



CD/07/6.1
Original: English
For decision

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

Geneva, Switzerland
23-24 November 2007

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SEVILLE AGREEMENT

Document prepared by the Council of Delegates
Resolution 8 Group on Implementation of the Seville Agreement

Geneva, October 2007

Executive summary

1. The Supplementary Measures are a **relevant and appropriate** clarification and development of the Seville Agreement. The Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures (SA & SM) were found to be aligned to current needs, even if they are not always well known in detail by all Movement components.
2. Movement relief operations initiated in 2006 and 2007, notably during the crisis in Lebanon and floods in Kenya, explicitly used the SA & SM as the framework for Movement coordination. During consultations, respondents frequently referred to the “**spirit of Seville**”, which was described as the determination of Movement components to find ways of working together to deliver an optimal response to the needs of victims of conflict and natural disaster.
3. In terms of **preparedness measures**, much has been achieved in sensitizing operational managers within the Movement to the need to work in accordance with the SA & SM. Through in-depth training and shorter, adapted dissemination sessions, knowledge of the SA & SM has been increased across the Movement.
4. Further preparatory work needs to be done to ensure that Movement components adhere to common coordination frameworks. Since the **work processes** involved build the trust and predictability in working relationships that ensure that the Movement, especially **National Societies**, will be “first on the ground, first to act” to bring meaningful assistance to beneficiaries, particular emphasis should be placed on the following:
 - i. **Meetings** between Movement components present in a country: information exchange, analysis and opportunities to build working relationships and the trust required to assist victims appropriately.
 - ii. **Country-level memoranda of understanding (MoUs)** that reiterate the roles and responsibilities of Movement components articulated in the SA & SM.
 - iii. **Contingency planning** that assesses the risks and the resources that are available or that can potentially be mobilized within the Movement and considers how such resources would be coordinated to ensure effective delivery of assistance to beneficiaries.
5. **Training** should be carried out on a cyclical basis to ensure that all senior managers and members of governance within the Movement with operational decision-making responsibilities have adequate knowledge of the SA & SM.
6. **Coordination processes** must first and foremost focus on meeting the needs of victims and of vulnerable people. To be effective, they must also be adapted to the local context. Coordination mechanisms should take into account multiple perspectives, including those of the beneficiaries, of all Movement components and of humanitarian and other actors outside the Movement, and be established within the framework of the SA & SM.
7. **Learning and best practice** should be documented and shared so that the whole Red Cross and Red Crescent network can benefit and thereby improve its performance for the beneficiaries.
8. Implementation of the SA & SM should continue to be **monitored** through existing structures and mechanisms within the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Council of Delegates Resolution 8 Group Report on Implementation of the Seville Agreement

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	3
1.1 Scope of Resolution 8	3
1.2 Seville Agreement knowledge deficit	3
2 The work of the Resolution 8 Group	4
2.1 Dimensions of the Group's work	4
2.2 Responsibilities and actions of Group members	4
2.3 Communication between the Group, National Societies and the Standing Commission	5
2.4 Information considered by the Group	5
3 Implementation of the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures: Findings	5
3.1 What is being done to ensure that the SA & SM are known and applied by all those most concerned?	6
3.2 What measures are taken to ensure that the ONS is the Primary Partner of the Lead Agency (if it is not the lead agency)?	8
3.3 What has been done to establish and/or improve cooperative working relationships and coordination mechanisms to ensure timely and effective responses?	9
3.4 Learning from regional consultation processes, operations, implementation reviews, and questionnaires completed by ICRC and International Federation delegations	9
4 Achievements and challenges	11
4.1 Achievements	11
4.2 Challenges within the Movement	11
4.3 Challenges in the external environment	12
5 Recommendations	13

Annex 1 Monitoring framework for implementation of the Seville Agreement 14**Abbreviations**

HNS	Host National Society/National Society working in its own country
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
International Federation Movement	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
	All components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement: National Societies, the ICRC and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
NS	National Society
PNS	Participating National Society/National Society working internationally
SA & SM	Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures

1. Introduction

Resolution 8 of the 2005 Council of Delegates established a group comprising representatives of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (International Federation), its Secretariat and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)¹ and charged it with three main tasks:

- to monitor the implementation of the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures (by establishing a monitoring and reporting framework) and to address all cooperation and coordination issues in the Movement;
- to ensure that mechanisms exist at regional level (taking advantage of existing fora) to hear the views and concerns of all interested National Societies;
- to draw conclusions and make recommendations as appropriate, and report these to the Council of Delegates in 2007.²

This report describes the approaches taken and the work carried out by the Resolution 8 Group (“the Group”) to fulfil these tasks. It summarizes the results of consultations and research and makes recommendations that build on National Society experiences and best practices and that go towards bridging gaps identified in the implementation of the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures (SA & SM).

1.1 Scope of Resolution 8

Through Resolution 8, the Council of Delegates adopted the Supplementary Measures to Enhance the Implementation of the Seville Agreement. It also reaffirmed the Seville Agreement as a catalyst for building a collaborative spirit and as a valid tool for organizing the international activities of the components of the Movement.

Resolution 8 further reaffirmed that National Societies within their own countries are autonomous national organizations acting independently in conformity with the Fundamental Principles, their own statutes and national legislation in pursuance of the mission of the Movement and in the interests of vulnerable people.

1.2 Seville Agreement knowledge deficit

The Council of Delegates noted that, despite being in force for nearly a decade, the Seville Agreement is not sufficiently understood, accepted and applied at all levels within the Movement. It emphasized the need to redress this knowledge deficit so that all Movement components can properly apply the SA & SM and the associated coordination and cooperation mechanisms required to deliver optimal services to beneficiaries.

¹ The Group comprised “the four elected vice presidents of the International Federation and a member of the Governing Board representing the Middle East and North Africa region, plus two representatives each of the ICRC and the International Federation Secretariat” (Resolution 8, Council of Delegates 2005, point 6).

The members of the Group were: International Federation governance: Mr Shimelis Adugna, Mr Tadateru Kanoe Mr Bengt Westerberg and Dr Raymond Forde (Chair), Vice Presidents, and Dr Seyed Massoud Khatami, representative of the Middle East and North Africa region; International Federation Secretariat: Mr Markku Niskala, Secretary General, and Ms Susan Johnson, Director of the National Society and Field Support Division; ICRC: Mr Jacques Forster, Vice President, and Mr Pierre Krähenbühl, Director of Operations.

² Resolution 8, Implementation of the Seville Agreement, Council of Delegates 2005, points 6 and 7.

These considerations, together with the findings of previous reports to the Council of Delegates on implementation of the Seville Agreement, shaped the work of the Resolution 8 Group and led it to focus on addressing particular gaps in international cooperation and coordination. Priorities identified were: raising awareness of and training in the substance of the SA & SM; the development of a Movement tool for monitoring implementation; and the promotion of a Movement-wide dialogue on cooperation and coordination in international relief operations.

2. The work of Resolution 8 Group

The Group met five times in 2006 and 2007. At its first meeting, it determined that there were two dimensions to its work: **monitoring implementation** of the SA & SM and addressing **cooperation and coordination** issues in the Movement. By its second meeting, the Group had developed a work plan and list of deliverables.

2.1 Dimensions of the Group's work

Since Resolution 8 required the establishment of a monitoring framework, the Group decided to build the framework around three core issues:

1. What is being done to ensure that the SA&SM are known and applied by all those concerned?
2. What measures were taken to ensure that the Host NS is the Primary Partner of the Lead Agency (if NS is not the Lead Agency)
3. What has been done to establish and/or improve cooperative working relationships and coordination mechanisms to ensure timely and effective responses?

The monitoring framework is attached in Annex 1.

Regarding cooperation and coordination, the Group felt it was imperative that all points of view within the Movement were heard and taken into account. It therefore undertook to ensure that all National Societies were given the opportunity to express their opinions and engage in dialogue on the issue.

