



Our world. Your move.

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

Geneva, 26 November 2011 – For humanity



EN

CD/11/11.4

Original: English

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

Geneva, Switzerland
26 November 2011

The Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures

Implementation report

Document prepared jointly by

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

Geneva, October 2011

Report on Implementation of the Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures

June 2009 – June 2011

Executive Summary

The Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures continued to be the reference for the coordination of the Movement's response to new onset emergencies and long term international relief operations. Within this framework, Host National Societies (HNS) assumed markedly more responsibility for the coordination and management of the Movement's international relief activities. Responding to requests from their Governments, many NS assumed additional coordination responsibilities for the wider humanitarian response.

Prompted by changes in the humanitarian environment, including the emergence of new, non-traditional international actors, innovative ways were found to apply the principles of SA&SM. The functions of Lead Agency Primary Partner and with ICRC or Federation acting as supporting partner (depending on the context) were consolidated. More efforts were made than in previous years to work in partnership. Good results were achieved when problems arising were dealt with promptly in the field, without resorting to capitals. Improvements in the performance of Movement components coordinating international relief operations would require enhanced communication, negotiation and cooperation skills.

A feature of the reporting period was the highly politicised environment in which Movement components had to manage international relief operations. This complicated access to beneficiaries for all humanitarian organisations, particularly UN agencies which were perceived as political actors in some contexts. By contrast, Movement components generally had greater access, being perceived as neutral and impartial actors. This is a testimony to the added value for beneficiaries of Movement components working in accordance with the Fundamental Principles. This access and their increasing national prominence meant that HNS were put under pressure to become implementing partners for UN and other agencies, with little regard for their ability to absorb and manage the resources proffered.

The Federation and ICRC, with HNS, need to make special efforts to ensure greater coordination and clarity when appealing for funds in complex emergencies. In addition, public communication, particularly in situations of armed conflict and violence need to be better coordinated.

Overall, Movement components still need to improve their preparedness to work together and respond effectively to unforeseen emergencies and mega disasters. Whilst individual Movement components have established their own contingency plans, little progress has been made in coordinated contingency planning between Movement components at country level. During the initial phases of emergencies, more NSs were observed working outside their own countries, without coordinating with the HNS and/or within Movement coordination mechanisms which can negatively affect the public perception of the work of the HNS and wider Movement.

1. Introduction

This is a joint ICRC and International Federation (Federation) report covering the period from June 2009 - June 2011. It analyses the implementation of the Seville Agreement¹ and its Supplementary Measures² (SA&SM) in international relief operations, whilst recognising that the scope of the SA & SM applies to all international activities which the components are called upon to carry out in cooperation on a bi-lateral or multi-lateral basis, to the exclusion of the activities which the Statutes of the Movement and the Geneva Conventions entrust to the components individually³.

Overall trends, challenges, lessons learned and good practices are highlighted from significant international relief operations during this period. The report focuses on recommendations of the SA & SM implementation report to the 2009 Council of Delegates.

2. Findings

2.1 Application of the SA & SM with a primary focus on the recommendations approved in report to the 2009 CoD

Strengthening National Societies

Leadership

The SA&SM continued to be the reference for the coordination of the Movement's response to new onset emergencies and long term international relief operations. A key finding⁴ is that Host National Societies⁵ are assuming more responsibility for the coordination and management of relief activities. More NS are in a position to act as lead agency or primary partner of the Lead Agency. ICRC and the Federation have undertaken steps to improve their performance when acting as supporting partners when they assume this function.

Partnership, supporting Host NS

All Movement components are strengthening and developing a range of partnerships to better support and coordinate preparedness and response to disasters.

Based upon a specific request from National Societies at the 2009 Council of Delegates, the ICRC together with the Canadian and Colombian Red Cross Societies, launched a project to produce a practical and user-friendly guide that supports NSs to position, prepare and respond to armed conflict and other situations of violence with a view to securing the acceptance required for safe access to victims. A 2011 Council of Delegates resolution 'National Societies preparing for and

¹ Resolution 6, 'Future of the Movement, Council of Delegates 1997

² Resolution 8, Council of Delegates 2005

³ For further updates on multi-lateral and bi-lateral cooperation, please refer to the implementation report on the, 'Code for Good Partnership'³; the background reports of draft resolutions on, 'Movement Components relations with external humanitarian actors' and 'Guidance for National Societies working in armed conflict and other situations of violence' submitted to this Council.

⁴ Based on a survey response of approximately 20 National Societies and consultation with ICRC and International Federation delegations.

