

REAFFIRMING THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES: A MOVEMENT-WIDE INITIATIVE

Regional workshops for Europe

Asghabat, 6 May 2015 and Budapest, 4 June 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 The main activity 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 two workshops organized for Europe by the International Federation with the support of the ICRC. The first meeting was organized in Asghabat, Turkmenistan, on 6 May 2015. The second workshop took place in Budapest, Hungary, on 4 June 2015. These two meetings were preceded by other regional workshops in Beirut, in March 2014; in Nairobi and Dakar in March 2015; in Kuala Lumpur in April 2015; and will be followed by a last workshop for the Americas in July 2015.

The Asghabat workshop, hosted by the Turkmenistan Red Crescent, took place over half a day and brought together 21 participants from 13 National Societies, mainly from Central Asia. The Budapest workshop, hosted by the Hungarian Red Cross, lasted one day and brought together 31 participants from 21 National Societies (see annexed list of participants).

STRUCTURE OF THE WORKSHOP AND THE REPORT

The workshops were structured around four broad themes that were also addressed in previous workshops, to maintain some consistency within the Movement-wide initiative (see annexed agendas), albeit the Ashgabat meeting was limited in time. These themes came up repeatedly during the consultations organized within the Movement in 2013 in the run-up to the Council of Delegates in Sydney.² Thus, participants focused on the following topics: 1) National Societies' unique **auxiliary role** and the challenges it poses to the application of the Principles; 2) **partnerships**, both within and outside the Movement (coordination), and

¹ The report of this workshop is available at: <https://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/red-cross-crescent-movement/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.

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 workshops 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 case studies and on ethical dilemmas, and plenary debates. The workshop was held under the **Chatham House rules** and participants' remarks remain anonymous, except when they have expressly agreed that the specific examples they mentioned during the discussion be shared in this report.

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

SOME KEY POINTS FROM THE EUROPE WORKSHOPS

- Ø **A balanced relationship:** Acting as auxiliary to its Government in the humanitarian field – while upholding the principles of Independence, Impartiality and Neutrality – requires constant dialogue of the National Society with its authorities to clarify its limits and the obligations of the Government to respect these limits. It also requires a certain financial autonomy so that the NS is able to act in a manner that is totally independent from politics.
- Ø **Managing perceptions:** NS must carefully consider accepting demands from its Government that can lead to a risk of the NS being perceived as implementing its Government policy, be it in its own country (on migration issues for example) or abroad (such as in conflict situations).
- Ø **Managing partnerships:** Partnerships with external actors must be based on the NS' own assessments of needs in order to ensure respect of the principles of Independence and Impartiality and with consideration of the reputation of the partner in the eyes of the authorities and communities to ensure that the NS is able to continue to maintain the confidence of all and act consistent with the principle of Neutrality.
- Ø A National Society needs the **trust and support of the community** to do its work and the relationship must be well established before a crisis occurs. Working consistently in accordance with the Principles is the basis of establishing the trust.
- Ø **Respecting coordination requirements:** NS operating internationally must coordinate their activities with the host NS and with other components of the Movement to respect the principles of Unity and Universality, but also of Independence, Impartiality and even Neutrality.
- Ø **Advocating impartially:** NS may decide to engage in public advocacy campaigns when this is deemed necessary to defend the principles of Humanity and Impartiality but must always base this engagement on its own work and activities and ensure, through a thorough risk assessment, that this does not affect its ability to maintain a meaningful dialogue with its public authorities.

THE AUXILIARY ROLE AND THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

The role of National Societies as auxiliary to the public authorities in the humanitarian field raised a number of issues for the participants. While the auxiliary status places National Societies in a unique position, enabling them to develop a wide range of humanitarian services, this close relationship to governments also creates at times some tensions with the principles of Neutrality and Independence in particular.

