

Improvement Analysis ChildFund New Zealand June 2019

Lessons learned in the reporting period (B2)

The report refers to learnings around the Road Mapping process, with representatives from four countries sharing their experiences to be included in the Road Map Guidebook.

A specific lesson is around the effectiveness of publishing Road Map documents and the resultant ownership from various parts of the community. ChildFund NZ is continuing to explore the broader applications of the Road Map methodology, relating it to thematic areas rather than just communities.

Are there any examples of lessons learned from challenges, if any, and how ChildFund NZ is responding?

In the next report, the Panel suggests including some more information on how lessons are shared internally and externally and how learning is systematised – are there regular evaluations and reflections on learnings? How are staff involved? See Sightsavers' approach (report [here](#), pp. 6-7) as an example.

Reaching out to those impacted or concerned by your work (D2)

In Kiribati, ChildFund NZ has close personal relationships with individual households, communicating through household visits, workshops, and country-level advisory committees. The response explains that this direct approach is effective because of the relationship-based nature of local communities, and that it is possible due to the smaller size of local populations.

In the other countries in which ChildFund NZ works together with other ChildFund Alliance members, a common structure is that parents of sponsored children elect representatives onto zonal committees and Boards. These representatives work with ChildFund and local partners.

Children's Clubs are mentioned as one way children's voices are heard. The Panel would like to see more information on this, and other ways that ChildFund NZ reaches



out to children and youth in the next report. What works particularly well, and what are some challenges? For example, is there a need to speak to boys and girls separately, or to have discussion groups split up based on age?

Stakeholder engagement (E2)

The report provides two examples of stakeholder engagement throughout the development and roll-out of programmes – one in Kiribati, where there was no previous relationship, and one in Kenya where ChildFund already had a long-standing relationship with the community.

Both examples indicate a high level of engagement of a variety of stakeholder groups, from communities, children and youth, to local partners, NGOs, and government representatives. This engagement happens at several stages throughout the process, with various in-person workshops.

Overall stakeholder engagement is clearly taken seriously, but we would like more evidence about how this engagement, particularly with CBOs and other grassroots stakeholders, is used to shape programmes through collaboration and joint programming. In the next report the Panel would like to see more details about the youth participatory design process which was mentioned, as well as how stakeholders are involved in monitoring and evaluation, and how you are coordinating with other ChildFund Alliance members to ensure strong stakeholder engagement in Category 2 and 3 programmes. Also, are there any policies or documents outlining ChildFund NZ's approach to stakeholder engagement?

The Panel would also like to know how stakeholders are engaged beyond programmatic work – for example, in defining ChildFund NZ's strategy or priorities.

Main likes/dislikes from stakeholders and organisation's response (E3)

Main likes and dislikes from partners is summarised. Partners appreciate their opinions being taken into consideration, the fact that ChildFund NZ funds entire programmes, and that they invest in capacity building.

A dislike, or suggestion for improvement, was that ChildFund NZ could be more involved in project design. The report explains why the organisations tends not to take this approach; the Panel would be interested to know whether this was also explained to the partner who gave the initial feedback, to demonstrate that their suggestion had been heard and responded to.



In the next report, the Panel would also like to see what key feedback was received from local communities, children and youth involved in ChildFund NZ's programmes, and internal stakeholders, i.e. staff.

Availability of key policies and information on your website (G1)

ChildFund NZ publishes audited financial statements and statistics in their annual reports, which are [online](#). Beyond this, policies, evaluations, and other documents are not published (except for the [Child Safeguarding Policy](#)). Is ChildFund NZ considering publishing any more documents or information, and if so is there a planned timeline for this? The policy manual which has been shared with the Panel does not seem to be controversial; have there been discussions about either making it available on your website or sharing it with your programme partners? Is this an issue that has been discussed within the ChildFund Alliance network, and do you have an idea about how your approach to transparency compares with others in this network?

This is an area for improvement, and the Panel suggests that at a minimum ChildFund NZ's code of conduct and complaints policy be available online. An example of good practice in this regard is Restless Development – see their [open information policy](#).