**32nd IC – Resolution unique questionnaire – British Red Cross Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Strengthening the Movement response to growing humanitarian needs |
| 1 | **Has your organisation taken action on the implementation of this resolution?**  Yes |
| 2 | **If YES, please describe the actions taken (including challenges encountered if there is any) and provide concrete examples (including written reports, programme information, photos and videos\*)**  **3 key facts and figures**  As of 2 March 2018, the General Assembly’s “Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Humanitarian Assistance” is now considered to be mandatory reading for all British Red Cross staff members who work in the International Directorate.  On 11 February 2019, the British Red Cross launched a new report, *The Case for Complementarity: Working together within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in armed conflict and other situations of violence,* in Geneva. Alexander Matheou, Executive Director of International, British Red Cross, spoke on the panel alongside Yves Daccord, the Director General of the ICRC, Pascale Meige, Director of Crisis Prevention Response and Recovery of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and others. A representative of the UK Permanent Mission was also in attendance. The event was the third in a series of Humanitarian events to explore localisation in contemporary humanitarian action. The executive summary of the report is presented as our story of interest below.  On 12 April 2019, a humanitarian policy adviser, presented learnings from our report, *The Case for Complementarity: Working together within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in armed conflict and other situations of violence,* at an Overseas Development Institute (ODI) workshop. This workshop forms part of an ODI research series on capacity and complementarity between local and international actors, to unpack what ‘as local as possible’ really means.  **2 high resolution pictures with an extended caption**  A link to a video of the launch event for *The Case for Complementarity: Working together within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in armed conflict and other situations of violence* can be found below:  <https://youtu.be/pOnKe9O10Gk>  **1 story of interest**  Extract from *The Case for Complementarity: Working together within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in armed conflict and other situations of violence*  In the last five years, and particularly since the Grand Bargain commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016, discussions on the localisation of aid in the humanitarian sector have abounded. In its message to the WHS in December 2015, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (the Movement) sent a strong message of support for strengthening the role of local and national actors in responding to humanitarian need, while affirming the importance of complementarity with international actors, notably in situations of conflict.  In order to better understand approaches to Movement complementarity and how they may inform the localisation agenda, the British Red Cross (BRC) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) selected three contexts (Colombia, Somalia, and Ukraine) to study how the ICRC and different Movement components work amongst themselves in armed conflict and other situations of violence2 that fall below the threshold of applicability of International Humanitarian Law, to enable principled humanitarian action.  In this research, the term “complementarity” refers to the interaction and comparative advantages3 between local, national and international components of the Movement, taking into account their respective mandates, the Movement’s Fundamental Principles and the operational settings in which they are working. Complementarity can be defined as the combination of strengths that each component can bring in a complementary way that ensures the ability of each individual component, as well as the Movement as a whole, to respond to the humanitarian needs of those affected by conflict. The comparative advantages of each of the Movement’s components, linked to their distinct mandates and identities, form the basis for Movement complementarity. While there are some shared areas of expertise, each component also possesses very distinct attributes, which when combined can enable the Movement to meet the broad range of conflict-related needs of those affected.  The three contexts selected – Colombia, Somalia, and Ukraine – represent different operating environments covering active conflict; protracted conflict; and situations of violence below the threshold of armed conflict (e.g. urban violence). Visits were undertaken to each of the case study countries in order to hold discussions with different components of the Movement – the Host National Society (HNS); the ICRC; Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies supporting the HNS (referred to as Participating National Societies or PNS); and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). Discussions were held with other non-Movement stakeholders in each country and internal and external documentation was reviewed.  The findings from the three country case studies have been used to inform this synthesis study and form the basis for the study’s own key findings and recommendations. Due to the sensitive and confidential nature of the content of the studies themselves, they have not been made available for publication.  The full report is available at:  [**https://www.icrc.org/en/download/file/88335/the-case-for-complementarity-report.pdf**](https://www.icrc.org/en/download/file/88335/the-case-for-complementarity-report.pdf)  **Possible challenges**  Specifically with regards to complementarity, in the British Red Cross’ recent report, the authors discussed a number of factors which may hinder or even undermine complementarity. “These include historical legacies; the strengths and weaknesses of different National Societies; contextual diversity; the mechanisms that have been established for planning and coordination; organisational will; and different approaches to co-location.” Each of these factors are discussed at length in the report. |
| 3 | **If NO, please explain why and describe challenges encountered.**  *N/A* |
|  | **Please click here if the implementation is completed**  *Check yes* |