



Power of humanity

Council of Delegates of the International
Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement

27–28 October 2024, Geneva

Implementation of the Movement Coordination for Collective Impact Agreement (Seville Agreement 2.0)

PROGRESS REPORT

September 2024

EN

CD/24/13
Original: English
For information

Document prepared by
the International Committee of the Red Cross
and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

PROGRESS REPORT

Implementation of the Movement Coordination for Collective Impact Agreement (Seville Agreement 2.0)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

By adopting the Movement Coordination for Collective Impact Agreement (Seville Agreement 2.0), the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (Movement) reaffirmed its commitment to enhance its collective impact through a more inclusive approach to the organization of its components in situations triggering a collective response, as well as in all areas of functional cooperation.

The difference between the old agreement of 1997, with its concept of lead agency, and the new agreement of 2022, with its revised convening and co-convening mechanism, is that the latter places the host National Society at the centre of a collective response and promotes a collaborative approach to Movement coordination.

The fuller implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 is a journey that necessitates changes in mindsets, behaviours and political will within all components of the Movement. And that takes time. Over the past two years, there has been significant learning about and progress in putting the new normative framework into practice.

Recent major operations, in highly complex and sensitive contexts, have shown that investing sufficiently in the host National Society's convening capacities is key to the Movement achieving greater collective impact. Indeed, achieving the full potential of the Seville Agreement 2.0 requires that all Movement components fully assume their respective responsibilities. This means taking responsibility for Movement coordination and being accountable for the faithful implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 and its tools, giving it the appropriate level of priority and the resources necessary to make it happen and seriously addressing differences in the interpretation of responsibilities. It is only through such a commitment and political will that the positive developments observed in the past two years will bear fruit and the identified shortcomings will be overcome.

Based on these findings, this report recommends a number of actions to be undertaken by the different components of the Movement, with a view to enhancing the implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0, such as the need to ensure greater knowledge and understanding of and accountability for the Seville Agreement 2.0; the need for all Movement components to wholly fulfil their assigned roles and responsibilities, including investing in the National Society's capacities as convener; the importance of developing strong coordination and trust early on during normal times and to prepare for crises and emergencies; and the need to improve the coordination of resource mobilization initiatives based on strategic discussions and decisions in-country.

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The Statutes of the Movement define the overall framework according to which coordination among Movement components is organized. The Seville Agreement, adopted by the Council of Delegates in 1997 and complemented by Supplementary Measures in 2005, provided a normative framework on how this coordination among Movement partners should function.

In 2013, the Strengthening Movement Cooperation and Coordination (SMCC) process was launched to revive and revisit Movement coordination. The experiences of the SMCC process exposed the shortcomings of the old agreement and paved the way for the development of the Seville Agreement 2.0, which was adopted by the Council of Delegates in 2022. The Seville Agreement 2.0 provides an updated normative framework for Movement coordination, with the host National Society at the centre of all Movement coordination. The SMCC process ends with the 2024 Council of Delegates,¹ and it is now critical to bring all the different initiatives related to Movement coordination under a coherent Seville Agreement 2.0 umbrella.

This report has been prepared using a set of common indicators identified by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). It presents the initiatives that enable the implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0, progress and learning, and it proposes actionable recommendations.

2. INITIATIVES TO ENABLE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SEVILLE AGREEMENT 2.0

Movement dissemination and training

To assist National Societies in understanding their roles and responsibilities, an explainer document on the Seville Agreement 2.0 was produced by the ICRC and the IFRC and sent to all National Societies in March 2023. Joint briefings to individual National Societies and groups of National Societies have also taken place,² and the IFRC and the ICRC have provided additional support to the Red Cross and Red Crescent regional conferences in discussions on the implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0.³

The IFRC and the ICRC have revised existing training – such as the Movement Induction Course (MIC) for National Society leaders, the IMPACT course and Movement Coordinators in Operations training – in order to align content with the Seville Agreement 2.0. Four MICs⁴ and approximately 20 IMPACT courses have used the revised training materials.