2.2 Responsibilities and actions of Group members

Group members agreed to be “champions” of the SA & SM and to promote them in their daily functions. The vice presidents of the International Federation and the member of the Governing Board for the Middle East and North Africa assumed responsibility for ensuring that adequate consultation processes were carried out within their regions.

The representatives of the International Federation Secretariat and the ICRC, following appropriate internal decision-making processes, were able to make specific institutional commitments. Notable amongst these were:

- the development and production of an SA & SM training tool, circulated to all National Societies and International Federation and ICRC delegations;
- the requirement that all International Federation and ICRC delegations apply the spirit and the letter of the Supplementary Measures, including the “primary partner” concept, through directives received from the respective directors of operations.

- the obligation on all International Federation and ICRC senior staff with operational management responsibilities to be trained in the substance of the SA & SM;
- adoption of the Group's monitoring framework as the Movement's common performance measure of implementation of the SA & SM;
- support for Movement-wide consultation processes.

2.3 Communication between the Group, National Societies and the Standing Commission

National Societies were kept abreast of the Group's work through the regional consultation processes and by means of two letters. The Group maintained a dialogue with the Standing Commission and gave two formal updates on its work at the Commission's meetings.

2.4 Information considered by the Group

The Group examined all previous reports on implementation of the Seville Agreement submitted to the Council of Delegates. The sum of this learning and the requirements of Resolution 8 directed the Group to focus on the development and application of practical tools to assist Movement components in monitoring their performance and to promote consultation and dialogue between them.

It should be noted that the monitoring framework indicates "expected results" that will take longer to achieve than the mandate of the Resolution 8 Group. Nevertheless, the framework establishes the main areas in which common progress is expected from all Movement components. The results also give an indication of the direction in which progress has been made and what other actions will be needed to ensure the achievement of the expected results.

<h2>3. Implementation of the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures: Findings</h2>

This report draws on a number of information sources. Foremost are the reports of all formal consultation processes and a number of informal debates that took place in a variety of Movement fora.

Three in-depth reviews of implementation of the Seville Agreement undertaken in Haiti, Indonesia and Kenya, conducted by an external consultant, have also been taken into consideration. These reviews were commissioned jointly by the International Federation and the ICRC and were based on the monitoring framework and principles established by the Group for the consultation process. The reviews were submitted in detail to the Group and enriched its knowledge and understanding of the situation on the ground.

The International Federation and the ICRC monitored the performance of their delegations through their internal management processes and shared their learning and insights with the Group. In addition, ten National Societies completed the checklist of questions to assess their performance in relation to the implementation criteria established in the monitoring framework.

The Group's findings presented here follow the format of the monitoring framework, since this is the common tool for assessing the performance of each Movement component in relation to the requirements of the SA & SM.

Key issues addressed under the monitoring framework

3.1 What is being done to ensure that the SA & SM are known and applied by all those most concerned

It is in this area that the most measurable progress has been made. In addition to significant achievements made in raising awareness of and training in the substance of the SA & SM, it was found that the concept of "primary partner" and associated consultation processes had permeated significantly since the adoption of the Supplementary Measures.

3.1.1 Awareness raising/training on the substance of the SA & SM

A number of activities have been undertaken to ensure effective dissemination of the SA & SM. They include awareness raising, consultation and training. Awareness-raising sessions cover basic information on the SA & SM and stress their importance for Movement cooperation. At consultation sessions, National Societies, in addition to receiving basic information on the SA & SM, were asked to provide their own assessment of what has worked well in the context of the SA & SM and what challenges they have encountered in applying them.

All National Societies have been familiarized with the Supplementary Measures, either through an awareness-raising or a consultation session. National Societies in Asia and the Pacific and in the Middle East and North Africa were reached through consultation sessions organized during their respective regional conferences in 2006. National Societies in Africa were reached through sub-regional meetings held in Dakar, Johannesburg and Nairobi in the second half of 2006. National Societies in the Americas were reached through meetings in Rio de Janeiro and Trinidad, while in Europe, National Societies were reached at the European conference in 2007. A regional consultation meeting on the SA & SM was hosted by the Red Crescent Society of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Tehran in April 2007. In addition, several National Societies from different regions were reached during a consultation session organized during the annual PNS meeting in 2006. Awareness-raising sessions were conducted in all ICRC and International Federation delegations.