For instance, a participant acknowledged that many National Societies today are much more than auxiliary to their public authorities in the humanitarian field, but can be **perceived by the public opinion as part of the public services**. This is the case for instance when they manage wide-ranging ambulance services or blood banks at the national level. In addition, some National Societies have most of their financial resources coming from governmental contracts that are open to public biddings and, therefore, subject to the laws and regulations governing public contracts. In this type of situation, National Societies can be bound by clauses enshrined in the contract that run counter to some of the Fundamental Principles, but which are not open to negotiation. For instance, this participant asked, what could a National Society do about a clause that would exclude irregular migrants from contracted ambulance services, in contradiction to the principle of Impartiality? Another participant disagreed that National Societies should be bound by such clauses. It was emphasized that 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 in Resolution 2 of the 2007 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.⁵

Another example highlighted the importance of ongoing dialogue with government: when a National Society was approached by an Ambassador to provide assistance to his country's citizens as a priority in a situation of conflict, the National Society considered the request but declined to assist, explaining that any assistance would be prioritised based on needs only. When the Ambassador complained to the relevant Minister of the government, the government supported the actions of the National Society because it was well informed of the importance of the Fundamental Principles thanks to this continuous dialogue.

The specific challenges linked to the **role of auxiliary to the armed forces' medical services** were also raised. This is the traditional role of National Societies as auxiliary to their public authorities, which dates back to the origins of the Movement, although only a few Societies still have this responsibility today. This role presents specific challenges to the principles of Neutrality and Independence since article 26 of the first Geneva Conventions provides that, in such cases, National Societies' staff “are subject to military laws and regulations”. A

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 Resolution 2, para. 4(b), adopted at 30th International Conference in 2007: “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.

participant acknowledged the significant tensions that this role raises for its National Society – a role regulated by domestic law in the particular case – and emphasized the importance of developing a sustained and transparent dialogue with its government to manage this tension. Once again, such a “balanced relationship” can create the level of trust and mutual understanding necessary to enable a National Society to say “no” to its government when such request would be in flagrant contradiction to the Fundamental Principles and pose unacceptable risks for the reputation of the Society and the broader RCRC Movement. A recent example of such refusal was mentioned, in a case where the government had asked its National Society to provide medical services to troops deployed as part of a peacekeeping mission, in a context where such association would have led to a clear breach of Neutrality and Independence.

Beside this specific role of medical auxiliary, this example was echoed by other National Societies asked by their governments to provide humanitarian services in **other countries where their authorities had foreign policy stakes**. For instance, a participant shared the experience of a National Society asked to provide humanitarian services in a particular province of Afghanistan where its government had a limited number of troops deployed as part of the NATO force in the country. Driven mostly by the principles of Impartiality, Neutrality and Independence, this National Society declined this request as the most severe needs were not in this province and it would have fueled the perception of being a puppet of its government’s foreign policy, potentially impacting the reputation of the broader RCRC Movement in the country. However, another participant felt that it was not easy to navigate the tension between the auxiliary role and Fundamental Principles in situations of asymmetrical warfare or counter-terrorism missions in third countries, and suggested that National Societies could benefit from more guidance in that respect. Criteria for engaging could be clearer, and there should be sanctions within the Movement for those not respecting.

Finally, the role of National Societies, as auxiliary to their public authorities, in addressing the need of migrants triggered some heated debates (see also the text box). A question was raised regarding **forced repatriation of migrants**, and whether National Societies should provide medical assistance if requested under these circumstances. Replies varied from clear refusal to providing staff on loan not carrying the Red Cross emblem when providing aid to avoid reputational risks, to the more extreme suggestion that it could

Immigration, xenophobia and Fundamental Principles

In December 2013, the Board of the Swedish Red Cross took a position of zero tolerance regarding racism, intolerance and other forms of discrimination within the organisation. This was linked to a project named « Mission Humanity », which sought to reflect internally on how, as guardians of the Fundamental Principles, volunteers and staff translate the principles into action. Regional and local branches were asked about their experience with racism, discrimination or intolerance during their everyday work and lives, and the answer was overwhelmingly “yes”.