Tools

The IFRC and the ICRC have revised all existing tools developed as part of the SMCC process to ensure alignment with the Seville Agreement 2.0, and they have also revised the template for Movement Coordination Agreements (MCA). The completion of the template revision process in August 2023 resulted in a positive push, with MCAs signed between the host National Society, the IFRC and the ICRC in Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Morocco and Niger.⁵

Capacity strengthening within the IFRC

The IFRC's secretariat conducted orientation sessions in 2022 for its senior managers in delegations and at its headquarters to ensure that the spirit and key elements of the Seville Agreement 2.0 are understood, critical issues identified and expectations clarified.

In parallel, training materials were prepared for IFRC staff with particular attention paid to practical examples on the operationalization of the Seville Agreement 2.0 in various scenarios. The materials continue to evolve as new issues and situations arise. Conscious that

¹ See the "Final report on Strengthening Movement Cooperation and Coordination" to be submitted to the 2024 Council of Delegates.

² For example, the Danish Red Cross in April 2023 and the Armenian Red Cross in June 2023; the annual National Society Legal Advisers' meeting in November 2022 and the European Legal Support Group in June 2023. Additional regional efforts include the working group set up by the IFRC and the ICRC in the Europe region, together with the German Red Cross, the Red Cross of Serbia and the Swiss Red Cross, to develop orientation materials for National Society leaders and operations managers. Related workshops will be rolled out from the third quarter of 2024.

³ In the Americas (June 2023), Africa (September 2023) and Asia and the Pacific (November 2023). Technical assistance on conference follow-ups, such as the monitoring of the Hanoi Declaration of 2023, is ongoing and led by the regions.

⁴ Regional MICs were organized in the Americas at the end of 2022, and in the Africa, Eurasia and Asia Pacific regions in 2023. Some have included a dedicated session on the Seville Agreement 2.0 jointly run by IFRC and ICRC experts, such as the MIC in Europe in May 2023.

⁵ For further information, see the "Final report on Strengthening Movement Cooperation and Coordination" to be submitted to the 2024 Council of Delegates, and the [SMCC Toolkit](#).

continuous learning, knowledge and skills development are needed, the IFRC has also launched online training for staff through its learning platform. A 20-hour training module discusses all aspects of the Seville Agreement 2.0 and analyses various contexts based on learning from major operations. The first training course in February 2024 was aimed at IFRC operations managers worldwide. The online materials will also help to expand future training for National Societies.

A number of heads of delegations and deputy regional directors were identified and selected as focal points specializing in the Seville Agreement 2.0. This group is now growing into an IFRC community of practice and think tank offering expertise in Movement coordination and cooperation, guiding and supporting others in situations that go beyond the text of the Seville Agreement 2.0.

Internal guidance, training and capacity-building within the ICRC

In June and July 2022, all ICRC delegations received the text of the Seville Agreement 2.0, together with an explanatory summary, a Q&A and a checklist specifically for delegations. An ICRC 2022–2024 Strategy on the Implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 (September 2022) was developed, focusing on the ICRC's co-convenor responsibilities in situations of armed conflict and internal strife.

Orientation 4.3 of the new ICRC Strategy 2024–2027 emphasizes the ICRC's commitment to implementing the Seville Agreement 2.0,⁶ which is further operationalized in a related implementation plan. The implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 has also been included in the 2023, 2024 and 2025 planning for results instructions.

New guidance for delegations on how to operationalize the ICRC's co-convenor role was shared from September 2023 onwards.⁷ Movement coordination has been included in the job descriptions and performance appraisals of delegation managers, and various internal ICRC courses have been updated to take into account the Seville Agreement 2.0.⁸ A number of ICRC delegations operating in situations of armed conflict and/or internal strife were provided with real-time guidance.

3. ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Mindset and political will

The Seville Agreement 2.0 represents a major cultural shift in the way the Movement operates – using the collective impact of the Movement as our common compass. In the face of increasingly complex and overlapping crises that exacerbate vulnerabilities and hardship among affected people, the Seville Agreement 2.0 aims to improve coordination between Movement components by promoting an inclusive approach and complementary roles and responsibilities. The first two years of implementing the agreement have confirmed the relevance of this shift, but also highlighted implementation challenges, including those related to individual and institutional responsibilities to prepare and adapt.

The faithful application of the Seville Agreement 2.0 depends on openness, transparency and pragmatic approaches to finding solutions. The required change in mindset has not been fully achieved. In highly visible contexts in particular, institutional individualistic reflexes still exist at times and Movement coordination may still be seen as a burden rather than as a necessity to deliver the best possible impact.

⁶ Orientation 4.3 states: "The ICRC assumes its statutory responsibilities and advocates for coordinated Movement responses. As a co-convenor, and in line with the Seville Agreement 2.0 and the Movement's Fundamental Principles, it works hand-in-hand with host National Societies as convenors in order to ensure the effective and impactful coordination of the Movement's responses to armed conflicts and other situations of violence."

⁷ "Guidance for ICRC Co-convenor role (Seville Agreement 2.0) Emergency and Crisis Movement operational coordination".

⁸ This includes the Staff Integration Programme, the Cooperation Integration Course, a self-paced module (Coordinating within the Movement) and the training for security and surge staff.

Knowledge, ownership and accountability

Despite the efforts described in Section 2 above, all Movement components, (leadership, staff, members, volunteers) still demonstrate a clear gap in their knowledge of the Seville Agreement 2.0, its tools, guidance and processes. Movement coordination is not sufficiently reflected in the training and curricula of the different Movement components. Similarly, the internal accountability systems of Movement components do not ensure that their staff are properly incentivized to improve Movement coordination.

Much remains to be done to build the required ownership of the Seville Agreement 2.0 and Movement coordination to ensure that it is faithfully implemented, particularly to include the role of the host National Society as convener (see the following section), but also the responsibilities of partner National Societies, which are at times operating outside the parameters of proper Movement coordination and/or coordination with the host National Society.

National Societies at the centre

Recent major operations – such as the armed conflict in Ukraine, the massive earthquake in Turkey and Syria, and the floods in Honduras, where the host National Societies were the first responders and considered key humanitarian players by their authorities, affected people and the international community – have confirmed the validity of placing the host National Society at the centre of Movement coordination (as convener) when a collective response to the crisis is necessary. This requires the host National Society to value the need for a collective response to maximize humanitarian impact.

The host National Society's role and responsibilities in the new Movement coordination framework are critical for ensuring that the IFRC and the ICRC are able to perform their role as co-convener and for the Movement to achieve greater collective impact. They are also critical to ensure the host National Societies' capacity to operate in strict conformity with the Fundamental Principles in today's highly complex and sensitive contexts. Therefore, investing in a National Society's institutional capacities, including for its convener role, is the foundation for achieving greater collective impact. National Societies must continue to work hard to gain and maintain trust with their own communities, with their local and national authorities and relevant civil society institutions by demonstrating integrity and accountability towards affected people, donors and other stakeholders, including international partners, thereby constantly strengthening access and acceptance.

The experience of the last few years of National Society Development (NSD) support in emergencies has confirmed that the impact of this support is much stronger (and coordination efforts related to NSD much easier) when an NSD plan exists. Overall, when it comes to functional cooperation on NSD, there is today a clear understanding within the Movement of the importance of collectively and coherently contributing to the host National Society's strategic objectives. As part of its primary responsibility in NSD, including in dealing with integrity issues, the IFRC is coordinating the NSD contributions of its members and the ICRC.⁹

There is, however, still a lot to do collectively to meet the Seville Agreement 2.0 commitments to invest in and efficiently support the host National Society, in particular during crises.

