, not after, a disaster hits a community.

Everyone agrees that numbers are not enough, but are there structured ways we can improve on just the numbers?

---

53 World Bank Indicators (2019). Rural Population (% of total population)
To generate community-centred evidence, we decided to use a research tool called SenseMaker®. This tool is designed to collect data on the underlying factors of behavioural change to gain insights into health habits. SenseMaker allows people reached by eCBHFA in communities to interpret or give meaning to their own stories and to convey their importance. It works with this natural process – letting people share the experiences they think others should hear. This approach tries to reduce the role of the researcher as the interpreter of insights (e.g., needs, risks and desires).

People who chose to join our study were asked to think about a moment when their health was made better or worse. After describing what happened by taking a picture or recording a story, they were also invited to answer other questions about their story which help in its interpretation, such as the topic (e.g., disaster preparedness, malaria), how the story made them feel, how long ago the event in the story took place and how long it lasted, and whether the story was about the Red Cross, as well as the age and sex of the respondent. We also asked the respondents whether the story was more about health habits, living conditions or social relations by pointing to its position on a triad...
We saw that different topics generate different feelings from different demographic groups. To act on the negative feelings and generate more positive feelings, it might make sense to use persuasive behavioural change techniques such as verbal persuasion about capability \(^5\). These can help show communities that they can successfully perform the target behaviour, arguing against self-doubts and asserting that they can and will succeed.

The complete report which we produced with the Cambodian Red Cross Society contains many interesting connections and suggestions like these.

**Figure 48:** Triad displaying negative stories answering the question: What is your story about? The most recent ones are about living conditions and health habits.
Conclusion

The FDRS is designed to standardize categories like volunteering, however, these categories may mean different things in different contexts. Because the Movement is so diverse, standardized data categories are never going to be enough. We always have a responsibility to ensure we look behind the numbers too, especially when talking about people’s health. This chapter has explored a new and interesting way to test our assumptions and generated a lot of useful ideas, beyond the numbers. However, we did not find the process easy. As with any piece of social research, planning, organising and – especially with a more in-depth study like this one – carrying out the study and analysing the data was a lot of work, even more than we had anticipated. The hardest part, as always, was about relationships – how did the different groups of people involved understand what was going on, what use could they make of it?

We concluded that it makes sense for the IFRC to continue to explore ways, in partnership with National Societies, to get beyond the global and national-level numbers, but that there is no easy, one-size-fits-all way of doing that.
7. Looking forward with the FDRS

The FDRS is a work in progress. In this final chapter we look at how it is evolving.
The data working group

The IFRC and the National Societies are involved in a wide variety of different initiatives all centred around data. The IFRC Data Working Group (and its many subgroups) has the objective to create a vision and plan for connecting and consolidating these initiatives and increasing access to data for National Societies. The FDRS team is actively involved, helping to standardise workflows, processes and technological solutions and advise the IFRC IT steering group.

Data protection

Since May 2018, a new General Data Protection Regulation55 has been in force in Europe. IFRC is drafting a policy and a roll-out strategy to align with the new regulation, and the FDRS team is involved in this too.

Digital transformation

The General Assembly of 2017 mandated the governing board and the IFRC secretariat with the task, following consultations, to develop a new strategy 2030 for the IFRC and its members. One of the key questions is: what would a digitally transformed IFRC network look like?

Digital transformation encompasses the skills, resources, infrastructure, culture and processes to integrate technology into our work – securely. National Societies see digital transformation as a top priority, and the FDRS is positioned to be part of the response. As there are many National Societies of widely different sizes, digital transformation means a range of very different needs and priorities, but these usually include digital infrastructure and digital literacy. Improving these should improve efficiency, localisation of information workflows and collaboration across all sectors.

More than numbers

One of the biggest challenges for a Federation-wide data system is knowing what to count. Of course our first priority will always be to put people at the centre of our data collection. But National Societies are often involved in initiatives whose importance cannot be measured in terms of the numbers of people reached. Sometimes, for example, we need to be counting trees, not people. A story from the Red Cross Society of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea provides a good illustration. Initiatives like this one have important consequences for the people we serve, but their importance can never be adequately captured by counting people. It is just one of many initiatives carried out by National Societies globally which will always be beyond the ability of the FDRS to capture fully.

