



EN

CD/09/6.1
Original: English
For information

COUNCIL OF DELEGATES
OF THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS
AND RED CRESCENT
MOVEMENT

Nairobi, Kenya
23-25 November 2009

The Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures
(follow-up to Resolution 6/2007)
(Item 6 of the Draft Provisional Annotated Agenda)

Report

Document prepared jointly by

The International Committee of the Red Cross and
The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Geneva, October 2009

International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies Report on Implementation of the Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures

June 2007 – June 2009

Executive Summary

The Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures (SA & SM) have continued to be applied in new-onset and long-running international relief operations. The most significant development has been the confirmed and consolidated position of a National Society working within its own country (Host National Society) at the centre of international relief operations, whether as primary partner of the lead agency or the lead agency, as provided for in the Supplementary Measures.

A number of coordination tools and processes have been developed and deployed in many international relief operations, including Movement coordination frameworks and mechanisms, as well as regular issuing of 'Joint Statements' at the onset of new emergency operations, which facilitate predictable and coherent Movement responses to emergencies. Further work is required on implementation procedures and financial mechanisms to ensure that Movement resources are maximized to the benefit of the affected population.

Fewer training sessions were run by all Movement components on the SA & SM in the past two years as SA & SM content was effectively mainstreamed into induction courses for new staff and into disaster-management training for senior managers. Progress has been slow in implementing preparedness measures at country level - such as processes to develop memoranda of understanding (MoUs) clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the different components of the Movement in accordance with the Statutes of the Movement and the SA & SM, and Movement contingency planning.

Cooperation and coordination between Movement components in major operations remain challenging and the full implementation of Movement policies on working in partnership needs constant attention, further improvement and commitment.

The recommendations at the end of this report call for the following:

- Country-level activities for preparing for, and responding to, emergencies;
- Training for operational managers and members of governance within all Movement components on the SA & SM;
- Sharing lessons learnt and good practices from international relief operations;
- Reviews of the implementation of the SA & SM in international relief operations and improved approaches to and procedures for resource mobilization;
- Supporting Host National Societies to manage the range of partnerships required in international relief operations.

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Findings
3. Achievements and challenges
4. Recommendations

Annex: Movement coordination framework, Pakistan

1. Introduction

This is a joint report from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (International Federation) covering the period June 2007 to June 2009. It examines implementation of the Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures (SA & SM) within the framework developed by the Resolution 8 Movement working group from 2005-2009, updated to include the provisions of Resolution 6 of the 2007 Council of Delegates on implementation of the Seville Agreement.

Issues arising from new-onset international relief operations during this period are discussed, and analysis incorporates ongoing international relief operations. Overall trends, challenges, lessons learnt and best practice are highlighted, based on the most significant international relief operations during this period (Kenya, Georgia, Pakistan, Gaza, Myanmar, China and Haiti).

2. Findings

2.1 Application of the SA & SM

The Movement's international relief operations in ongoing and new emergencies (China, Sichuan earthquake; Georgia, South Ossetia armed conflict; Haiti, tropical storms; Kenya, post-election violence; Myanmar, Cyclone Nargis; Pakistan, intensification of hostilities; and the Gaza crisis), continued to be organized in accordance with the principles and provisions of the SA & SM. The SA & SM were cited in 'Joint Statements' describing the Movement coordination set up for new-onset operations. Likewise, the SA & SM were cited in most appeal documents covering international relief operations during this period.

One of the most significant developments over the past two to four years since the adoption of the Supplementary Measures has been consolidation of the **central role of the Host National Society**¹ in the Movement coordination set-up established to manage international relief operations, as foreseen in the Supplementary Measures. The ICRC and the International Federation have developed common practices to ensure that at leadership level, the Host National Society is more systematically involved in all aspects of international relief operations as either primary partner or lead agency. Further work is required, however, on implementing measures that build support and capacity for the Host National Society to

¹Consistent with terms used in the Supplementary Measures, the National Society of a country where an international relief operation takes place is referred to as the 'Host National Society'.

accomplish its mission (a) in accordance with its auxiliary role to the public authorities and its humanitarian mandate and (b) in partnership with international partners, from within or outside of the Movement.

The SA & SM were applied in conjunction with other Movement policies and/or disaster management policies. Coordination mechanisms established to manage international relief operations proved **compatible with Movement cooperation tools and partnerships** such as Cooperation Agreement Strategies or Operational Alliances. However, a number of specific operations clearly demonstrated the need for pre-disaster strategic planning between the Movement components, so that roles and responsibilities are agreed in advance of major operations or emergencies.