Interpretation of the Seville Agreement 2.0: Roles and responsibilities

As expected, the normative framework of the Seville Agreement 2.0 requires hands-on operationalization and the identification of tension points, as well as the capacity to work on them for future operations. Since the Seville Agreement 2.0 was adopted, it has, at times, been challenging for the IFRC, the ICRC and the host National Society to reach a common understanding or interpretation of the ramifications of the Seville Agreement 2.0. This includes

⁹ At global and regional levels, there is good collaboration between the IFRC and the ICRC on various joint means of support to National Societies (e.g. through the Joint Statutes Commission, the Movement Induction Course and the National Society Investment Alliance).

issues such as agreeing which institution should be the co-convenor, including when the crisis becomes protracted, defining the exact responsibilities of the co-convenor and the organization that is not co-convening, and clarifying the interplay between Movement coordination and IFRC membership coordination. In some cases, this has resulted in unfortunate difficulties in organizing Mini-Summits and delays in issuing Joint Statements,¹⁰ but also in unnecessary tensions and potentially, although difficult to measure, a suboptimal Movement response. While the host National Society may be successful in creating conditions for dialogue (and it should strengthen its capacity to do so), addressing these differences in perspective between the ICRC and the IFRC on the operationalization of the Seville Agreement 2.0 in crisis situations have been a priority. Since January 2024, a constructive dialogue has intensified with the establishment of a “Movement coordination in operations working group” at headquarters level to analyse and resolve these differences.

Implementation of Movement coordination tools and mechanisms

A guidance note and decision table for **Mini-Summits** were developed to ensure consistency and coherence worldwide. The Mini-Summits are to be organized by the convenor and the co-convenor in the first 48 hours of a crisis, followed by a Joint Statement (Article 5.2.6 of the Seville Agreement 2.0) defining the roles and responsibilities of Movement partners and the general objectives and directions of the Movement’s response. Since the adoption of the Seville Agreement 2.0, there have been 13 contexts where it was necessary to hold Mini-Summits.¹¹ Some took place within 48 hours of the crisis starting, but not all. Eleven of the Mini-Summits made decisions on how the Movement would coordinate to achieve greater collective impact.

Despite the fact that 16 **Joint Statements** or similar have been issued since the adoption of the Seville Agreement 2.0,¹² they were not easy exercises. Draft texts were subjected to multiple and lengthy rounds of revision, requiring the intervention of the IFRC’s secretariat and the ICRC’s headquarters, while the key strategic decisions on the roles, responsibilities and the promotion of a collaborative approach have to be taken and properly documented at country level. Operational guidance and the Joint Statement template can bring some clarity, but the capacity of the host National Society to facilitate dialogue, and the ability of the IFRC and the ICRC to agree on the interpretation of roles and responsibilities (see the section above) are critical.

In all situations, including when there is no crisis or emergency, the Seville Agreement 2.0 calls for a mature level of coordination among Movement components and accountability when this does not happen. Exchanges and synergies (not “only” information-sharing) are valuable in all circumstances and help develop trust and the reflex to coordinate, which is particularly critical at the onset of a crisis or emergency. Similarly, further work is needed to better prepare collectively for crisis or emergency, such as developing joint contingency plans to facilitate Movement coordination in large-scale emergencies, and providing support for the development of National Society response plans with different contingencies. It should be noted, however, that good pre-crisis relations among Movement partners at country level and the existence of functioning Movement coordination platforms are not a guarantee of smooth coordination during the crisis, as evidenced, for example, in the floods operation in Pakistan or during the first months of the escalation in Ukraine, perhaps understandably given the overwhelming intensity and needs of the respective disaster and conflict.

General objectives and directions of the Movement’s collective response

“Propos[ing] the general objectives and directions of the Movement’s collective response” is a responsibility of the co-convenor to support true coordination in a large-scale crisis or

¹⁰ See the subsection on “Implementation of Movement coordination tools and mechanisms”.

¹¹ Armenia (two Mini-Summits), Bangladesh, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) (two Mini-Summits), Egypt, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Libya (two Mini-Summits), Morocco, the occupied Palestinian territory, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan and Togo.