Box 7: Counting trees, not people:
An environmental project in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

“Reforestation is one of the many activities that the Red Cross is involved in as a contribution to building a healthy eco-system, to improve resilience and to combat climate change. The Red Cross Society of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea have been implementing tree planting campaigns as a core activity since the foundation of the National Society. Volunteers and youth participate in this campaign annually between March and April. In 2018, close to 200,000 Red Cross volunteers and youth members planted 6.8 million seedlings throughout the country, especially in areas like mountains and river-sides to reduce risks by natural disaster. This initiative has resulted in more than 22 million seedlings being planted in the last 4 years”
Data sources and references


IFRC. (2018, October). Sex Age Disability Disaggregated Data. [Video File]. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wO1s39hqimE.


Appendix 1:
National Society achievements for 2017 in summary per country, by region
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Society</th>
<th>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</th>
<th>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</th>
<th>People volunteering their time</th>
<th>Paid Staff</th>
<th>People donating blood</th>
<th>People trained in first aid</th>
<th>Local Units</th>
<th>Income CHF</th>
<th>Expenditure CHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola Red Cross</td>
<td>7,000 72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>877,646 907,779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baphalali Eswatini Red Cross Society</td>
<td>73,683</td>
<td>5,235 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0 3,124 65</td>
<td>1,032 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,660 1,694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkinabe Red Cross Society</td>
<td>27,552 5,383</td>
<td>2,953 218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi Red Cross</td>
<td>166,614 67,974</td>
<td>463,500 652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,808,755 5,696,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon Red Cross Society</td>
<td>13,461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Red Cross Society</td>
<td>24,545 670</td>
<td>12,000 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213,633 212,665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congolese Red Cross</td>
<td>0 0 12,142 27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,950,826 15,911,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabonese Red Cross Society</td>
<td>2,998,365 635,400</td>
<td>19,607 2,087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,089,074 667,686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Red Cross Society</td>
<td>1,470 2475 20 0</td>
<td>66,580 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,270 778,123 778,123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Red Cross Society</td>
<td>5,989 2,000,560</td>
<td>66,580 71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,990,969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho Red Cross Society</td>
<td>1,002,048 3,204,955</td>
<td>111,249 642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,033,061 2,173,683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>60,592 558 70</td>
<td>1,235 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,163,353 2,019,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy Red Cross Society</td>
<td>2,542 3,359 1,568 68</td>
<td>6,934 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>272,198 561,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi Red Cross Society</td>
<td>60,445 0</td>
<td>4,291 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,151,280 2,016,036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali Red Cross</td>
<td>206 90 28</td>
<td>170 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,316,235 1,418,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritanian Red Crescent</td>
<td>322 10 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>331,098 548,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius Red Cross Society</td>
<td>3,900 668</td>
<td>6,857 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>272,198 561,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique Red Cross Society</td>
<td>1,897 542,450</td>
<td>4,000 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,316,235 1,418,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia Red Cross</td>
<td>956,602 23,004</td>
<td>448 248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>331,098 548,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>206 90 28</td>
<td>170 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>448,072 448,072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of Djibouti</td>
<td>3,900 668</td>
<td>6,857 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>272,198 561,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of Benin</td>
<td>0 768 1,568</td>
<td>1,090 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>899,172 1,080,929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of Cape Verde</td>
<td>0 768 1,568</td>
<td>1,090 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>899,172 1,080,929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society</td>
<td>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</td>
<td>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</td>
<td>People volunteering their time</td>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>People donating blood</td>
<td>People trained in first aid</td>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>Income CHF</td>
<td>Expenditure CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of Chad</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,381,658</td>
<td>2,379,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of the Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>92,245</td>
<td>33,079</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>12,345</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>2,317,854</td>
<td>2,373,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>5,197</td>
<td>431,696</td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2,543,152</td>
<td>1,363,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of Guinea</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>8,516</td>
<td>9,264</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2,543,152</td>
<td>1,363,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of Niger</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44,5364</td>
<td>331,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan Red Cross</td>
<td>91,550</td>
<td>166,010</td>
<td>45,054</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,026</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,642,843</td>
<td>3,570,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>189,000</td>
<td>175,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegalese Red Cross Society</td>
<td>9,423</td>
<td>4,752</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>641,680</td>
<td>613,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>288,448</td>
<td>219,465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone Red Cross Society</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3,057</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,040,788</td>
<td>1,096,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,366</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4,13E+08</td>
<td>4,13E+08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan Red Cross</td>
<td>673,005</td>
<td>295,450</td>
<td>11,466</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5,017,882</td>
<td>4,350,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania Red Cross National Society</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>26,189</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10,840,108</td>
<td>10,705,128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Comoros Red Crescent</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,041,265</td>
<td>930,597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gambia Red Cross Society</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>434,826</td>
<td>439,228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South African Red Cross Society</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sudanese Red Crescent</td>
<td>1,219,922</td>
<td>763,833</td>
<td>88,889</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37,024</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Uganda Red Cross Society</td>
<td>1,143,270</td>
<td>2,810,000</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7,065,866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese Red Cross</td>
<td>32,446</td>
<td>107,694</td>
<td>65,874</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia Red Cross</td>
<td>123,685</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,071,107</td>
<td>2,060,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe Red Cross Society</td>
<td>18,376</td>
<td>125,774</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,295</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5,887,596</td>
<td>5,830,184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMERICAS**

