

REAFFIRMING THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES: **A MOVEMENT WIDE INITIATIVE**

Africa Regional Workshop (English-speaking) **Nairobi, 4-5 March 2015**

INTRODUCTION

In 2015, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement celebrates the 50th anniversary of the adoption of the Fundamental Principles. In preparation for this important milestone, a workshop on the Fundamental Principles, organized alongside the Council of Delegates in Sydney in 2013, endorsed a proposal to launch an initiative to enhance understanding and application of the Principles within the Movement.¹ One of the activities planned in the framework of this initiative was the joint organization by the ICRC and the International Federation of regional workshops on the application of the Fundamental Principles by the components of the Movement. The aim of these workshops was to identify the challenges and dilemmas facing National Societies in the implementation of the Fundamental Principles and to collect good practices and constructive approaches that participants have used to overcome them.

This report describes the proceedings of one of two workshops organized on the African continent. The workshop was held in Nairobi, Kenya, on 4-5 March 2015, followed closely by a workshop held in Dakar, Senegal, on 9-10 March. The initiative's first regional workshop, for the Middle East and North Africa, took place in Beirut, Lebanon, in March 2014. Workshops for Asia, the Americas and Europe will be held between April and July 2015.

The regional workshop in Nairobi, organized by the ICRC with the support of the International Federation and hosted by the Kenyan Red Cross Society, brought together 22 participants from 15 National Societies from English-speaking Africa (see annexed list of participants).

STRUCTURE OF THE WORKSHOP AND REPORT

The Nairobi workshop was structured around a number of themes relating to context-specific challenges encountered in the application of the Fundamental Principles (see annexed agenda). These themes came up repeatedly during the consultations organized within the Movement in 2013 in preparation to the Council of Delegates in Sydney.²

¹ The report of this workshop is available at: <https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/red-cross-crescentmovement/council-delegates-2013/cod13-ws1-fp-final-report-eng.pdf>.

² For a summary of the main conclusions of these consultations, see the document "Outline of workshop 1" relating to the workshop organized on the sidelines of the 2013 Council of Delegates, available at: http://www.standcom.ch/download/cod2013/wo/CD13_WS1_FP_outline_30Sept_clean_EN.pdf.

Thus, participants focused on the following topics: 1) National Societies' **auxiliary role** and the challenges it poses to the application of the Principles; 2) **partnerships**, both within and outside the Movement (coordination), and potential tensions with the Principles; 3) the relationship between **neutrality, access and public advocacy**; and 4) the **role and responsibilities of the leadership** in the application of the Principles. During a brief session at the end, participants were informed of upcoming projects linked to the 50th anniversary of the Fundamental Principles and the place that the Principles will hold at the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent in December 2015.

In terms of methodology, a large part of the workshop was devoted to the sharing of experiences among participants, combined with presentations by individual National Societies on the challenges encountered and good practices developed, group work on hypothetical

KEY POINTS FROM THE NAIROBI WORKSHOP

- Ø National Societies must have a solid **legal and statutory base** as a primary means to preserve the independence of the National Society.
- Ø National Societies must maintain a **regular dialogue** with the authorities and ensure **constant communication** with the public and all other actors of influence. Having an established and solid dialogue, **including in times of peace**, is essential in order to be able to resist potential requests from authorities that would not respect the principles.
- Ø **Proximity to the authorities** is an advantage, but must be constantly reassessed in order not to compromise National Societies' independence. The same applies to ties between a National Society's leadership or staff members and political circles, which may engender significant risks of perception and must be kept in check.
- Ø Partnerships can help to cover more extensive needs and **strengthen the principles of humanity and impartiality**, but can also impact perception of neutrality and independence. Particular care must be taken when entering into large and long term partnerships, for instance with some UN agencies, **to preserve the ability of a National Society to respond to emerging needs whilst maintaining commitments** taken as part of this partnership.
- Ø A **lack of coordination** within the Movement undermines the Principles, in particular impartiality and unity, while **better coordination** strengthens the Movement and its universal and coherent application of the Principles.
- Ø The Principles provide **a framework for concrete decision-making**, especially when confronted by dilemmas arising from public communication, advocacy and campaigning.
- Ø The **leadership of a National Society** has an essential role to play in the application of the Principles, be it at institutional, operational or individual level.

case studies, discussions on ethical dilemmas, and plenary debates. The workshop was held under the **Chatham House rules** and the specific examples reported in this document were consequently anonymized.