What started as a project is now an approach embedded across the whole organisation to focus on the principles of Humanity and Impartiality as the basis for its actions. This internal reflection has been accompanied by efforts to expand access to services for immigrant and refugee groups, focusing on respect for their human dignity and practical skills.

be done in the interest of Humanity if in all the circumstances this was the only way to ensure a humane process. Some participants stressed that it must be kept in mind that participating in forced repatriation in any form may result in adverse effects for National Societies in the country of origin if forced returnees are accompanied by Red Cross staff.

PARTNERSHIPS AND THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

Discussions 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 coordination and better coverage of needs, they also risk compromising Neutrality and Independence because the reputation of the external partner can tarnish perception of the National Society, and that of the Movement as a whole. Meanwhile, issues of coordination within the Movement pose some challenges specific to the principles of Unity and Universality.

For the participants, it was vital that activities carried out with **external partners** were based on assessments conducted in the field by the National Society itself and not by other entities. Such assessments would ensure that any ensuing activities complied with the Fundamental Principles. The partner’s reputation and others’ perception of it should also, of course, be checked before any such partnership was concluded. In cases of partnerships with UN agencies, participants agreed that National Societies should look at the reputation of the UN in a given context. For example, in situations where a peacekeeping force is deployed, special care should be taken to assess how the UN is perceived and whether this could impact the perception of neutrality of the Movement.

Participants also agreed that in **contexts where a Participating National Society (PNS) operates in another country**, partnerships with external actors can also impact the principles of Unity and Universality as it interlinks with Movement coordination. In these type of situations, participants noted that the first reflex should be to consult with other Movement actors, including the ICRC, the Federation and the Operating National Society (ONS), before entering into a partnership. For instance, a participant mentioned a concrete example in Niger where the PNS entered into an agreement with a UN agency to provide humanitarian services

Implementing partner and maintaining long term impartial humanitarian assistance.

As an implementing partner of UNHCR for many years, one National Society explained a Memorandum of Understanding was agreed each year with the UN agency which provided the funding for assisting migrants. The partnership is mutually beneficial as the UN relies on the expertise and abilities of the NS to collect necessary information and assess needs, while the NS is able to reach a greater number of people thanks to the funding whilst retaining the ability to assess for themselves those who are the most in need.

Whilst this long standing relationship has been a benefit for both sides, the NS has recognised the importance of diversifying its income in order to act impartially, to be in a position to address the ongoing and future needs and to maintain the program once the funding from the UNHCR is discontinued, whenever that might be.

to refugee camps. This partnership was accepted only after consulting with the ICRC delegation in the country and the ONS, and ensuring that it would not negatively impact the ability of the National Society to respect the Principles or the reputation of the RCRC in the country.

The discussion moved to the importance of having **clear framework agreements** with model clauses ensuring the partnership will respect the emblem and the ability of the National Society to respect the Fundamental Principles.⁶ While most participants said they have model framework agreements in their National Society, recognizing that such safeguards even led in concrete cases to rejecting partnership agreements contradicting Fundamental Principles, a few acknowledged not having them. A National Society also shared with other participants its practice of organizing regular breakfast meetings with various ambassadors, corporate sector actors and other humanitarian actors to sensitize them on the RCRC Movement, its activities and the importance of its Principles. Such **proactive communication on Fundamental Principles**, which can be compounded by the use of written promotional material, ensure better understanding of the Movement and greater respect of the Principles by potential external partners.

“Humanity is important but it should not trump
the other principles.”

On the subject of **coordination within the Movement** in relation to the Fundamental Principles, most of the discussion focused on the tension between respecting the principles of Unity and Universality, which dictates to consult and coordinate with the host National Society and other Movement components present in a given country, and the principles of Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality and Independence. Participants agreed that the “essential” principle of Humanity, which often provides the motivation to start operating in a country affected by a crisis, should not trump the other principles, including those of Unity and Universality. While the so-called humanitarian imperative often provides a strong motivation to intervene to address existing needs, it should always be interpreted in light of the other principles, which are meant to ensure the consistency and coherency of the Movement. In general, the group rejected the idea of working unilaterally within a country, without engaging with other Movement components, including the ONS.