2.1.1 Awareness raising / training on the SA & SM

Between the 2005 and 2007 Councils of Delegates, the International Federation and the ICRC developed a comprehensive training tool that was distributed to all Movement components, and carried out a joint training drive targeting all staff with operational decision-making responsibilities. Comprehensive data on SA & SM training sessions held by all Movement components is not available at the time of writing, however, it is clear that **fewer specific training sessions on the SA & SM** have taken place in the field and headquarters since 2007 than between 2005 and 2007. All senior ICRC and International Federation managers were aware of the SA & SM, whilst outside the leadership of National Societies, knowledge of the SA & SM was less common. If more training sessions are not run, knowledge of the SA & SM could become increasingly patchy within the Movement.

The principles of the **SA & SM** have, however, been '**mainstreamed**' into **ICRC and International Federation induction courses for new delegates**. The Movement's Basic Training Course has been replaced by two training modules: the World of Red Cross, Red Crescent and Red Crystal (WORC), and International Mobilization and Preparation for Action (IMPACT). These courses are used to train International Federation delegates and National Society delegates who may work on a bilateral basis. Short modules have also been included in the International Federation Disaster Management Induction Course, and FACT and ERU training courses. The Leadership Development Course run jointly by the ICRC and the International Federation trained approximately 60 participants on the SA & SM during this period.

The ICRC's new induction course covers roles and responsibilities within the Movement and contains a role-play simulation of a Movement coordination meeting. Planned training for the ICRC's Rapid Deployment Unit includes the basic elements of the SA & SM.

The International Federation and the ICRC undertook a **joint review of SA & SM training**, focusing on the feedback received from trainers and participants. Recommendations include production of a revised training module with simplified presentation materials; more practical examples of the application of the SA & SM; and guidance for trainers/facilitators who may not have had extensive experience of Movement coordination or international relief operations.

2.1.2 Security management in situations of conflict and other situations of violence

With the aim of improving the safety of Movement personnel, in October 2008 the ICRC developed and shared with all National Societies its approach to the security management of Movement components in countries affected by armed conflict and other situations of violence. The ICRC sought through this means to promote dialogue, to provide increased clarity, and to manage respective expectations for international relief operations where the ICRC was, or was likely to become, lead agency. Host National Societies are also supported

by the ICRC to work in conflict and other situations of violence through the '**Safer Access**' approach. This is integrated into the ICRC's operational partnerships and is in harmony with the International Federation's security-management approach. The ICRC provided valuable security support and advice to the International Federation and National Societies in various operations in response to natural disasters, in full alignment with the Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures.

2.1.3 Revision of the Principles and Rules of Red Cross and Red Crescent Disaster Relief (1995)²

Recognizing the importance of the Principles and Rules for coordinating the work of National Societies and their International Federation during natural and technological disasters as set out in the Constitution, and referenced in the Seville Agreement,³ the International Federation initiated a general revision process to bring them up to date with current operating procedures and policies, including the SA & SM. The Principles and Rules working group involving National Society, International Federation and ICRC representatives recommended that they be extended to **encompass recovery and risk reduction** whilst the scope should remain **natural and technological disasters**.

2.1.4 Mobilization of financial resources for international relief operations

Throughout the reporting period, the formulas used to mobilize resources, including the launch of appeals, varied from context to context, and **new approaches** were tried in various international relief operations. Some Host National Societies (the Palestine Red Crescent Society, the Kenya Red Cross Society and the Magen David Adom) launched their own appeals with the support of the ICRC and/or the International Federation. The International Federation and the ICRC opted for single integrated appeals in Myanmar and Georgia with mixed results (owing to accountability constraints). This led to changed practice in Pakistan whereby each organization launched their respective appeal in a closely **coordinated manner**.

Continued coordination is required between the Host National Society, the International Federation and the ICRC on the mobilization of financial resources. This will ensure that the Movement secures the resources each component needs to deliver an optimal coverage of humanitarian needs whilst also complying with respective accountability requirements, promoting coherence in Movement operations, and retaining credibility with donors into the future.

As an example of good practice regarding management of the Movement's response to the Gaza crisis, a **coordination cell** was set up at the headquarters of the Palestine Red Crescent Society, with representatives from both the ICRC and the International Federation. The cell coordinated the delivery of all assistance to Gaza coming from Movement partners and maintained close links with the coordination established by the Egyptian Red Crescent Society, which played a major role in this operation.