The present report is structured according to the abovementioned themes and, in conclusion, highlights certain recurring points and cross-cutting observations.

THE AUXILIARY ROLE AND THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

National Societies' auxiliary role to the public authorities in the humanitarian field, and in particular the tension that exists between this role and the principle of independence but also the principle of Neutrality, generated considerable interest and rich discussion.

While the auxiliary role is a specific relationship which is recognized as having significant advantages, such as a privileged access to the authorities, presentations from participants highlighted that the added value of this relationship depends upon authorities having a strong understanding of the concept and an ongoing dialogue between them and the National Society.

« Our auxiliary is a perpetual negotiation with authorities »

Moreover, the nature of this **continuous dialogue** was emphasized. One participant commented that auxiliary is a perpetual negotiation to be revisited regularly. The concept of auxiliary relationship and what it means in practice must be the object of regular discussions with the authorities so that they understand well the need for the National Society to respect the Fundamental Principles.

The question of how a National Society can decline a request from its government that would be in contradiction with the Principles generated extensive debate. It was acknowledged that the dialogue with the authorities can be qualified as being of a "diplomatic nature". While a bold and direct "no" is rarely a useful response, there are often ways to find creative solutions to accommodate a request from the State while respecting the Fundamental Principles. This can be done by accepting a certain aspect of the request or proposing an alternative solution (see text box).

The importance of having **comprehensive Statutes and a domestic Red Cross/Red Crescent law** in place, which specifically includes respect for the Fundamental Principles as the basis of the National Society's work, was highlighted regularly by participants as a primary means to

Successfully navigating difficult requests

National Societies use a variety of strategies to address direct requests made by the authorities while working in accordance with the Fundamental Principles. One participant described arriving at his office to find authorities preparing to use the National Society's office as a voting station for the following day's election. With the help of the ICRC and the International Federation, the NS' Secretary General met with the authorities to explain the need for the Red Cross to preserve its neutrality, in order to address humanitarian concerns, by not being seen as part of the political or electoral process. The NS assisted the authorities to find a more suitable location.

In another example, a National Society described how, when providing disaster relief in a flood, government members had required the NS to provide their distribution lists. The NS feared the motive behind the request was to gain political mileage. Fortunately, the NS had previously sensitized some government officials who could explain to their colleagues why the NS could not comply with the request.

Both examples demonstrate the importance of an ongoing dialogue with government officials, and the need to incorporate such dialogue into all preparedness planning.

preserve the independence of the National Society and avoid interference from authorities.

In addition, reminding the authorities of the Resolutions of the International Conference that they have themselves adopted was also mentioned as an important but underutilized tool. In particular, States have committed through the Statutes of the RCRC Movement to respect the adherence of National Societies to the Fundamental Principles,³ a commitment that was reiterated on numerous occasions in resolutions of the International Conference.⁴ It is therefore the responsibility of National Societies to remind their public authorities of this commitment by establishing a "**balanced relationship**", consisting in a constant and transparent dialogue on the respective role and responsibilities of National Societies and their governments, including the duty of a National Society to decline requests that would not be consistent with the Fundamental Principles.⁵

Some participants were concerned about the peculiarities of the nature of the auxiliary relationship in conflict situations. Whilst acknowledging that this was not always easy, participants highlighted the importance of being able to resist requests that would be or could be perceived as in contradiction with any of the Fundamental Principles, in particular those of

³ Article 2 (4) of the Statutes of the RCRC Movement states that: "The States shall at all times respect the adherence by all components of the Movement to the Fundamental Principles."

⁴ For instance, resolution 2, para. 4(b), adopted at the 30th International Conference in 2007 states that: "States must refrain from requesting National Societies to perform activities which are in conflict with the Fundamental Principles".