⁵ Consistent with terms used in the Supplementary Measures (SM), the National Society of a country where an international relief operation takes place is referred to as 'Host NS' and National Societies operating outside their own countries are termed Participating National Societies or 'PNS'

responding in armed conflict and other situations of violence' will be tabled by the NS concerned and ICRC, supported by the Federation.

Following Resolution 6 of the 2007 CoD in relation to the Seville Agreement, the ICRC developed and implemented a strategy and plan to strengthen its operational partnerships with National Societies. This included close consultations with National Societies and the IFRC to develop a set of competencies for partnership to strengthen ICRC's internal partnership capacities. This has not only resulted in improving ways of working with NS but also contributes to improving coordination between Movement components, particularly during emergencies.

To further support the individual and collective efforts of Movement components, the British Red Cross provided a report which focused on identifying gaps and issues in relations and partnerships between the Movement and external actors primarily in emergency situations. This contributed to the drafting of a Resolution to be submitted to the CoD, 2011 to mandate the ICRC and IFRC to move forward on developing guidance to all RC/RC members on engaging with specific external actor groups.

In addition, the IFRC and ICRC have been actively engaged in providing guidance to all Movement components the evolving role played by of civil protection and Military and Civil Defense assets in disaster and crisis situations.

A standard template agreement based on that developed with UNHCR, is being developed between WFP and NS and should be concluded by the end of 2011.

Progress is also being made by the ICRC and the IFRC to finalise a model agreement for cooperation on asylum seekers and refugees between the Red Cross Red Crescent national societies and the UNHCR in the Caribbean islands in conformity with the existing standard template.

Preparing for emergencies

Meetings between Movement components. More NS are establishing coordination mechanisms with Movement partners, earlier in the emergency phase. This was a result of Movement coordination mechanisms and on-going capacity-building support being included in contingency planning.

Regular meetings take place between Movement components in many more countries at both strategic and operational levels in emergency and non-emergency situations. Almost all IFRC and ICRC operations updates reflect this development. However, further support is required for managing the coordination function, clarifying its purpose and ensuring clear roles and responsibilities vis à vis planning and decision-making.

Guidance Note and template for Movement Coordination agreements. A Guidance Note on the coordination process for developing a Movement Coordination Agreement between the components of the Movement and an accompanying template was developed and finalized in early 2011 by the ICRC and International Federation. The English, French, Spanish, Russian and Arabic versions were made available to all ICRC delegations and International Federation offices for sharing with NSs.

Movement components are being encouraged to conclude this agreement so that when natural disasters, conflicts and, violence occur and require international

support, it is better prepared to respond efficiently and effectively to the needs of the beneficiaries through a well-coordinated Movement response.

As of August, 2011, agreements have been signed in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Nepal, Lebanon, Sudan, Haiti, Libya, Zimbabwe, Iraq and in the Central Asian National Societies. In various other countries - such as in Democratic Republic of Congo, South of Sudan and Côte d'Ivoire, Movement components have already started a process aiming to sign an agreement which will likely take place by the end of 2011.

The IFRC continues to include Movement coordination processes and activities in its updates of guidelines for National Disaster and Response Mechanisms and Contingency Planning Guidelines.

Training

While training on the SA/SM has taken place in a number of regional ICRC and IFRC offices and within National Societies, it has not been systematically done. This may be due to the course being available through the on-line World of Red Cross and Red Crescent (WORC). Even with this, given that each operational situation is different, promoting dialogue and sharing of experiences on the application of the SA/SM contributes to a better understanding of roles, responsibilities, and coordination in any given context.

ICRC now also includes within its training for Management staff deploying as part of the rapid deployment mechanism a specific session on developing an ICRC Security Framework which includes the SA & SM concepts and their link to security management.

The IFRC has developed a Security Management Framework which includes security training for ERU and FACT teams deployed in response to natural disaster situations. In addition, online security training is mandatory for IFRC staff to complete. The same online training is available to all NS and to the general public.

Amongst others, the SA & SM has been included in the following courses:

WORC (World of Red Cross and Red Crescent) online course includes a chapter on coordination entitled Coordination within the Movement and in direct relation to the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures.

IMPACT (International Mobilization and Preparation for Action) is the induction course for all staff working on international assignments with the Federation or National Societies.

ICRC basic course for new delegates under ICRC contract includes an online module which has a chapter on the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures.

Movement Induction Course for NS leaders is a 5-day course organized jointly by the ICRC and the IFRC once a year. It aims to inform senior NS leaders (Chairperson or Secretary General) on their responsibilities within the Movement including awareness raising and application of Movement policies.