To promote further knowledge of the SA & SM, a training package was developed jointly by the ICRC and the International Federation consisting of a presentation, a case study, notes for the trainer, and reference material. The package was produced in the four official languages of the International Federation and has since been translated into at least five additional languages. Every National Society received the training materials between September and December 2006 in their preferred language and in English. They were also requested to organize training sessions with other Red Cross Red Crescent components present in their countries.

According to information received, training sessions on the SA & SM have so far involved 56 National Societies, and sessions are planned in an additional 15 countries. This information may not be complete, however, and it is likely that more National Societies have conducted training sessions than has been recorded here. The sessions have usually targeted National

Society leadership and management. ICRC and International Federation delegations and Partner National Societies have usually participated in these sessions if present in the country concerned. A second round of training planned in many countries will target operational staff and volunteers. In addition, over 200 managers and operational staff based at ICRC and International Federation Secretariat headquarters have undergone the same training in sessions conducted jointly by the two organizations.

- *Knowledge of the SA & SM should be incorporated into the regular training cycles of all operational managers and strategic decision-makers.*
- *Awareness-raising/sensitization activities should be carried out jointly for all other Movement actors.*

3.1.2 Contingency planning

Overall, there has been little formal contingency planning at the Movement level, although significant progress has been made on a bilateral basis between National Societies and the ICRC and between National Societies and the International Federation. Contingency planning in any country needs to take into consideration the range of capacities that will be required by the National Society to respond to the risks identified. Part of this process should include discussion on the functions the Host National Society will assume in different emergency scenarios.

The International Federation has drawn up guidelines and the methodology for contingency planning based on learning from planning processes addressing natural disasters in the Americas and the refugee influx in Western Africa. The guidelines are now being piloted in Central Asia and link contingency planning at country level with regional preparedness. The ICRC's contingency planning with National Societies has focused on preparedness measures for working together in conflict, including partnering through the Safer Access approach, which cuts across all programmes, including relief, first aid, medical services and restoring family links.

During the first quarter of 2007, the ICRC began reviewing approaches to working with National Societies as part of its rapid response initiative designed to improve both its own and its partners' response to emergencies. The ICRC and the International Federation coordinated their efforts to ensure joined-up and appropriate support to National Societies in preparing to meet needs in conflict environments, natural disasters and complex emergencies.

- *Basic contingency planning should be carried out at country level. This should at a minimum incorporate: assessment of risks, existing/potential Movement capacities and resources to address possible humanitarian needs arising from identified risks; and coordination arrangements for a potential Movement response.*

3.1.3 Country-level memoranda of understanding

MoUs that reflect the management principles and guidelines embodied in the SA & SM now exist in more than ten countries. These countries report that the MoU provides a practical basis for cooperation and coordination. The process of negotiating the MoU was reported to have promoted closer, more cooperative working relationships once differences had been worked through.

A number of National Societies have initiated negotiation of an MoU, whilst others, because of their operational culture or particular history of relations within the Movement, deemed the process not to be constructive.

- *National Societies should be encouraged to develop MoUs as a way of preparing for a response to emergencies and as a cooperation tool.*

3.1.4 Problem solving

At country level, problems were reportedly resolved through a constant dialogue conducted via face-to-face meetings, e-mail and phone. The need for dialogue was reported by some to be “time consuming” and “heavy”, but at the same time was seen as a basic requirement for cooperation and a basis for coordination.

Some problems reported as unresolved arose from differences of opinion on approaches, particularly in relation to the transition from emergency relief to recovery policy and the different operational cultures of Movement components. Respondents viewed referring issues to headquarters level as a last resort and appropriate in a few cases.