The ICRC and the International Federation are consulting National Societies and each other to revise their financial guidelines for working with Host National Societies. The aim is to simplify procedures and minimize the workload of the Host National Societies when receiving funds or other resources from the ICRC or the International Federation.

² Principles and Rules of Red Cross and Red Crescent Disaster Relief, 26th International Conference (1995).

³ Agreement on the Organization of the International Activities of the Components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, Article 6.1.2, B, a.

2.2 Measures taken to ensure that the Host National Society is the primary partner of the lead agency or the lead agency

In adopting Resolution 6 on Implementation of the Seville Agreement, the 2007 Council of Delegates required that all Movement components focus on building their capacities to be effective partners to Host National Societies and enhancing the **Host National Society capacity to be primary partner or lead agency** when applicable.

In all contexts, **Host National Societies were consulted and involved** in the management of international relief operations. Some Host National Societies required more support from Movement partners than others. Increased support to National Societies is normally required to manage the multiple layers of partnership found in international relief operations. These include partnerships with public authorities (auxiliary capacity), with international partners from within the Movement, and external partners such as UN organizations, NGOs and the private sector.

Long term, programmed **disaster management and organizational development support** are normally required to make service provision sustainable including functioning governance, management and income-generating activities.

The Myanmar Cyclone Nargis operation is an example of where ICRC water and sanitation training carried out on the spot for MRCS staff and volunteers led to the National Society establishing a permanent capacity in this field. The Red Cross Society of China requested support from the International Federation to manage international coordination with the PNS⁴ during the Sichuan earthquake operation.

Some Host National Societies with substantive experience in successfully managing international relief operations have been able to reinforce their capacities to coordinate relief operations involving PNS, the ICRC and the International Federation (e.g. the Kenya Red Cross Society for post-election violence; the Palestine Red Crescent Society in the Gaza crisis; and the Pakistan Red Crescent Society following the intensification of hostilities).

The Council of Delegates has previously noted⁵ that preparedness measures, including Movement meetings, contingency planning, and processes to develop MoUs, are essential parts of capacity- building which **prepare the Host National Society to be primary partner or lead agency** in international relief operations.

Underpinning the Supplementary Measures is a model of **shared leadership** whereby the national institution (Host National Society) and one of the two international institutions of the Movement with the relevant mandate, supported by the other (the ICRC or the International Federation, as the case may be) interact closely and in an enhanced manner to take strategic decisions, manage operations and deliver optimal services to beneficiaries. Shared leadership models have been a growing trend for international relief operations over the past two years.

The notion of **supporting partner** complements shared leadership for the coordination of international relief operations by recognizing that the Movement component assuming the lead-agency function can only achieve an optimal response for beneficiaries if it has the full support of all the other Movement components contributing to operations. For example, the ICRC worked as a supporting partner to the Kenya Red Cross in responding to post-election

⁴ The term 'PNS' refers to National Societies working internationally.

⁵ Supplementary Measures 2005; implementation of SA & SM report 2007; Council of Delegates 2007, Resolution 6, *Implementation of the Seville Agreement*.

violence, making its skills and operational set-up available for the Kenya Red Cross-led emergency operation.

Likewise, the ICRC functioned as supporting partner to the International Federation and the Haitian National Red Cross Society, bridging coordination-capacity gaps during the tropical storms of 2008, as well as to the International Federation and the Myanmar Red Cross Society for the Cyclone Nargis response. The International Federation acted as supporting partner to the ICRC and the Host National Society during the 2008 Georgia and Gaza crises. The PNS during a given operation also play a supportive role, thereby forming part of the overall Movement operation in the country concerned.

During the reporting period, the ICRC continued implementation of its management priority on partnerships with Host National Societies, focusing on the development of **Host National Society emergency-response capacities** and on improving the skills of its own staff to work in partnership with Host National Societies, to ensure that both **the ICRC and the Host National Society emerge strengthened** from operational cooperation. This work takes into account the International Federation's established policies and methods of working and is coordinated with the International Federation.