⁵ The notion of "balanced relationship" was also endorsed in resolution 2 of the 2007 International Conference.

impartiality, independence or neutrality. Being able to resist requests during situations of conflict requires **a solid dialogue be already established in times of peace.**

« From peacetime to conflict, things have changed drastically. »

In the same vein, a participant emphasized that **establishing solid institutional bases in peacetime** could also contribute to better managing the relationship with the public authorities in the event of conflict. Guided by the principle of Unity, this National Society took great care to develop its capacity to operate throughout the country and to have a staff and volunteer basis that represented in a balanced manner the numerous ethnic groups present in the country. This proved critical a few years later when the country descended into conflict and the National Society had to take some distance from its government, itself a party to the conflict, to be able to provide impartial humanitarian services to all those in need

PARTNERSHIPS AND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

The session on partnerships and the Fundamental Principles focused on two types of partnerships: those with actors outside the Movement and those with other components of the Movement, the latter being linked to issues of coordination. These two types of partnerships raised a number of similar issues in relation to the Fundamental Principles. While it was recognized that partnerships can enhance the impartiality of the response by ensuring greater coverage of needs, they also risk compromising the perception of the National Society as neutral and independent because of the reputation of the external partner. Issues of coordination within the Movement were seen to sometime pose some challenges specific to the principles of Unity and Universality.

Participants highlighted the caution needed and the proper risk analysis that was necessary before **partnering with external actors**. Such caution is even more acutely needed in times of conflict when external actors may have different agendas and may be perceived rightly or wrongly as siding with one party to the conflict. Participants reminded that the consequences of poor decisions can have a dire impact in terms of safety and security of volunteers and staff of the National Society itself, as well as those of other Movement components, and of access to affected communities.

With regard to UN agencies, a range of experience and opinion was expressed. While many National Societies had positive partnership experience with the UN, one Society chose not to partner with UN agencies because of the so-called “triple agenda” of the UN in its contexts: humanitarian, but also political and military. As the UN system suffers from perception and acceptance problem by some parties to the conflict in that specific country, a partnership would entail significant risks for the National Society. On the other side of the spectrum, the same participant acknowledged that partnering with vocal NGOs such as Oxfam or MSF must

also be carefully assessed, since it can at times affect the perceived neutrality of the society should these NGOs engage in “aggressive” public advocacy.

Other concerns included the perception that UN agencies were sometime looking for short lived partnerships which could potentially distract significant resources from the usual activities of the National Society. On the other hand, the fact is that UN agencies do dispose of significant resources that are tempting, as partnering with them can allow to assist large numbers of beneficiaries. In sum, participants agreed that the decision to partner with external actors is highly contextual and must always be carefully assessed. Indeed, depending on the situation in the country and on the nature and activities of the external actor, partnership can either consolidate the impartiality of the response or impact its perceived neutrality and independence.

A complex partnership

In a highly sensitive conflict environment crowded by humanitarian organisations, National Societies acknowledge both benefits and challenges to partnering with UN agencies. One NS recognized for instance the benefits of working with a UN agency to bolster its health activities. However, due to negative perceptions of the UN by an armed group that could significantly impact the safety of its staff, it had to work through the ICRC as a go-between to avoid any visible association with the UN.

Another NS, working as a large partner for a UN agency’s specific program, found that implementing the agreement required use of NS resources (including human resources / volunteers) which resulted in focusing on this specific program to the detriment of their own priorities. Having made the agreement in a time of peace, the capacity of the NS to respond was compromised when conflict broke out.

Participants also acknowledged the opportunities of **partnering with the private sector** to ensure that they diversified their funding sources as widely as possible in order to be able to respond to humanitarian needs. An essential criteria in deciding when and who to partner with was based on how the public would perceive the partnership and the actions of the corporate company. One National Society was comfortable to partner with a large oil company on a polio prevention program on the basis that the program was small and discrete (with no conditions on the part of the corporate partner with regard to branding or public recognition) and the purpose of the company did not conflict with the mission.

Another NS described how they decided not to partner with a large brewery that was the distributor for Coca-Cola based on the fact that the partnership could be poorly received because of the public health issues and social impact related to the consumption of alcohol.