| American Red Cross                      | 6,884,433                                                       | 300,000                                                     | 21,124            | 2,685,427 | 2,273,907 | 264 | 2.61E+09 | 2.73E+09 |
### National Society Achievements for 2017 in Summary Per Country, by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Society</th>
<th>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</th>
<th>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</th>
<th>People volunteering their time</th>
<th>Paid Staff</th>
<th>People donating blood</th>
<th>People trained in first aid</th>
<th>Local Units</th>
<th>Income CHF</th>
<th>Expenditure CHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda Red Cross</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>485,872</td>
<td>307,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentine Red Cross</td>
<td>19,546</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42,012</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2,584,579</td>
<td>24,774,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize Red Cross Society</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivian Red Cross</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>352,265</td>
<td>343,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Red Cross</td>
<td>8,756</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,335,674</td>
<td>1,355,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean Red Cross</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>5622</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>696,037</td>
<td>103,128</td>
<td>28,024</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>124,809</td>
<td>50,520</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>17,409,381</td>
<td>16,180,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rican Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6188</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>33991770</td>
<td>32265694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban Red Cross</td>
<td>128,808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,851</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70,996</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>116,394</td>
<td>116,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Red Cross</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>473,818</td>
<td>22,0811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Red Cross</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorian Red Cross</td>
<td>14,401</td>
<td>54,056</td>
<td>7,903</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>195,295</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23,547,966</td>
<td>22,835,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada Red Cross Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan Red Cross</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>9,033</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,453,954</td>
<td>4,407,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti Red Cross Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran Red Cross</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>43,605</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>39,578</td>
<td>3,414</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4,810,881</td>
<td>4,269,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Red Cross</td>
<td>1,387,000</td>
<td>7,174</td>
<td>45,114</td>
<td>9,876</td>
<td>14,269</td>
<td>63,368</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>41,371,895</td>
<td>20,614,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,158,306</td>
<td>1,596,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguayan Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,933,879</td>
<td>4,858,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian Red Cross</td>
<td>14,995</td>
<td></td>
<td>858</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,533,170</td>
<td>1,928,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of Panama</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,570,971</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,457,598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis Red Cross Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,570,971</td>
<td>1,457,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadorean Red Cross Society</td>
<td>4,406</td>
<td>9,8172</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7,360,366</td>
<td>7,051,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society</td>
<td>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</td>
<td>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</td>
<td>People volunteering their time</td>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>People donating blood</td>
<td>People trained in first aid</td>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>Income CHF</td>
<td>Expenditure CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,395,859</td>
<td>1,734,632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bahamas Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49,174</td>
<td>590,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barbados Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,813</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298,989</td>
<td>320,596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canadian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>13,2472</td>
<td>12,466</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>556,695</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>343,723</td>
<td>338,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guyana Red Cross Society</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trinidad and Tobago Red Cross Society</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguayan Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>901,103</td>
<td>965,199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuelan Red Cross</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA PACIFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan Red Crescent</td>
<td>61,054</td>
<td>28,937</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17,511,110</td>
<td>17,111,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Red Cross</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>58,843</td>
<td>21,440</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>497,550</td>
<td>40,211</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>6.6E+08</td>
<td>6.64E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>1,143,904</td>
<td>1,833,026</td>
<td>89,7824</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>65,874</td>
<td>98,700</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26,526,432</td>
<td>27,239,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3766</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>47,631</td>
<td>206,697</td>
<td>12,853</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>458,821</td>
<td>471,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji Red Cross Society</td>
<td>77,032</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,237,605</td>
<td>2,255,547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>55,207</td>
<td>5,323,260</td>
<td>2,513,709</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>849,607</td>
<td>362,379</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>4,121,519</td>
<td>3,010,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>1,588,088</td>
<td>686,459</td>
<td>352,925</td>