However, the principles of Impartiality, Neutrality and Independence might be at stake in situations where an ONS is operating under an oppressive regime and is either unwilling or unable to address important humanitarian needs. In such circumstances, some participants suggested that there might be a need for collective action within the Movement to support

⁶ In that respect, it should be noted that the annex to Resolution 10 of the 2003 Council of Delegates presents and explains the “Minimum elements to be included in operational agreements between Movement components and their external operational partners”.

impartial, neutral and independent humanitarian action. Without entirely side-stepping an ONS, presenting the collective voice of the Movement – in application of the principle of Universality – might help explaining to a government how National Societies work and what the Fundamental Principles mean. Indeed, the responsibility to build the capacity of other National Societies should not be limited to technical aspects only, but extend to the capacity to respect the Principles.

NEUTRALITY, ACCESS AND ADVOCACY

A participant reminded the workshop that, whilst in text books the Principles looked nice, the challenge of applying the principle of Neutrality is in reality very difficult and requires leaders, staff and volunteers to ensure that activities were not only consistent with the principle, but also perceived to be consistent. It was essential not to confuse the notion of neutrality with indifference.

Neutrality, perception and access in a polarized context

In 2011, the Northern Ireland branch of the British Red Cross undertook a mapping of the most vulnerable communities and came to the conclusion that it faced genuine access problems, largely due to perception issues. Guided by the principle of Impartiality, it took real leadership and managerial courage to strengthen the perceived neutrality of the NS in a still polarized society, resulting in improved access.

Amongst other measures, the branch adapted its recruitment policy in order to better reflect the demographic reality of the Northern Ireland society; improved and contextualized the training of its staff and volunteers to emphasize the importance of the Principles; and even limited the use of the word “British” in its logo where and when this would constrain its ability to work, due to perceptions in parts of the society.

A National Society shared its experience on how it has used in recent years the Fundamental Principles as a concrete **framework to guide policy- and decision-making**, resulting in greater access to communities in need (see text box).

Besides this example, most of the discussions during this session focused on **public advocacy and respect for the Fundamental Principles**, including the principle of Neutrality and the requisite to abstain to “engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.” Participants had to respond to a case study which asked whether it was appropriate for a fictitious National Society to join a human rights campaign promoting the judicial rights of terrorism suspects, in a country where counter-terrorism is a politically sensitive issue. Most participants considered that Neutrality does not necessarily mean remaining silent on such topics.

It was agreed that **engaging in advocacy first requires a thorough assessment** of the situation, including the political and reputational risks that this entail. Any decision to engage in advocacy should be based on first-hand data and evidence coming from the work of the National Society, and should serve its programmes and activities. In addition, some participants suggested that collaborating with external authoritative experts might help to support the evidence and give a higher degree of objectivity to the argument, precluding the perception that the National Society engages in a baseless controversy. For instance,

collaborating with a renowned professor of economics was mentioned as a good way to counter inflated claims of the “cost” of asylum seekers, without giving the impression to take an ideological stance in the sensitive political debate on migration.

“Neutrality must never be mistaken for indifference.”

Secondly, Movement’s components must consider in their decision all the **different avenues available to conduct advocacy**, including “silent” diplomacy, informal off-the-record meetings with the different stakeholders and public campaigning (referred to as “loud” advocacy). Depending on the sensitivity of the issue in a given context and based on a thorough risk assessment, National Societies can consider more or less discreet advocacy approaches to address issues that are critical to their mandate, while preserving their reputation as a neutral actor and its “balanced relationship” with the public authorities. For instance, a participant cited a situation where the National Society had to take a public position against a request of its government to participate to the resettlement of Syrian Christians only, as this would be in clear contradiction with the principles of Humanity and Impartiality. Although it exposed the National Society to criticisms by the government and some quarters of public opinion, it strengthened at the end of the day the perception of an independent and consistent institution, which is driven by intangible values and principles.