However, in both cases the decision was taken through discussing with the National Society’s resource mobilisation committees, set up for the purpose of advising on the merits of corporate or other partnerships. The importance of a National Society having clear criteria, such as screening guidelines, for assessing the merits and risks of a partnership was

emphasised as an important tool.⁶ Ultimately proposed partnerships should maintain the trust of the National Society by the public and ensure that the National Society was seen to act according to the Fundamental Principles.

“Solidarity does not mean substitution”.

Regarding the question of **coordination within the Movement** in relation to the Fundamental Principles, the main issue raised related to Participating National Societies who were working without coordination on the territory of an Operating National Society. In some cases, these Societies were working on behalf of their government, resulting in the perception of being aligned on their country’s foreign policy rather than carrying out activities in a neutral and impartial way. This created tensions, security risks and reputational problems for the Operating National Society and other Movement components active in that country.

Some PNS were said to justify unilateral work by the fact that there was a gap in the capacity of an operating National Society. However whether a question of access or technical capacity this clearly should not happen.⁷ Instead, these PNS should coordinate with the ICRC and the National Society if the gap is linked to access to a conflict zone. In situations where Participating National Societies deem necessary to implement some activities due to the lack of capacity of the Operating National Society, this should always be in a coordinated manner and accompanied by capacity strengthening measures. Participants agreed with the premise that “solidarity does not mean substitution”.

BALANCING NEUTRALITY, ACCESS AND ADVOCACY

The session on neutrality, access and advocacy highlighted the value of the Fundamental Principles as a **framework for concrete decision-making**. The operational dimension of the seven Fundamental Principles as a means for a National Society to implement its mandate was underlined. In polarized contexts, such as armed conflict and other situations of violence, the importance of applying the Principles in a strict but non-doctrinaire manner was also recalled.

⁶ Reference was also made to the “Minimum elements to be included in operational agreements between Movement components and their external operational partners”, annexed to resolution 10 of the 2003 Council of Delegates, which provides guidance for drafting partnership agreements, as well as to the “Movement policy for corporate sector partnerships”, annexed to resolution 10 of the 2005 Council of Delegates..

⁷ Resolution 11 adopted at the 10th International Conference in 1921 states that National Societies operating in another country should first seek consent of that country’s National Society. Article 3.3 of the Statutes stipulate that “Internationally, National Societies, each within the limits of its resources, give assistance for victims of armed conflicts, as provided in the Geneva Conventions, and for victims of natural disasters and other emergencies. Such assistance, in the form of services and personnel, of material, financial and moral support, shall be given through the National Societies concerned, the International Committee or the Federation.”

Discussions were held on the question of balancing neutrality, access and advocacy. One of the key starting points to decide how best to navigate decision making in this area was to say that **context matters**. For instance, the case of signing a petition from an NGO promoting human rights can be unacceptable in some countries while acceptable in others. In all contexts, however, it was seen as essential to consider the motive of the other organisations involved and to be mindful that using the name of a Movement component can bring a level of legitimacy to a cause. It was also important for a National Society to choose its partners carefully, as even there was a risk that the National Society could be implicated in or linked to other actions of the NGOs.

The hypothetical scenario that asked whether it was acceptable for a local branch to say a prayer before a meeting provoked animated discussion, with both points for and against being argued strongly. Context was again key. One participant noted that a National Society reflects its country's culture and it might be an accepted practice across all organisations in a particular country with no risk of anyone feeling excluded from the activity.

Participants agreed that the practice was not useful if there was any risk of alienating or excluding volunteers or if a context was sensitive and the community makeup included a diverse range of religious affiliations. Reading aloud the principles or making a simple pledge were suggested as possible alternatives that reinforced the importance of a National Society as being neutral and impartial, and open to all religions.

Challenges related to the rise of the use of social media by staff and volunteers promoted robust discussion. The issue of how and when a volunteer can be said to represent the National Society have always been an issue, but social media provides a higher level of immediate external scrutiny. Participants recalled that Codes of Conduct for staff and volunteer behaviour are helpful to set clear standards and that leaders must set the right policies for both the public and the private sphere, striking the necessary balance between a certain professional duty of discretion and the freedom of speech and expression.