2.3 Movement contingency planning and country-level memoranda of understanding (on respective roles and responsibilities of Movement components) or pre-relief agreements

The Supplementary Measures and Resolution 6 of the 2007 Council of Delegates require that the ICRC, the International Federation and National Societies place emphasis on preparedness measures that facilitate working together in emergencies.⁶

Overall, development of Movement contingency planning at country level in the manner envisaged in Resolution 6 has been slow. However, there are notable examples of **good practice**, such as **Nepal**, where agreement on roles and responsibilities and plans for the management of resources in emergencies led to the signing of an MoU in mid-2009.

To date, such **MoUs** have been signed in five countries whilst processes for developing MoUs have been initiated in other countries. Lack of clarity or disagreement on respective roles and responsibilities and differing interpretations of the SA & SM have hindered the signing of MoUs in some instances.

The International Federation included a section on Movement coordination in its **Disaster Response and Contingency Planning Guide (2007)** to ensure that relevant Movement policies and tools are taken into consideration when planning for large-scale emergencies. More detail on the SA & SM will be added when the guide is updated in late 2009.

In response to these factors, the International Federation and the ICRC revived a joint process to develop minimum elements for a common **MoU template** with input from National Societies and International Federation and ICRC delegations. Emphasis is being placed on the coordination and cooperation processes between partners which must be in place to agree an MoU.

⁶ Council of Delegates 2007, Resolution 6, *Implementation of the Seville Agreement*, Article 3, d. i, ii and iii.

2.4 Movement cooperation and coordination processes, tools and outcomes

Lessons learnt from the coordination of international relief operations demonstrate that the formalization of regular coordination meetings between components of the Movement into **Movement coordination mechanisms** (with clear responsibilities set out for decision-making and transfer of information through Movement coordination platforms) are effective and desirable. The **basic Movement coordination framework** used for the Movement's response in Pakistan is annexed. This framework has routinely been used in major sudden-onset emergencies requiring an international Movement response since the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, for which it was first developed with good results.

Further good practice has been the issuing of '**Joint Statements**' (from the Host National Society, the ICRC and the International Federation) that set out the coordination mechanisms at the outset of new-onset emergency responses. These were issued for the Gaza crisis, in Myanmar and in Pakistan. The Joint Statement is now considered a **standard coordination tool** by the International Federation and the ICRC.

Both the ICRC and the International Federation have contributed to the development of a Movement '**Code for Good Partnership**' which focuses on the behaviour of individuals and institutions when working in partnerships. The Code will be presented to the 2009 Council of Delegates, and National Societies, the ICRC and the International Federation will be encouraged to consider how implementation of the code could facilitate effective cooperation and coordination processes.

2.5 Coordination with partners outside the Movement

The International Federation and the ICRC worked with **UNHCR** to develop a **field-level template** for 'Operational Agreements between Movement Components and their External Operational Partners', designed to enhance the position of the Host National Society in the partnership and to support Host National Societies in their implementation partnerships with UNHCR. The information note and the template were distributed to all National Societies in October 2008. A similar process has now been initiated with the **World Food Programme**.

In addition to their responsibility to be primary partner to the lead agency or lead agency in international relief operations, some National Societies have been given significant or leading roles by their **governments** for the **coordination of international disaster relief operations** (e.g. Kenya, Myanmar and China). This is in recognition of the status and disaster-response capacities of National Societies and further underscores the importance of Movement components taking preparedness and contingency-planning measures to ensure that Movement coordination and other national responsibilities can be carried out in full conformity with the Fundamental Principles and Movement-coordination agreements and policies.

Furthermore, the International Federation and the ICRC, in consultation with National Societies, are exploring areas where further guidance and support should be developed for Movement components working with external partners. Work is in its early stages and planned consultation with National Societies includes a workshop on this subject to be held at the 2009 Council of Delegates.

2.6 Problem solving

The Supplementary Measures state that problems regarding the implementation of the Seville Agreement “should be clearly identified in the field and addressed there with the institution(s) or individuals concerned.”⁷ A series of steps and procedures are clearly outlined, but not always duly implemented.

The Movement coordination mechanisms established to manage international relief operations were observed to be largely successful in facilitating problem solving. However, an increased level of pre-disaster contingency planning and clarification of the respective roles and responsibilities of Movement components (such as through an MoU), would help to avoid many of the problems encountered. In the event that such pre-disaster contingency planning is not in place at the outset of a major operation, commitment to solving problems in the field as they arise has to be the first recourse, following the steps outlined in the Supplementary Measures.