3.2 What measures are taken to ensure that the ONS is the Primary Partner of the Lead Agency (if it is not the lead agency)?

The monitoring framework prompts consideration of the quality of the relationship between the Lead Agency and the Host National Society. Respondents were also asked to consider how Movement components other than the Lead Agency dealt with the primacy of the Host National Society working in its own country.

3.2.1 Consultations with the Host National Society

In all contexts where emergency relief operations were conducted, the Host National Society was consulted regarding the Movement's response. However, the scope of consultation varied according to the context and the operational culture and capacities of the Host National Society. In Lebanon, where the Lebanese Red Cross largely conducted the Movement's emergency medical response during the crisis in July 2006, the National Society was consulted on all aspects of the Movement's response.

Consultations were most frequent and extensive at the outset of international relief operations, when the need for operational coordination was at its height. Consultations relating to preparedness for future response were rarer, particularly within the framework of contingency planning.

The behaviour of Partner National Societies towards the Host National Society varied. Some worked bilaterally in ways that the Host National Society perceived to be more concerned with positioning themselves vis-à-vis interested parties in their home countries than with the needs of people in the affected country.

- *Consultations should be carried out as a preparedness measure and, where possible, should be part of the Host National Society's contingency planning and MoU negotiation processes.*

3.2.2 Transition

During the period under review, little information on the management of transition situations was gathered. However, this subject was treated in depth by the Council of Delegates working group on implementation of the Seville Agreement between 2003 and 2005.

3.3 What has been done to establish and/or improve cooperative working relationships and coordination mechanisms to ensure timely and effective responses?

3.3.1 Coordination meetings held in non-emergency situations and in international relief operations

In all large-scale international relief operations in 2006 and 2007 ? (in Pakistan, Lebanon, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Somalia, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Colombia, Israel, the occupied and autonomous Palestinian territories and the Democratic Republic of the Congo), coordination meetings took place between the Host National Society, the ICRC and the International Federation.

The architecture of Movement coordination differed in each context, since it was contingent on contextual factors. For example, Indonesia and Sri Lanka had the same formal, structured coordination set-up consisting of a strategic decision-making body, an operational coordination body and special technical bodies, but the outcomes were different in each country. The position of Participating National Societies within Movement coordination mechanisms varied, but they were mostly involved at the operational and technical levels.

3.4 Learning from regional consultations, operations, implementation reviews, and questionnaires completed by ICRC and International Federation delegations

Significant findings that have not been incorporated into the monitoring framework format are highlighted in this section. The list is not exhaustive; rather, it is illustrative of the points raised that were relevant to the Group's mandate.

3.4.1 Regional consultations

- Cooperation and coordination work well when there are existing working relationships and trust has already been built.
- The primary objective of coordination within the Movement is to meet priority needs. However, coordination should aim to be as inclusive as possible of all Movement partners within the parameters of existing Movement policies. The Movement coordination process should enhance the coordination capacities of the Host National Society.
- Pre-agreements that clarify roles and responsibilities (i.e. country-level MoUs in line with the SA & SM) are essential cooperation and coordination tools.
- The statutes and legal base of a Host National Society should adequately cover the coordination functions required of it in an international relief operation. The National Society's operational relationship with the government specifying its auxiliary function and coordination role in national disaster response should be clarified in advance.
- Participating National Societies should always consult the Host National Society before coming into a country and, once there, should participate in established coordination

mechanisms. Each Participating National Society should nominate a contact person to facilitate meaningful communication between it and the Host National Society.

- The Lead Agency should be well prepared and have the capacities to lead, in particular to provide a situation analysis focused on needs, to create a shared vision and to provide a coherent framework for the operation.
- Operational guidelines concerning use of the emblem for protective and indicative purposes by Participating National Societies should be drawn up, communicated and enforced in each country.
- Factors that inhibit coordination include: intense media pressure on national players; government and donor pressure for rapid action; and the absence of a clear Lead Agency.
- The commitment of various leaders within the Movement to make the SA & SM work has had a beneficial impact on relationships within the Movement and consequently on the effectiveness of the coordination of Movement resources for the delivery of services to beneficiaries.