Participants agreed that there was often confusion between the application of Neutrality and Impartiality. However it was readily identified that while Impartiality requires assistance to be given based on need alone, in order to maintain the trust and confidence – and, indeed, the safety of the personnel – it is sometimes necessary to take into consideration not only the needs of the most vulnerable, but also those of communities nearby, even if less acute, to avoid tensions between communities and perception problems in the area. Thus, pragmatism and agility in implementing the Fundamental principles was emphasized.

PRINCIPLED HUMANITARIAN LEADERSHIP

As presented at the workshop on the Fundamental Principles at the 2013 Council of Delegates, the regional workshops were conceived to provide, among other things, “an opportunity for leaders to reflect on what changes they can make in their own organisations to more effectively utilise the Fundamental Principles in their broader practice”. To this end, the participants were encouraged to reflect on their roles and responsibilities in ensuring respect for the Principles, and on how each of them used the Principles to address day-to-day challenges and problems.

The discussion on leadership highlighted three levels at which the Fundamental Principles had a clear role to play: The **institutional level**, i.e. the establishment of a normative framework centred on the Principles; the **operational level** where participants discussed the tools available for putting the Fundamental Principles into practice, such as the Organizational Capacity Assessment and Certification (OCAC) developed by the International Federation⁸ and the Safer Access Framework developed by the ICRC⁹; and finally the **individual level**. At the individual level, the qualities expected of a leader are many and diverse – moral, intellectual, managerial and relational.

“It starts with my own actions as a humanitarian leader ...
the focus must be on serving the vulnerable people.”

The message was clearly put that “charity starts at home”, meaning that leaders must be able to walk the talk of the respect of the Fundamental Principles.

Leaders must live the Fundamental Principles, but also be able to contextualize them in their country and be able to adapt their speech in order to convince decision makers and other actors of influence (see text box), but also to guide their own staff, from the volunteers to the manager. A leader is not just leading an organization but is also leader of the community and must always remember the purpose of the organization and focus on serving the vulnerable people.

⁸ For more information on this tool, see the following FedNet link: <https://fednet.ifrc.org/en/resources/ns-development/national-society-development/organisational-capacity-assessment--certification1/>.

⁹ The Safer Access tool is available at: <https://www.icrc.org/saferaccess>

Talking to all

Several participants emphasized the primary responsibility of leaders to **engage all actors, including political opposition or non-state armed groups**, in order to both demonstrate and explain the principles that guide the Movement's action. While critical in armed conflict, it is also important in peacetime so that Movement's action is known, understood and trusted in the event of crisis.

Acknowledging the challenge of engaging radical armed groups that would reject the Fundamental Principles, participants insisted that a good principled leader must be able to **adjust the language and contextualize the principles** to the interlocutors' cultural or religious background. Consistency in the application of the principles, coupled with pragmatism and agility, often provide the best argument.

Key factors and attributes identified by participants as important for leaders included the ability to win the trust and confidence of the public, be objective and open and uphold the principle of Humanity in a personal way. For one participant, a principled leader could be described as being "just, fair, honest, transparent, and accountable of his/her actions to the vulnerable".

Training and induction to educate staff and volunteers was acknowledged by all as imperative for a strong National Society, as well as implementing policies such as a Code of Conduct which link the principles to individual responsibility and behaviour. Participants highly appreciated the case studies used during the workshop and emphasized how important it is to use such scenario-based exercises and simulations in training on Fundamental Principles, in order to highlight the practical framework provided by the principles to guide decision-making. A participant also insisted on the importance to educate people on the Fundamental Principles during peacetime, to prepare for the occurrence of war.

Some participants mentioned the importance of strong provisions for taking action if a staff member, volunteer or governance member is not complying with the Fundamental Principles. One National Society described how in the event of a transgression, there is a local committee set up and the concerned people will be asked to explain themselves.