¹² In the DRC, a Joint Statement, in the format of a “National Society Special Note” was published after a Movement coordination meeting and before the Mini-Summit took place.

emergency. Yet, the ICRC and the IFRC have not systematically fulfilled this specific responsibility when acting as co-convenor. The challenges of doing this in an acute crisis when the ICRC or the IFRC is facing its own internal resource and operational challenges should not be understated. In different instances, host National Societies, as convenors, made it clear that they see this specific responsibility as critical to coordinating the Movement components that are present and operating in their country, at the onset of the crisis and during the response phase of any operation.

Functional cooperation

Some progress has been made in better coordinating appeals and other **resource mobilization** efforts between the ICRC, the IFRC and National Societies in situations triggering a collective Movement response. The funding models and timings of the Movement components are, however, all different. This is a complicating factor that needs to be recognized. To become better coordinated on the fundraising side, clear coordination modalities would need to be in place, and operational response plans and budgets would need to be coordinated from the very start of a crisis.

In the period under review, there are very few positive examples of coordination between the ICRC's budget extension appeals and the IFRC's emergency appeals, such as the sharing of draft documents ahead of the funding ask, the development of joint marketing documents and/or the organization of joint donor events.¹³ Less positive examples can be found in a range of different operations. In any event, wider discussions on resource mobilization between the IFRC and the ICRC should aim to capture and address the issues identified.

Effective coordination of **Movement communication** in crises or emergencies has been, at times, challenged by limited information flow, follow-up or a lack of prioritization or consultation. Good practice nevertheless includes jointly developing communication guidelines and/or key messages;¹⁴ coordinating public communication (such as joint statements, joint media events, social media posts, media outreach, etc.);¹⁵ organizing communication coordination calls for National Societies and/or aligning communication;¹⁶ and developing and publishing Movement Pictures or similar communication tools.¹⁷

There has also been a marked proactiveness in supporting host National Societies in humanitarian diplomacy efforts related to crises.¹⁸ It is important that the Movement finds ways of seizing opportunities to fully leverage its collective strength for diplomatic engagement. In this respect, the IFRC has worked on a humanitarian diplomacy plan of action and the ICRC is currently developing a more coherent, predictable and proactive humanitarian diplomacy offer for situations where it is co-convenor. Likewise, the ICRC needs to become more systematic about providing guidance to Movement components to ensure their response to the armed conflict is in accordance with **international humanitarian law** and to ensure respect for the rules on the protective use of the emblem.

Overall, recent experience has therefore demonstrated the need to also prioritize functional cooperation areas, including public communication and positioning, international representation and resource mobilization linked to emergency scenarios.

¹³ Notably in the cases of Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory, Sudan, Ukraine, or the thematic appeals on child protection in June 2023.

¹⁴ For example, Colombia, the DRC, Ethiopia, Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory, Nagorno-Karabakh, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine-Russia, Venezuela and Yemen.

¹⁵ In Colombia, the DRC, Haiti, Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory, Sudan, Ukraine-Russia, Venezuela and Yemen.

¹⁶ For example, Colombia, the DRC, Haiti, Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory, Libya, Myanmar, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine-Russia, Venezuela and Yemen.

¹⁷ For example, Ethiopia, Mali, Niger, Sudan, and Ukraine and impacted countries. The Movement Picture, an SMCC tool, is a visual map and graphics showing at a glance the presence and operations of Movement components in a crisis context or region.

¹⁸ Humanitarian diplomacy is understood as influencing the decisions and actions of affected state governments, donors and inter-governmental and inter-agency bodies in relation to particular crises. In practice, it refers to the bilateral or semi-public engagement with the diplomatic and UN/humanitarian community in operational contexts, foreign capitals and in multilateral settings.

4. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

As a follow-up to Resolution 8 of the 2022 Council of Delegates, the IFRC and the ICRC have developed a set of common indicators to assess progress,¹⁹ as well as a joint table to track the use of all the different existing tools (Mini-Summits, new MCAs signed, etc.). Similarly, a consultative group composed of representatives from eight National Societies, the ICRC and the IFRC has been established to support the monitoring and implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0.²⁰ This group will capture the learning from Movement coordination practice and will work to drive constant improvement towards enhanced collective impact.

5. CONCLUSION AND WAY FORWARD

By adopting the Seville Agreement 2.0, the Movement reaffirmed its commitment to enhance its collective impact through a more inclusive approach to coordination and through complementarity in roles and responsibilities in situations triggering a collective Movement response, as well as in all functional cooperation areas. The implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 by the IFRC, the ICRC and National Societies in its first two years of existence has had contrasting results. The Seville Agreement 2.0 has made mandatory a number of demonstrably useful tools, mostly developed and by now updated under the SMCC process. This should serve as a strong basis to take Movement coordination a step further. Over the past two years, while significant progress has been made in strengthening Movement components' understanding of the Seville Agreement 2.0 and Movement coordination, as well as their capacities to implement it, much remains to be done. In particular, investing sufficiently in a National Society's capacity as convener is key to achieving greater collective impact and requires full commitment and leadership by National Societies themselves.

At the same time, the full shift in mindset towards coordination has not yet happened, with individualistic institutional reflexes still present at times, and significant energy spent on transactional negotiations relating to roles and responsibilities rather than on operational response and the search for synergies. While not always easy to measure, the most critical issue is the concrete impact of suboptimal coordination on operations, which should not only be seen as an administrative issue, but also as an operational impediment.

It is now imperative that the IFRC, the ICRC and National Societies to fully implement the modalities of operational coordination and functional cooperation as outlined in the Seville Agreement 2.0 and to consistently "walk the talk". This means taking responsibility for Movement coordination and being accountable for the faithful implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 and the tools developed and updated under the SMCC process. It also means committing to pragmatic operational Movement coordination, using the Mini-Summit to discuss and decide the Movement's objectives and how to achieve them, and then using the strategic, operational and technical platforms to implement them. The ICRC and the IFRC recommend the following actions for Movement components:

¹⁹ See Resolution 8, "Movement Coordination for Collective Impact Agreement (Seville Agreement 2.0)", Council of Delegates, June 2022, CD/22/R8, operative paragraph 4, which requests that "the ICRC and the IFRC, in collaboration with National Societies, develop relevant indicators and a means of tracking progress [...]".

²⁰ See Resolution 8, "Movement Coordination for Collective Impact Agreement (Seville Agreement 2.0)", Council of Delegates June 2022, CD/22/R8, operative paragraph 5. Eight National Societies, representing the four IFRC statutory regions, are members of the group: the Central African Republic, Honduras, Indonesia, Iraq, Mexico, Ukraine, Somalia and Spain.