<td>7,044</td>
<td>4,317,982</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>8,611,255</td>
<td>6,781,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Red Cross Society</td>
<td>244,011</td>
<td>3,522,016</td>
<td>1,252,126</td>
<td>62,787</td>
<td>4,732,141</td>
<td>788,749</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1.14E+10</td>
<td>1.14E+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati Red Cross Society</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11,945</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>290,260</td>
<td>371,595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao Red Cross</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>68,099</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,611</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1,601,606</td>
<td>1,891,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldivian Red Crescent</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>9,322</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>960,195</td>
<td>608,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia Red Cross</td>
<td>19,863</td>
<td>39,736</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>468,634</td>
<td>468,634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>33,318</td>
<td>363,425</td>
<td>54,113</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>44,016</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>3,227,833</td>
<td>3,185,222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar Red Cross Society</td>
<td>91,664</td>
<td>1,203,480</td>
<td>8,209</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>14,218</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>9,000,142</td>
<td>8,197,629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society</td>
<td>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</td>
<td>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</td>
<td>People volunteering their time</td>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>People donating blood</td>
<td>People trained in first aid</td>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>Income CHF</td>
<td>Expenditure CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal Red Cross Society</td>
<td>385,356</td>
<td>1,011,458</td>
<td>112,613</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>118,400</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>35,167,380</td>
<td>26,012,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Red Cross</td>
<td>116,590</td>
<td>12,865</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65,458</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>32,709,519</td>
<td>33,294,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau Red Cross Society</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40,958</td>
<td>44,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea Red Cross Society</td>
<td>10,816</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>676,922</td>
<td>605,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Red Cross</td>
<td>883,616</td>
<td>717,131</td>
<td>105,625</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>458,312</td>
<td>138,775</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37,489,621</td>
<td>31,167,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of China</td>
<td>6946778</td>
<td>1926001</td>
<td>37,939</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3101315</td>
<td>91,906</td>
<td>9.74E+08</td>
<td>9.08E+08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2,528,627</td>
<td>105,609</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>298,651</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>84,631</td>
<td>85,626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,381</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84,631</td>
<td>85,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Red Cross Society</td>
<td>6,094</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>73,107</td>
<td>11,811</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9,555,564</td>
<td>9,430,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka Red Cross Society</td>
<td>85,852</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>11,302</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,860</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>4,597,382</td>
<td>3,768,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Republic of Korea National Red Cross</td>
<td>929,115</td>
<td>516,961</td>
<td>130,449</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>2,714,819</td>
<td>464,336</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.83E+08</td>
<td>5.83E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Solomon Islands Red Cross</td>
<td>29,758</td>
<td>8,443</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>688,995</td>
<td>735,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Thai Red Cross</td>
<td>59,478</td>
<td>4,022,305</td>
<td>40,240</td>
<td>10,723</td>
<td>388,635</td>
<td>71,735</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>8,07E+08</td>
<td>6.34E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste Red Cross</td>
<td>2,8643</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,419</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,865,201</td>
<td>2,683,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga Red Cross</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu Red Cross</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu Red Cross</td>
<td>19,814</td>
<td>37,901</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam Red Cross</td>
<td>578,435</td>
<td>419,884</td>
<td>14,389</td>
<td>1,543,858</td>
<td>24,569</td>
<td>16,006</td>
<td>7,696,841</td>
<td>6,793,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Society</th>
<th>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</th>
<th>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</th>
<th>People volunteering their time</th>
<th>Paid Staff</th>
<th>People donating blood</th>
<th>People trained in first aid</th>
<th>Local Units</th>
<th>Income CHF</th>
<th>Expenditure CHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian Red Cross</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6,388</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,521,309</td>
<td>1,244,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorran Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,377,769</td>
<td>1,245,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12,8433</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,746,634</td>
<td>1,738,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,124,797</td>
<td>74,327</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>218,793</td>
<td>376,451</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>53,433,289</td>
<td>53,539,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus Red Cross</td>
<td>18,327</td>
<td>107,960</td>
<td>16,935</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,405</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>51,42,573</td>
<td>49,68,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society</td>
<td>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</td>
<td>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</td>
<td>People volunteering their time</td>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>People donating blood</td>
<td>People trained in first aid</td>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>Income CHF</td>
<td>Expenditure CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,569</td>