3.4.2 The Movement operation in Lebanon

The SA & SM framed the Movement's response to needs arising from the crisis in Lebanon in July 2006. The Lebanese Red Cross was supported as primary partner by the ICRC in its Lead Agency function and by the International Federation in the manner foreseen in the Supplementary Measures. The scope and scale of the Movement's response was coordinated by the Lebanese Red Cross and the ICRC and supported by the International Federation. The joint statement issued by the ICRC and the International Federation setting out the Movement coordination arrangements in Lebanon and for the region was agreed in advance with the Lebanese Red Cross and other affected Host National Societies in the region.

From the outset, efforts were made to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance contributed by Participating National Societies, particularly from within the region. The ability of the Lebanese Red Cross and the ICRC to coordinate international assistance was undermined when National Societies worked unilaterally or proposed to deliver assistance outside the parameters established for the Movement's response.

3.4.3 Reviews of implementation of the SA & SM in Kenya, Indonesia and Haiti

The review in Kenya documented the role of the Kenya Red Cross Society as Lead Agency in managing the Movement's response to the droughts in late 2006. The Kenyan Red Cross demonstrated its capacity to work with the government as co-chair with the Office of the President in the coordination of a sudden onset disaster. The National Society was supported in its Lead Agency function by both the ICRC and the International Federation.

The review noted that cooperation in several operations conducted recently in Kenya (in response to drought, tribal clashes and an influx of Somali refugees) had gone through different phases, sometimes with difficulties and moments of tension for the different partners involved. However, cooperation between partners was seen to have been strengthened as a result of working together and of working through the problems.

A key issue that surfaced during all three reviews was the difficulty of running a large-scale international relief operation in ways that benefit the Host National Society in terms of building its capacity to coordinate future such operations and of enhancing its profile in its own country. This prompted the reflection that the scope and scale of Host National Society

involvement should be linked to its actual capacities and that Movement coordination processes should aim to build the Host National Society's coordination capacities for the future. The Indonesian Red Cross Society and the Haitian National Red Cross Society both felt that there was a real risk of their own organizations being weakened by international relief operations.

4 Achievements and challenges

4.1 Achievements

Overall, this report has a positive message concerning the ability of Movement components to work in partnership within the framework of the SA & SM in the interests of vulnerable people. The findings indicate that the Supplementary Measures are aligned with coordination requirements and actually improve the ability of Movement components to coordinate among themselves, thereby facilitating the delivery of services to beneficiaries.

Used appropriately, to initiate or enhance cooperation processes, the SA & SM have provided an impetus for the establishment of routine cooperative working practices that are the foundation of effective coordination. At the time of writing, the Supplementary Measures have been under implementation for a year and half. Whilst their initial impact has been significant, further and deeper impact will only be achieved over the long term. It is vital that the initial positive momentum be maintained and built on by all Movement components.

The commitment of the leadership of the National Societies, the International Federation and the ICRC to implement the SA & SM and to enhance knowledge of their basic principles through training and awareness raising has increased their impact within the Movement. The imperative now is to put these principles into action on the ground.

4.2 Challenges within the Movement

Coordination and cooperation within the Movement need to intensify at country level, and all Movement components have to further develop their capacities to work in partnership to ensure optimal responses to the needs of beneficiaries. Contingency planning to assess risks, resources and capacities for action are key in this respect.

Some Host National Societies felt that international relief operations may not strengthen their long-term capacities to deliver services to vulnerable people in their own countries. Host National Societies need to make realistic assessments about their capacities to coordinate and operate in international relief responses. Strategic decisions should be taken at the outset of an international relief operation about the areas that a Host National Society wishes to develop and the scope of its participation in the operation. Its role should also be continually reassessed to ensure it is adjusted as the operating environment changes.