3. Achievements and challenges

3.1 Achievements

Through mobilizing and managing human and financial resources, the combined efforts of Host National Societies, the ICRC, the International Federation and PNS contributed to the alleviation of suffering of many people affected by armed conflict and other emergencies during this period. Predictable coordination structures were established in all international relief operations and good practices in employing coordination tools were further developed.

3.2 Challenges

Without doubt, the Movement faces enormous **challenges** in **meeting the needs of vulnerable people** in the coming years. Many more people are becoming vulnerable as a result of poverty, disease, climate change and the food crisis; there are limited resources to meet these increasing needs, exacerbated by the financial crises; and challenges to humanitarian space are coming from a variety of sources including integrated military/political missions.

Changes in the global humanitarian environment over the past few years, including the UN humanitarian reform with its integrated and comprehensive approaches, require the Movement to adapt if it is to remain relevant and effective in different operational contexts. The assets that can be mobilized and deployed **collectively and distinctly by all Movement components** are increasingly sought by partners outside the Movement, particularly in international relief operations. Judgement needs to be used to ensure that all partnerships outside the Movement are managed in accordance with the **Fundamental Principles** and in conformity with the **Statutes of the Movement and the SA & SM**.

Cooperation and coordination between Movement components remain challenging and full implementation of Movement policies relating to working in partnership⁸ has yet to be

⁷ Supplementary Measures to the Seville Agreement, Article 6.2.

⁸ Such as the Supplementary Measures and Resolution 6 of the 2007 Council of Delegates.

realized. Some of the key challenges and successes emerging during the reporting period included:

- utilizing the **shared leadership** model between the Host National Society and the relevant international institution as an opportunity for coordination and capacity-building through joint assessment and implementation of the international relief operation;
- recognizing and **supporting Host National Society roles and obligations** under national disaster-response plans (including their auxiliary role to public authorities) in conformity with the lead-agency function and supporting-partner approaches implicit in the SA & SM;
- Movement components sometimes **lacking the capacity and resources** needed to assume the lead-agency function. In addition, assuming the function with an inclusive leadership and partnership approach;
- ensuring the basic coordination mechanisms recommended in the Supplementary Measures are fully functional at country level to deliver the following results:
 - agreed public statements and external communications on behalf of the Movement;
 - effective utilization of Host National Society disaster-needs assessment and response based on shared capacity assessments;
 - procedures for engagement of Movement components and the delivery of services by others other than the lead agency or/and the Host National Society are established and disseminated reflecting the steps set out in the Supplementary Measures;
- formulating coherent and effective approaches to the mobilization of financial resources for international relief operations – including options for single integrated (joint) appeals, separate well-coordinated appeals, national appeals and the procedures for the use of Disaster Response Emergency Funds in various types of situations.

These issues need continued attention and to be addressed through ongoing dialogue between components of the Movement and through the various recommendations outlined below.

4. Recommendations

Taking into consideration the observations of this report, the following recommendations are made to members of the 2009 Council of Delegates:

- 1) Focus on country-level activities for preparing for, and responding to, emergencies including:
 - holding meetings between Movement components
 - developing amongst Movement components present in a country a common understanding of respective roles and responsibilities as set out in the Statutes of the Movement and the SA & SM, leading to the signing of an MoU whenever feasible

- development of contingency planning as cited in Resolution 6, 2007 Council of Delegates.⁹
- 2) Continue the good practice carried out between 2005 and 2007 of training operational managers and members of governance within all Movement components on the SA & SM, with a focus on practical implementation. The International Federation and the ICRC to support National Societies with this training, with adapted training materials where appropriate.
 - 3) The ICRC and the International Federation monitor and share with National Societies lessons learnt and good practices from international relief operations including cooperation and coordination mechanisms, models and tools successfully employed.
 - 4) The International Federation and the ICRC, in consultation with Host National Societies, carry out reviews of the implementation of the SA & SM in international relief operations and continue to work on improved approaches and procedures for resource mobilization.
 - 5) Means are developed for supporting Host National Societies to manage the range of partnerships required in international relief operations. These include: partnerships with public authorities (the auxiliary role); partnerships with the international bodies of the Movement and National Societies; and partnerships with UN organizations, NGOs and the private sector.

⁹ Council of Delegates 2007, Resolution 6, *Implementation of the Seville Agreement*, Article 3, d. iii, "Contingency planning that assesses the risks and the resources that could be mobilized within the Movement and considers how such resources would be coordinated to deliver effective services to beneficiaries."

Annex: Movement coordination framework, Pakistan