In that respect, a participant cautioned that engaging in advocacy on human rights issues very much depends on the level of “political” development in a country: while taking a public stance on the issue of judicial rights of terrorism suspects might be understood and appreciated (even by the government) in a relatively democratic society, with strong media and civil society, it might be an utterly sensitive issue in a more autocratic system, presenting significant risks to the ability of the National Society to maintain a meaningful dialogue with its public authorities.

HUMANITARIAN LEADERSHIP BASED ON THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

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 internal reform undertaken by the Italian Red Cross in recent years (see text box below⁷) was presented as an interesting example of how principled leadership expresses itself at three

⁷ A public study carried out by the International Federation on this transition and reform process is available online: Tiziana Bonzon, Leadership in Transition: The experience of the Italian Red Cross 2005-2014, Geneva, IFRC, 2015 (https://www.ifrc.org/Global/Documents/Secretariat/201505/1285400-Italian%20Case%20study-A4-EN_LR.pdf).

levels: at the **institutional level**, through the establishment of a normative and institutional structure centred on principles; at the **operational level**, by developing and implementing tools that put the principles in practice⁸; and at the **individual level**, reflecting the importance of the moral, intellectual, managerial and relational qualities of a leader, who is expected to set an example, share his or her experience, and run the National Society with integrity and rigour.

In the ensuing discussion, the importance of having leaders who are “fluent” with the Fundamental Principles was stressed. The group agreed that those representing the Movement should have more than a superficial understanding of these principles, and some participants questioned whether all leaders within the Movement have a sufficient knowledge of their value and utility. This remark compounded the idea that, more than additional guidance to apply the principles, what is needed is **better training and sensitization to the Principles**, including through regular sharing of experience and good practice between peers, such as in the present workshop.

The structure needs to support the action

Until 2005, the Italian Red Cross was legally a public entity that operated in Italy’s public sector. The structure created significant impediments to the ability of the National Society to act in accordance with the principles of Independence and Unity. For example as a public entity in the Italian public sector, the NS was financially dependent on the Italian government. In addition, the IRC had a structure composed of six separate voluntary components as well as branches that operated quite separately and autonomously from one other. The interaction among the voluntary components was challenging and the principle of Unity was at risk.

In 2005, the IRC changed its statutes to become a voluntary association, financially independent of government. At the same time, it also altered its structure to a single integrated voluntary body, so that the ultimate decision making, including allocation of funds, was vested in a central headquarters. The reform was a significant one that created a structure that would strengthen the ability of the IRC to operate in accordance with the Fundamental Principles. However, such a process can be slow to achieve. Such change must be reinforced by strong leadership to guide the process and to continually emphasise and demonstrate the importance of the Principles in every day decision making.

Another participant highlighted that principled leadership is necessary not only from the management but also from the governance of National Societies (such as Presidents or Board Members). Indeed, while those in a managerial position have to deal with the day-to-day reality of managing National Societies, daily reality that might constantly challenge them to

⁸ The Organizational Capacity Assessment Certification (OCAC) developed by the International Federation and the Safer Access Framework (SAF) developed by the ICRC were mentioned throughout the different regional workshops as good examples of such tools that enable the “operationalization” of the Fundamental Principles. More information on these tools are available at: <https://fednet.ifrc.org/en/resources/ns-development/national-society-development/organisational-capacity-assessment--certification1/> and <https://www.icrc.org/saferaccess>.

compromise or indulge on principles, **governance members have a key role to play** as guardian of the principles, since they are not confronted to the same pressures.

The discussion also touched upon the importance of principled leadership at global level, with some participants calling for adapting or reforming existing **Movement's compliance mechanisms**, so that unprincipled humanitarian action or behaviour by a National Society would have consequences. However, the difficulty of the issue was fully acknowledged, including the fact that there is no mechanism within the Movement to take away the emblem from a National Society that would be recurrently and flagrantly breaching the Fundamental Principles.