<td>24,307</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>424,699</td>
<td>94,803</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>4.13E+08</td>
<td>4.05E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td>36,329</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,012</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107,202</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.75E+08</td>
<td>3.64E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian Red Cross</td>
<td>10,517</td>
<td>480,447</td>
<td>18,234</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>164,031</td>
<td>60,194</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13,415,251</td>
<td>12,666,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Red Cross</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>279,817</td>
<td>22,033</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,194</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>8,997,958</td>
<td>7,186,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus Red Cross Society</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16,613,78</td>
<td>16,052,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184,283</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,834</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.75E+08</td>
<td>3.64E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Red Cross</td>
<td>5,337</td>
<td>57,943</td>
<td>33,614</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,397</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.55E+08</td>
<td>2.52E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62,248</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,834</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.25E+08</td>
<td>1.23E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Red Cross</td>
<td>24,487</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>11,8244</td>
<td>93,866</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1,25E+08</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1,25E+08</td>
<td>1,23E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Red Cross</td>
<td>59,857</td>
<td>17,217</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,54E+09</td>
<td>1,54E+09</td>
<td>8,91E+09</td>
<td>8,91E+09</td>
<td>8,91E+09</td>
<td>8,91E+09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>164,200</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,738,246</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>19,573,833</td>
<td>19,335,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenic Red Cross</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>18,011</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>258,696</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>19,832,221</td>
<td>19,335,908</td>
<td>19,335,908</td>
<td>19,335,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic Red Cross</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,181</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8,437,689</td>
<td>9,476,318</td>
<td>9,476,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Red Cross Society</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,887</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,29E+08</td>
<td>1,08E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Red Cross</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>145,891</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>1,29E+08</td>
<td>1,29E+08</td>
<td>1,29E+08</td>
<td>37,163,24</td>
<td>37,050,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh Red Crescent</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37,163,24</td>
<td>37,050,37</td>
<td>37,050,37</td>
<td>37,050,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian Red Cross</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>8,686</td>
<td>8,625</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,990,089</td>
<td>10,820,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,774,617</td>
<td>1,774,617</td>
<td>1,774,617</td>
<td>1,774,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,718,889</td>
<td>1,717,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,15E+08</td>
<td>1,15E+08</td>
<td>1,15E+08</td>
<td>1,15E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta Red Cross Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>608,603</td>
<td>596,999</td>
<td>596,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114,500</td>
<td>40,001</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,828</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>2.38E+08</td>
<td>2.32E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Red Cross</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>350,331</td>
<td>85,227</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>85,745</td>
<td>33,823</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>42,339,785</td>
<td>40,566,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese Red Cross</td>
<td>11,587</td>
<td>157,117</td>
<td>5,759</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>7,869,859</td>
<td>7,857,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of Azerbaijan</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>70,489</td>
<td>21,759</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1,083,155</td>
<td>1,083,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society</td>
<td>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</td>
<td>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</td>
<td>People volunteering their time</td>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>People donating blood</td>
<td>People trained in first aid</td>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>Income CHF</td>
<td>Expenditure CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>6,121</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>9,428</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,075,516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan</td>
<td>49,061</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,274</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1,794,487</td>
<td>1,499,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of Turkmenistan</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3,475,639</td>
<td>1,514,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of Uzbekistan</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12,2300</td>
<td>25,587</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,691</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1,157,963</td>
<td>1,065,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of Monaco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,848,317</td>
<td>7,936,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of Montenegro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,245</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,994</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross of the Republic of San Marino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188,310</td>
<td>115,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of Georgia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>8,643</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,933</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94,214,257</td>
<td>7,6373,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Society of the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>167,444</td>
<td>167,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian Red Cross</td>