CONCLUSIONS

Beyond being an opportunity to exchange ideas on the challenges and good practices in the application of the Fundamental Principles and providing a forum for ongoing discussion and mutual support, the workshop reaffirmed the central place and crucial importance of the Principles for National Societies.

As suggested by one participant, our seven Fundamental Principles provide a living framework for action and leave room for creativity and pragmatism. In order to use them in an optimal manner, a sound understanding and ability to consider **context** and take **pragmatic decisions** are key. Another participant reflected upon the fact that every conversation throughout the workshop ultimately turned to a question of trust and the need for the National Society to

have the confidence of all – not only of governments, but also of the community, the beneficiaries, and all those who oppose or distrust the public authorities.

To achieve this level of trust, the need for the following were emphasised:

- **Continuous dialogue** with all relevant players, particularly with government authorities, regarding the Fundamental Principles and the auxiliary role of National Societies.
- To **prepare in peacetime for occurrence of conflict**, acknowledging that the application of Fundamental Principles is more sensitive in conflict.
- National Societies are regularly making difficult choices or imperfect decisions, and the application of the principles often require a **balancing act** between competing priorities and the principles. For example, a decision where to direct assistance may require a balance between Impartiality and Neutrality.
- The importance of a **cohesive Movement approach** and the acknowledgment that Movement components are complementary. The ICRC/Federation can sometime support National Societies in responding to requests by their governments.

ANNEX 1 – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

National Society	NAME, First name	Function
Angola RC	BOMBO GUANGE QUIFICA, Valter	Secretary General
Burundi RC	KANTABAZE, Pamphile	President
Ethiopia RC	TAMRAT, Wondwosen	Board member
Ethiopia RC	GAMECHU, Hagos	Deputy Secretary General
Kenya RC	GULLET, Abbas	Secretary General
Kenya RC	MOHAMMED, Asha	Deputy Secretary General
Lesotho RC	KITLELI, Teboho	Secretary General
Madagascar RC	FANJA NANTENAINA, Ratsimbazafy	Secretary General
Mauritius RC	JAWAHEER, Oormeela	President
Sao Tome & Principe RC	NETO, Alberto	Secretary General
Seychelles RC	SERVINA, Julia Colette	Secretary General
Somalia RC	ABDI, Abdulkadir Ibrahim Haji	Director Communication & Organization Development
Somalia RC	HASSAN, Dr Ahmed Mohamed	President
Somalia RC	MOHAMED, Yusuf Hasan	Vice-President
South Sudan RC	LOBOR, John	Secretary General
South Sudan RC	DUHOR, Joseph	President
Sudan RC	GAFAR ABDALLA, Osman	Secretary General
Sudan RC	KHOGALY, Asmaa	ICD Director
Swaziland RC	KHUMALO, Simon Thulani	Vice President
Tanzania RC	GAMA, Zainab Amir	Vice President
Zimbabwe RC	PHIRI, Maxwell	Secretary General
Zimbabwe RC	SITAMBULI, Kimu	President
ICRC/Federation	NAME, First name	Function
ICRC	MARCLAY, Eric	Head of Operations for East Africa
ICRC	SANDOZ, Jean-Christophe	Deputy Director, Department of International Law & Policy
ICRC	LABBE, Jeremie	Head of Project - Humanitarian Principles
ICRC	POMMIER, Bruno	Deputy Head of Division for Coordination and Cooperation within the Movement
ICRC	LUYET, Nicolas	Head of Project on Movement Coordination
ICRC	BARSTAD, Kristin	Adviser on Movement Policies
ICRC	MARTIN, Catherine Marie	Adviser on Movement thematic issues and statutory meetings
ICRC	BRASSARD-BOUDREAU, Cynthia	Adviser, Project SMCC
Federation	TOMAR, Bhupinder	Senior Officer, Disaster Preparedness
Federation	BONZON, Tiziana	Unit Manager
Federation	HOSTENS, Karen	Senior Policy Adviser
Federation	DODD, Rebecca	Senior Officer, Fundamental Principles Project