CONCLUSIONS

These two workshops provided opportunities for participants to openly share and reflect on the experience of their National Societies with regard to the Fundamental Principles. Overall, it confirmed the prevalent impression that came out of the other regional workshops organized as part of the Movement-wide initiative so far: although not always easy to apply and respect, the Fundamental Principles do provide to all Movement components a useful framework to guide decision-making (at institutional, operational and individual level) and to overcome challenges and dilemmas that National Societies may face on a daily basis.

The main takeaway of these workshops are:

- Careful assessment of contexts and risks, in light of the Fundamental Principles, should always precede and guide decision making.
- Most participants felt that there is no need for more tools, guidance or policy on Fundamental Principles, acknowledging that the principles already permeate most of the Movement's normative and policy framework.
- However, echoing what came out of other workshops, they highly valued the opportunity offered in these meetings to share and discuss experience among peers: more regular and frequent sharing of experience, good practices, as well as scenario-based training related to FP would be welcome.

ANNEX 1 – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Title	Organisation
Artur Katuci	Secretary General	Albania RC
Astrit Dervishi	Member Of Steering Council	Albania RC
Vigen Melkonian	Member of Governing Board	Armenia RC
Werner Kerschbaum	Secretary General	Austrian RC
Emilie Goller	Head Of International Relations	Austrian RC
Bayram Valiyev	Secretary General	Azerbaijan RC
Lea Kujundic	Head Of International Affairs	Bosnia & Herzogivina RC
Rajko Lazic	President	Bosnia & Herzogivina RC
Amelia Kyazze	Senior Humanitarian Policy Adviser	British RC
Bob Dewar	Member Of The Board Of Trustees	British RC
Preslava Lilova	Act. Director International Cooperation And Programmes	Bulgarian RC
Anna Hoybye	Senior Advisor To The Secretary General	Danish RC
Riina Kabi	Secretary General	Estonia RC
Ketevan Mindeli	Head Of Health Care Department	Georgia RC
Dr. Johannes Theodor Richert	Director, International Cooperations	German RC
Istvan Kardos	Director General	Hungarian RC
Dr. Zsigmond Gondocs	President	Hungarian RC
Alice Szél	Humanitarian Adviser	Hungarian RC
Mohammad Sh. Mohammadi Araghi	Under-Secretary General Of International Affairs & IHL	Iran RC
Barry O'donovan	National Secretary	Irish RC
John Roche	Interim Secretary General	Irish RC
Guendalina Conte	Special Advisor To The Vice President Of IFRC	Italian RC
Francesco Rocca	Vice President	Italian RC
Yelena Kim	Director General	Khazakstan RC
Tolkyn Issabekova	Deputy Director General	Khazakstan RC
Rustam Aleyev	Secretary General	Kyrgyzstan RC
Chingiz Djakipov	Chairman	Kyrgyzstan RC
Michel Simonis	Secretary General	Luxembourg RC
Sasho Taleski	Head Of Programme Sector	Macedonia RC
Sait Saiti	Secretary General	Macedonia RC
Chaim Rafalowski	EU Projects And DM Coordinator	MDA
Maria Turcan	Vice President	Moldova RC
Natasa Uskokovic	International Relations, Head	Montenegro RC
Gijs De Vries	Secretary General	Netherlands RC
Bas Van Rossum	Chairman European Youth Coordination Committee	Netherlands RC
Preben Marcussen	Senior Advisor	Norwegian RC
Snorre Gundersen	Vice-President	Norwegian RC
Raisa Lukuttsova	President	Russia RC