<td>45,901</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>54,383</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8,102,166</td>
<td>7,719,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Red Cross</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>54,547</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,023</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8,081,811</td>
<td>8,078,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian Red Cross</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>49,453</td>
<td>12,336</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>99,738</td>
<td>31,178</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8,704,264</td>
<td>8,671,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Red Cross</td>
<td>661,480</td>
<td>5,019,214</td>
<td>197,061</td>
<td>11,808</td>
<td>155,669</td>
<td>53,947</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>723,413</td>
<td>691,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Red Cross</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1.35E+08</td>
<td>1.35E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Red Cross</td>
<td>595,391</td>
<td>57,891</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>230,190</td>
<td>136,096</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5,23E+08</td>
<td>5,47E+08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands Red Cross</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,227</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,662</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.49E+08</td>
<td>1.36E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Red Cross of Serbia</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>16,889</td>
<td>69,455</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,866</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3,536,089</td>
<td>3,536,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Red Cross of North Macedonia</td>
<td>19,504</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>55,400</td>
<td>17,658</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2,914,275</td>
<td>250,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Red Cross Society of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24,665</td>
<td>9,007</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>30,908</td>
<td>31,127</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>480,972</td>
<td>480,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Russian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>90,695</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>16,325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>1,897,365</td>
<td>4,786,608</td>
<td>66,007</td>
<td>4,741</td>
<td>1,931,783</td>
<td>52,007</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>8.68E+08</td>
<td>7.8E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>44,164</td>
<td>368,329</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,772</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,3148,774</td>
<td>12521893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerian Red Crescent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,403,633</td>
<td>1,336,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society</td>
<td>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early Recovery Programmes</td>
<td>People Reached by Long-Term Services and Development Programmes</td>
<td>People volunteering their time</td>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>People donating blood</td>
<td>People trained in first aid</td>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>Income CHF</td>
<td>Expenditure CHF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>45,603</td>
<td>259,995</td>
<td>30,121</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>98,300</td>
<td>19,373</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,124,044</td>
<td>2,986,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>4,798,008</td>
<td>157,722</td>
<td>10,492</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>109,782</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29,350,328</td>
<td>31,699,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel – Magen David Adom in Israel</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>252,877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan National Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>15,916</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>592,088</td>
<td>529,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>4,541,721</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>304,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese Red Cross</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>887,298</td>
<td>8,248</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>19,671</td>
<td>16,581</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4,059,532</td>
<td>28,149,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan Red Crescent</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan Red Crescent</td>
<td>17,670</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>20,910</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>1,266,956</td>
<td>88,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,758</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,672,202</td>
<td>64,011,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of the Islamic Republic of Iran</td>
<td>588,159</td>
<td>630,723</td>
<td>1,864,495</td>
<td>8,567</td>
<td>73,836</td>
<td>192,778</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>47,613,577</td>
<td>45,179,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Society of the United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Red Crescent Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.08E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Red Crescent</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>9,248</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Palestine Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>154,059</td>
<td>940,484</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,384</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisian Red Crescent</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen Red Crescent Society</td>
<td>5,361</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,159</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,563</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2,675,834</td>
<td>3,946,075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2:
Percentages of National Societies reporting on main indicators, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Americas</th>
<th>Asia Pacific</th>
<th>Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Middle East and North Africa</th>
<th>Global</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People Reached by Disaster Response and Early</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Reached by Long-Term Services and</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People volunteering their time</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People donating blood</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People trained in first aid*</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Units</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income CHF</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure CHF</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3:
Details of the Quality of Data Index
How the index is calculated