DAY 1 – Challenges and dilemmas				
Time	Topic	Description	Responsible	Objectives and key questions
8h45-9h00	REGISTRATION OF PARTICIPANTS			
9h00-9h15	Opening Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome to FP and SMCC workshops - Welcome to FP workshop 	Kenyan Red Cross (KRCS) ICRC HoRD & IFRC Zone	
9h15-9h45	Introduction to Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of Movement-wide initiative - Objectives of workshop - Presentation of agenda - Introduction of participants (+ expectations) 	Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participants understand Movement initiative and objectives of workshop. - Organizers understand participants' expectations.
9h45-10h15	Warm up session on Fundamental Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 747 puzzle (warm up game) - Overview of FP (normative framework) 	ICRC/IFRC fileholders	Foster joint reflection on content of FP and understanding of normative framework.
10h15-10h45	Session 1 – FP and the Auxiliary Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of concepts (definition of auxiliary role, links with FP, etc.) - Presentation by NS – Sharing of experience, based on practical approaches/dilemma - Q&A session / discussion on presentation 	Chair ICRC/IFRC fileholders Zimbabwe Red Cross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good practices in maximizing impact of auxiliary role in full respect of the FPs. - Challenges to independence and neutrality resulting from auxiliary role. - Instances where auxiliary role impacts acceptance/access.
10h45-11h15	COFFEE BREAK			
11h15-12h00	Session 1 (cont'd)	Group work session based on case studies	Participants	
12h00-12h45	Session 1 (cont'd)	Restitution in plenary + discussion	Chair	
12h45-14h00	LUNCH BREAK			
14h00-14h40	Session 2 – FP and Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of concepts (both External Partnership and Movement Coordination) 	Chair ICRC/IFRC fileholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify how external partnerships can impact Neutrality, Independence, and Impartiality

		- Presentation by 2 NS on External Partnerships & Movement Coordination – Sharing of experience, based on practical approaches/dilemma		Somalia Red Crescent & South Sudan Red Cross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reflect on good practices and “red lines” in partnering with external actors. - Discuss the link and possible tensions between Movement Coordination and impartiality and unity.
14h40-15h20	Session 2 (cont’d)	External Partnerships Group work, continuation of session 1 case study	Movement Coordination Group work, continuation of session 1 case study	Participants	
15h20-15h40	COFFEE BREAK				
15h40-16h30	Session 2 (cont’d)	Plenary discussion Report on the 2 working groups (rapporteurs) + discussion		Chair	
16h30-17h15	Session 3 – Open Session	Open discussion based on feedback received ahead of Workshop and issues arising from Day 1		Chair	Address specific concerns of participants related to FP not covered by agenda.
17h15-17h30		Brief wrap-up of Day 1 and information for Day 2		Chair	

DAY 2 – The role of principled humanitarian leadership					
Discussion on the 32nd International Conference					
Time	Topic	Description	Responsible	Objectives and key questions	
9h00-9h15	Introduction to Day 2	Introduction of day 2 programme	Chair		
9h15-10h15	Session 4 – Balancing Neutrality, Access and Advocacy	Interactive session based on short ethical dilemma	Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discuss challenges raised by public advocacy with regard to neutrality, perception and access issues. 	
10h15-10h45	COFFEE BREAK				

10h45-11h45	Session 5 – Principled humanitarian leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of Session - Presentation of tools (OCAC and SAF) 	Chair (KRCS) ICRC/IFRC fileholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building on previous day discussions, identify how NS leaders can walk the talk. - Identify existing tools and guidance for principled leadership and governance. - Share good practices regarding compliance with FP within NS (dissemination, training, etc.). - Discuss how to better ensure NS integrity.
11h45-12h15	Session 5 (cont'd)	Group discussion	Participants	
12h15-13h00	Session 5 (cont'd)	Restitution in plenary + discussion	Chair (KRCS)	
13h00-14h30	LUNCH BREAK			
14h30-15h30	Session 6 – FP and 32nd International Conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of concept and timeline - Plenary discussion with participants 	Chair ICRC/IFRC fileholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inform participants on preparation of 32nd IC and expected outcomes - Take stock of participants' expectations and concerns related to FP and the 32nd IC.
15h30-16h00	Final Wrap-up and Closing Remarks	Summary of workshop and way forward	Chair	