Recommendations for the entire Movement

- All National Societies, the ICRC and the IFRC should consider developing and/or revising Movement Cooperation Agreements using the new template.
- Movement components should, in all circumstances, place the collective impact of the Movement in protecting and assisting affected people before the interests of any individual institution.
- Additional efforts should be made by all Movement components to fulfil their responsibilities in preparing their own institution to adhere to and be accountable for the Seville Agreement 2.0, in promoting the desired improvements to achieve collective impact and in ensuring the relevant tools and guidance are communicated about and shared at all levels (leaders, staff, members and volunteers).
- The ICRC and the IFRC should ensure that regional and global training and learning initiatives take place, particularly by strengthening their sponsorship of the MIC and the IMPACT course. National Societies should ensure that country-level training includes the Seville Agreement 2.0 and all tools and guidance relevant to Movement coordination.
- Efficient Movement coordination mechanisms should be in place in all contexts, including in situations of normalcy. These mechanisms should not focus solely on information-sharing, but they should primarily look for synergies and collective decision-making. More efforts should be focused on preparing for crisis well before it occurs, in particular through collective support to the host National Society's contingency plans and, as appropriate, to the development of Movement contingency plans. Countries with a higher vulnerability to disaster, conflict or other emergencies should be prioritized for the development of contingency plans and simulation exercises. This will increase mutual trust and help develop more respectful relationships among Movement components.
- In situations triggering a collective Movement response, the convener and co-convener should be proactive, the Mini-Summit should take place within the first 48 hours, ensuring agreement on roles and responsibilities, and on the direction and objectives for the Movement's collective response, with the meeting's outcomes properly documented. Regular strategic- and operational-level coordination meetings should happen as often as required. The response of all Movement actors should be coordinated effectively, with needs assessments shared – and jointly carried out where feasible – and tasks and functions allocated based on which Movement actor is best placed to meet those needs.
- The ICRC's budget extension appeals, the IFRC's emergency appeals and National Societies' appeals should be well coordinated, grounded in operational plans and in line with the decisions made during the Mini-Summit.
- As part of the accountability framework, the IFRC, the ICRC and National Societies should ensure the continued monitoring of the implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 at country level and, at the global level, review periodically the application of key tools and mechanisms for continued improvement. In addition, all Movement partners should introduce accountability for Movement coordination in their human resource management systems.
- Movement components should further develop modalities for key functional cooperation areas and strategic questions – such as resource mobilization, communication and positioning – taking into account the defined primary responsibilities and existing opportunities.
- The recently established consultative group to support the implementation of the Seville Agreement 2.0 should provide advice and lessons learned in accordance with its terms of reference.
- The ICRC and the IFRC, through their Movement coordination in operations working group, should continue to analyse and clarify any important issues relating to roles and responsibilities under the Seville Agreement 2.0, and share any agreements that are reached.

Recommendations for the host National Society

- Host National Societies should fully assume their convener role and functions in situations triggering a collective Movement response, which requires an inclusive and multilateral collective Movement approach and mindset.
- Host National Societies, with the support of Movement components as required, should:
 - enhance their knowledge and understanding of Movement coordination and the Seville Agreement 2.0, and the convener role in particular, and include these elements in their training curricula
 - ensure they are equipped with sufficient capacity to play their convener role, including by addressing possible constraints and challenges
 - adjust their NSD plan, considering operational priorities in emergencies, while not losing sight of their long-term development objectives.

Recommendations for the ICRC

- The ICRC should, together with the convener, play its co-convener role to the full, directing Movement coordination from the very onset of a crisis.
- The ICRC should systematize its proposal, to be presented at the Mini-Summit, of the general objectives (to be translated into operational objectives) and directions of the Movement's collective response at the onset of crises where the ICRC is the co-convener, as well as its guidance on respect for international humanitarian law, the Fundamental Principles and use of the emblem.
- Where the ICRC is co-convener, the ICRC should, in consultation with the host National Society and the IFRC, systematize its offer of services to the host National Society and partner National Societies from the beginning of a crisis: in addition to security, this offer would include communication, information management, logistics, welcome services and humanitarian diplomacy.
- Linked to its general and specific responsibilities as co-convener, the ICRC should aim to scale up its support to the host National Society in armed conflict and internal strife, as a means to both enhance the humanitarian response and to safeguard principled humanitarian action.

Recommendations for the IFRC

- The IFRC should, together with the convener, play its co-convener role to the full, directing Movement coordination from the very onset of a crisis.
- The IFRC should systematize its proposal, to be presented at the Mini-Summit, of the general objectives (to be translated into operational objectives) and directions of the Movement's collective response at the onset of crises where the IFRC is the co-convener.
- The IFRC should provide full clarity on how IFRC membership coordination functions, in accordance with the Statutes of the Movement and the Seville Agreement 2.0, and on synergies between membership coordination and Movement coordination which comes first in all circumstances, by engaging with National Societies and the ICRC.
- The IFRC should, as part of its primary responsibility, ensure that NSD support is holistic and goes beyond a specific operational context or thematic silo. National Societies are present before, during and after any emergency and should be supported in all situations, be it an armed conflict, internal strife, disaster or other crisis.