International Federation Disaster Management Induction Course: is a five day course which has incorporated awareness raising and application of the SA/SM and of Movement Coordination mechanisms.

ICRC Law & Protection: one afternoon is dedicated to humanitarian coordination, mainly within the Movement, but also with the UN.

ICRC Movement Partnership training, a new course in its pilot phase, which has been developed to support ICRC staff, in particular middle managers and technical staff to be better partners with National Societies and to work more effectively within the Movement. This training is delivered with National Society and Federation colleagues where possible in the field.

Capturing and sharing learning for best practice

A significant achievement was the application of learning on Movement Coordination from the Asian tsunami 2004 to the Haiti earthquake, 2010. While the contexts were different, the principles and guidelines in establishing a coordination structure with roles and responsibilities were applied early on in the Haitian emergency response, taking into consideration the Tsunami Forum Recommendations approved by the International Federation Governing Board in 2007.

For example, the IFRC delegate functions of technical coordinators were separated from Movement coordinators in the same technical area (shelter, for example). This enabled a more effective Movement response to the needs of people affected by the earthquake. In addition, more systematic approaches are being taken to including coordination, roles and responsibilities, capacities of components to manage large and complex operations in Real Time Evaluations i.e. Pakistan, Haiti, and North Africa Crisis

Reviews. Whilst more attention has been paid to Movement Coordination in evaluations of operations, more focus could be placed on monitoring the effectiveness of the structures and management of coordination mechanisms and in relation to application of the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures.

2.2 SA & SM in new onset international relief operations

Haiti. Earthquake, January 2010: Movement coordination mechanisms were established after the first week the earthquake struck with a Movement Coordination structure in place within 2 weeks of the earthquake. A tripartite Movement Coordination agreement was eventually signed in May, 2010 by the Haitian Red Cross, the International Federation, and the ICRC which invited the PNS to endorse and make use of the coordination mechanisms set out in the agreement. Operational coordination meetings continue to take place on a regular basis with all RC/RC partners working as part of the earthquake response and reconstruction. Even the best Movement coordination mechanisms come under pressure in the wake of a disaster of this scale and with numerous National Societies and external actors still on the ground in Haiti now, coordination remains complex.

Pakistan. Floods, July 2010: There are several good examples of cooperation and coordination among Movement partners at the strategic level in the Pakistan flood response in 2010. Movement partners agreed early in the response to a coordination framework that placed Pakistan Red Crescent Society (PRCS) as the lead agency for coordinating of the Movement response to the flooding. The PRCS, IFRC and the ICRC formalized a Movement Platform which sought to delineate the roles and areas of responsibility of the respective parties when carrying out operations in the field. All Movement partners further agreed to the *Joint Statement on the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement in response to the flood crisis in Pakistan* on 27 September 2010. A donors' conference took place in Doha in October, where the IFRC PoA was shared and the issue of fundraising for the revised emergency appeal was discussed.

At the Islamabad level, the PRCS has also hosted daily operational update meetings and twice weekly Movement coordination meetings to discuss and agree on a common approach to operational issues, including security. At the operational level, the combined response and coverage rate of all of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement partners was good with Movement Factsheets and consolidated IFRC three month reports produced, despite difficulties retrieving and reporting some data on bilateral PNS support. Uncoordinated activities on the part of some National

Societies continued to pose problems. Despite the overall achievements, the relationships between the IFRC and the ICRC were strained at times, with differences of policy and opinion on appropriate roles and practices in the flood operation. In adopting a cohesive approach to the collective representation of the Movement, there was less cohesiveness with not all PNS adhering to the agreements they have signed or there were different interpretations of how to apply the agreements. Efforts have been made at the global, regional and in-country level to dialogue on these differences and to try and reach a greater level of share understanding and approach.⁶

Kyrgyzstan. The Movement Coordination Agreement signed in April 2010 became the basis for a well coordinated Movement response when Kyrgyzstan experienced a wave of ethnic violence in the south of the country in the month of June. A well developed tripartite Memorandum for Partnership and Coordination established by the Kyrgyzstan Red Crescent, ICRC and the International Federation provided a clear outline of roles, responsibilities and coordination mechanisms when the emergency began. Whilst the ICRC took the lead coordination role at the request of the National Society, the Memorandum enabled the Kyrgyzstan Red Crescent to assert strong coordination with a growing number of PNS interested in responding to the violence. The coordination mechanisms facilitated open dialogue that led to coordinated and complementary appeals from the International Federation and the ICRC in Uzbekistan in the first days. It contributed to a strongly coordinated Movement response. Additionally, in both countries the mentioned strong Movement coordination was extremely welcomed by their governments and the whole UN response system.