1. Construction of Components

A Number of main indicators component
1. Measured on a scale of 1 to 8, one point given for each of the eight main indicators that are reported.
2. The eight main indicators are: number of local units, income, expenditure, number of people volunteering, number of paid staff, number of people donating blood, number of people trained in first aid, and the number of people reached.
3. Within the indicator on the number of people reached, there are ten programme categories that National Societies report on (eight thematic areas and two type of programme). The main indicator for the number of people reached is considered reported if the National Society reports the number of people reached in at least one of the ten programme areas.
4. To scale this component to 100, a transformation is applied by multiplying the total score by 12.5, to give the total score out of 100.

B Age/sex/disability disaggregation component
1. Five of the eight main indicators should be sex/age/disability disaggregated: number of people volunteering, number of paid staff, number of people donating blood, number of people trained in first aid, and the number of people reached.
2. This component is calculated individually for sex, age and disability disaggregation with a weight of 0.5 for sex disaggregation, and 0.25 each for age and disability. The total component is then given a weight of 0.20 in the index, as shown in the table at the end of this appendix.
3. If the National Society does not have any activities in one of the programme fields, it should report it as zero. In this case, we do not consider the indicator as being disaggregated. The total score of disaggregated indicators is calculated as a percentage of the reported indicators that are possibly disaggregated by sex/age/disability.
4. The FDRS does not actually collect disability-disaggregated data; the points are given if the National Society answers yes to the questions in the FDRS about whether these indicators are available in disability-disaggregated form.

C People reached completeness component
1. The purpose of including this component in the Quality of Data Index is to measure the completeness of the reached indicators reported by National Societies.
2. It is calculated as a percentage of programme areas in which the National Society reported people reached, out of a total of 10.
3. If the National Society does not have programmes in a certain thematic area, and thus reports the number of people reached as zero, the thematic area is still counted as reported.

D Documents component
1. Scored on a scale of 1 to 3.5, with one point given for each of the three key documents that were submitted: annual report, financial statement and strategic plan. An additional 0.5 points is added if the financial statement is audited.
2. Once again, to scale the documents component a transformation is applied by multiplying the score by 28.571, to give a total score out of 100.
3. If the Strategic Plan spans several years, it is counted for each specific year, unless an updated version is submitted.

E Time to respond component
1. Calculated as one divided by the number of days between the date the questionnaire was sent out and the date of the first substantial submission of data to the FDRS. This is defined as the date the National Society submits at least half (four) of the main indicators.
2. In the case that there was back-and-forth communication between the FDRS and the National Society, for example if the data was partially returned on one date, and the remainder on a later date, this indicator is calculated as the amount of time until the earliest return date.
3. The reasoning for including this indicator is that we expect timely reporting from National Societies. However, the way it is calculated means it constitutes a very small portion of the overall index. This is because it is not meant to encourage faster reporting at the expense of higher quality reporting.

F FDRS Focal Point
1. Coded as 100 for ‘Yes’ or 0 for ‘No’ when the National Society has a dedicated FDRS Focal Point for data collection.
2. This measures institutional knowledge on FDRS processes and data collection, and consistency of data collection within each National Society over time.
## 2. CORRECTION FOR COUNTRY-SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

**A** This step is meant to correct for the country-specific conditions that may make it more difficult to collect data.

**B** World Bank data on the number of mobile phone subscriptions per 100 people is recoded as 100 minus the total number of mobile phones per 100 people, so countries with a lower number of phone subscriptions receive an added boost to their score.

**C** The reasoning behind this is that lower levels of mobile phone penetration are indicative of lower levels of communications infrastructure development. It follows that this impedes data collection, particularly if it is more difficult to communicate between operation centres in the field, local branches and headquarters.

**D** Accounting for these structural differences allows us to more fairly compare data collection levels between National Societies that are operating in a wide variety of different conditions.

---

### Example score calculation

A National Society submits the following data to FDRS 14 days after the initial questionnaire is sent. They report seven of the eight main indicators:

- the number of local units
- all three key documents (though the financial statement is not audited)
- total income
- total expenditure
- total number of volunteers, not disaggregated
- total number of paid staff, disaggregated by sex and age
- number of people trained in first aid, disaggregated by age and disability
- four of the ten indicators for people reached, all of which are disaggregated by sex and age.

The National Society has a dedicated FDRS Focal Point and is located in a country with 35 mobile phones per 100 people. The National Society's total score can be calculated as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>Main indicators</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Age disaggregation</th>
<th>Sex disaggregation</th>
<th>Disability disaggregation</th>
<th>Total disaggregation</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Focal point</th>
<th>Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of points, based on submitted data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100-35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale transformation</td>
<td>7*12.5</td>
<td>3*28.571</td>
<td>0.75*100</td>
<td>0.5*100</td>
<td>0.25*100</td>
<td>(1/14)*100</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.4*100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total component score, out of 100</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>85.173</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total component value</td>
<td>21.875</td>
<td>17.1426</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Data score: 65.6246
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