Sergey Kobets	Head Of International Department	Russia RC
Silvia Kostelna	International Cooperation	Slovak RC
Renata Brunskole	Secretary General	Slovenia RC
Kristina Nemanic	International Relations	Slovenia RC
Anna Carlstedt	President	Swedish RC
Beat Von Daniken	Director, International Cooperation	Swiss RC
Dilorom Mirova	Deputy Secretary General	Tajikistan RC
Murodali Ruzief	Secretary General	Tajikistan RC
Kaan Saner	Head Of International Relations	Turkish RC
Ivan Usichenko	President	Ukraine RC
Valeriy Sergovskyi	Undersecretary General, Head, Int. Department	Ukraine RC
Elvira Amiralieva	Executive Director	Uzbekistan RC
Mirjahongir Mirjaparov	Head Of The Disaster Preparedness Department	Uzbekistan RC

**Agenda for Fundamental Principles Session
RCRC Regional Meeting**

Wednesday 6 May 2015, Ashgabat, Turkmenistan

Time	Topic	Objectives and key questions
09.00-12.30	Turkmenistan RC/Turkmenistan government event on Peace and Neutrality	
12.30-14.00	Lunch	
14.00-14.30	Introduction -Fundamental Principles Session	
14.30 - 16.30	<p>Session 1 –</p> <p>Fundamental Principles and the Auxiliary Role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of concepts (overview of legal base of Fundamental Principles, definition of auxiliary role, links with FP, etc.) - Sharing of experience and discussion by NS - Group work: case studies & plenary 	<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.
16.30-16.45	Coffee break	
16.45 – 17.45	<p>Session 2 –</p> <p>Principled Humanitarian Leadership: tools for the job</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of concepts (overview of existing global tools, aspects of principled humanitarian leadership.) - Sharing of experience and discussion by NS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider the role of the NS leadership as guardians and promoters of the Fundamental Principles - What are the existing tools and guidance for embedding principles into our leadership and governance (what might be the gaps) <p>Best practice to utilise and embed the Fundamental Principles in the work and decision making of our leaders, our staff and our volunteers;</p>
18.00	Closure	

**Regional Consultative Meeting on
Governance Review and Fundamental Principles**

3-4 June, Budapest, Hungary

Day 2 – Thursday 4 th June 2015		
Chair: Francesco Rocca, IFRC Vice-President, Europe Note taking: Alexandra Hulse, Senior Assistant to the Director of Zone		
Schedule	Topic	Speaker / Facilitator
8:30	Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Francesco Rocca, Vice President IFRC
Session 1	<p>Presentation of the Movement wide initiative and the application of the Fundamental Principles</p> <p>Identifications of key working themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Balancing the auxiliary role and Independence 2. Neutrality, access and advocacy 3. External Partnerships and FPs 4. Movement cooperation and FPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebecca Dodd, Senior Officer, Fundamental Principles, IFRC Geneva • Jérémie Labbé, Head of Project, Principles Guiding Humanitarian Action, Dept. of Humanitarian Law and Policy, ICRC • Kristin Barstad, Movement Policy Advisor, ICRC
Session 2	<p>Update on NS initiatives :</p> <p>British RC “Principles to action” project Italian RC Solferino Academy Swedish Red Cross “Mission Humanity”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • British Red Cross • Italian Red Cross • Swedish Red Cross
10:30-10.45	Coffee break	
Session 3	<p>Session on working themes</p> <p>Consider challenges and dilemmas experienced by National Societies and identify good practices used to resolve the issues.</p> <p>Identify existing tools and guidance for embedding principles into operations and governance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebecca Dodd, Senior Officer, Fundamental Principles • Jérémie Labbé, Head of Project, Principles Guiding Humanitarian Action, Dept. of Humanitarian Law and Policy, ICRC • Kristin Barstad, Movement Policy Advisor, ICRC
12:30-13:30	Lunch break	
Session 4	<p>The way forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Movement wide initiative - 50th Anniversary - 32nd International Conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frank Mohrhauer, Head, Cooperation and Governance • Rebecca Dodd • Rudina Pema, Senior Regional Advisor, Europe and Coordinator of the General Assembly 2015 • Jérémie Labbé
14:30- 15:00	Close of meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Francesco Rocca, Vice President IFRC