Sudan. A strong emphasis was placed on coordination efforts in Sudan resulting in a Movement coordination framework which established meetings on a regular basis as well as ad-hoc, whenever required. A technical coordination committee was also created to deal with the anticipated separation between the National Societies of the North and the South. However, at the time of writing this report, the evolving situation in Sudan and the complexity of the humanitarian challenges require additional efforts with regard to coordination between the National Society, the ICRC and the International Federation, particularly with regard to the coordination and complementary nature of appeals. A Movement Coordination Agreement was signed amongst all partners and coordination mechanisms were included in contingency planning for the national elections of 2010 and the southern Sudan national referendum, 2011. Plans are underway for strengthening and developing partnerships with external actors including the UN and the private sector.

Côte d'Ivoire. A Tripartite Joint Statement was signed in January between the Côte d'Ivoire Red Cross, the International Federation and ICRC on the coordination of activities for an effective humanitarian response. As a part of the Movement Coordination Framework, a Movement Platform was created at the most senior levels of the 3 components to ensure a strategic approach to the operation. In addition, 3 tripartite Joint Notes and a conference call were organised to ensure effective communication and a common understanding of the situation in the country and to facilitate the Movement response.

Libya. The humanitarian crisis in Libya and neighbouring countries resulted in a prompt Joint Statement⁷ signed in March 2011 by the Libyan Red Crescent, the

⁶ Real Time Evaluation of IFRC response to Pakistan floods, January 2011

⁷ A Joint Statement is an internal communication tool to inform all Movement components of the roles and responsibilities of the HNS, the International Federation, and the ICRC and provides guidance on coordination required for a particular emergency situation. It is based on the SA/SM.

Tunisian Red Crescent, the Egyptian Red Crescent, the International Federation and the ICRC and shared with all Movement partners. The Movement's response to the crisis confirmed the need for strong coordination and clear roles and responsibilities in preparedness and response planning and implementation. Up until August, 2011, the following tools were used to coordinate and inform the Movement components:

A Framework Agreement for Coordination and Cooperation between the Libyan Red Crescent, the ICRC and the International Federation.

Three coordination meetings via conference calls for National Societies, the ICRC, and International Federation were held for information sharing

Two regional meetings conferences bringing together the PNS (particularly from within the region) the International Federation and the ICRC to address the Movement response to the humanitarian situation in Libya and on migration issues

Six Special Notes to all National Societies issued by the ICRC addressing issues such as Movement relations with external actors, guidelines for contributions to the Movement response and updating all National Societies on the ICRC response to the crisis.

Security management. The Movement response in operations is more often than not taking place in rapidly changing environments involving significant security risks. Also, complex situations such as in Libya and Haiti which included the involvement of international military entities coupled with the presence of numerous humanitarian actors working within a volatile and dangerous environment, constituted serious security risks for Red Cross and Red Crescent volunteers and staff.

Security concerns required communication to all Movement components on operational guidance in line with the Fundamental Principles and relevant Movement policies. One methodology was to issue "Special Notes" regarding operational challenges, such as relationships between the Movement components, military entities and other external actors in major humanitarian crisis such as in Libya and Côte d'Ivoire.

3. Recommendations

Taking into consideration the observations of this report, the following recommendations are made:

1. Components of the Movement continue to use the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures as the policy framework for Movement coordination in international relief operations. In the spirit of partnership, the Host NS, ICRC and the Federation adapt coordination arrangements to the local context to ensure humanitarian needs are met. National Societies working internationally participate in these coordination arrangements.
2. The International Federation and ICRC continue to develop tools, as relevant and appropriate, to manage the relations between Movement components and actors outside the Movement and in consultation with NS, develop guidance in this respect (as foreseen in the draft External Actors Resolution submitted to the 2011 Council of Delegates)
3. All Movement components disseminate their ways of working in accordance with the Fundamental Principles and the Statutes of the Movement to actors outside the Movement.

4. Country level activities that prepare for and enhance a Movement response to emergencies should be enhanced, including:
 - a. Hold meetings between Movement components
 - b. Contingency planning that:
 - i. enhances NS preparedness
 - ii. assesses risks
 - iii. shows how resources could be mobilised and coordinated within the Movement
 - iv. positions the Movement's response within a wider humanitarian response
 - c. Establish processes to develop Movement Coordination Agreements as a tool to enhance cooperation and state of preparedness
5. Lessons learnt from all large-scale international relief operations, including through Real Time Evaluations, are shared with Movement partners
6. In consultation with Host NS, the International Federation and ICRC improve their coordinate their appeals, ensuring they are complementary.