Maintaining a coherent Movement response proved most challenging where Participating National Societies failed to coordinate with the Host National Society and pursued bilateral programmes with partners outside the Movement. The reputation of the Host National Society is affected by the behaviour of Participating National Societies. These should always coordinate their activities with the Host National Society and, as appropriate, with the ICRC or the International Federation as foreseen in the Statutes of the Movement.

4.3 Challenges in the external environment

Challenges in the external environment, particularly in conflict situations, underscore the need to take advantage of the Movement's distinct identity, which is derived from its Fundamental Principles. This distinctiveness has enabled the Movement to reach victims of conflict and natural disaster in Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan and many other countries.

All Movement components face increased competition from other humanitarian organizations which, along with contextual challenges, require a twofold response. First, it is to reaffirm the Movement's strict adherence to the Fundamental Principles, which are its source of comparative advantage. Second, each Movement component should develop its capacities to act and work in partnership with others within the Movement.

The SA & SM provide an effective tool to achieve the Movement's mission. Their flexibility can accommodate the constraints and challenges arising in each particular context.

5	Recommendations
----------	------------------------

1. The Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures should continue to be applied as the framework for organizing the Movement's international relief operations.
2. Training of senior operational managers and members of governance within all Movement components should be compulsory. National Societies, with the support of the International Federation and the ICRC, should develop and implement a training action plan. In the first instance, training should focus on countries with large-scale international relief operations.
3. All Movement components should develop their capacities to work together in partnership. The ICRC, the International Federation and National Societies working internationally should build their capacities to be effective partners to Host National Societies, whereby each institution emerges strengthened from operational cooperation. Practical measures taken in this regard should, where necessary, enhance the ability of the Host National Society to be the primary partner and, where applicable, the Lead Agency.
4. National Societies, the International Federation and the ICRC should place emphasis on preparedness measures that facilitate working together in emergencies as foreseen in the SA & SM. Such measures include:
 - 4.1 Meetings between Movement components present in a country: information exchange, analysis and opportunities to build working relationships and trust required to assist victims and vulnerable groups appropriately
 - 4.2 Negotiation processes opened to develop country-level memoranda of understanding (MoUs) that define the roles and responsibilities of Movement components articulated in the SA & SM.
 - 4.3 Contingency planning that assesses risks and the resources that could be mobilized within the Movement and considers how such resources would be coordinated to deliver effective services to beneficiaries.
5. Coordination efforts should first and foremost focus on the needs of victims and vulnerable people, be results oriented, always take the local context into consideration and be established within the framework of the SA & SM.
6. National Societies, the International Federation and the ICRC should ensure that learning and best practices are documented and shared so that the Movement as a whole can benefit and improve its performance for beneficiaries.
7. In order to build on the positive momentum and achievements that followed the adoption of the Supplementary Measures to the Seville Agreement, implementation of the SA & SM should be continuously monitored. The International Federation and the ICRC should regularly inform National Societies of progress in implementation following the monitoring framework.

Annex 1

Monitoring framework for implementation of the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures

1 Introduction

The Seville Agreement³ became Movement policy at the Council of Delegates in 1997. Reports on its implementation have been produced for each subsequent Council of Delegates.

The objectives of the Seville Agreement – to assist beneficiaries by making optimal use of resources within the Movement and to strengthen cooperation among National Societies, the International Federation and the ICRC – remain valid. Working together in ways that are satisfactory for each Movement component, however, has proved challenging.

Since 1997, there have been changes in the wider external environment and changes within the Movement. Lessons have been learned about the management of Movement responses in a number of large-scale emergencies.

With these factors in mind, the Supplementary Measures to the Seville Agreement⁴ were adopted in 2005. They address the shortcomings of the Seville Agreement and thereby improve services provided to beneficiaries by Movement components.

At the same time, a Movement Group (Resolution 8 Group on Implementation of the Seville Agreement)⁵ was established to improve implementation of the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures. The monitoring framework set out in this paper was developed by the Group.

2 Focus and scope of the monitoring framework

The Resolution 8 Group agreed that the monitoring framework would focus on three core areas:

- § *What is being done to ensure that the SA & SM are known and applied by all those most concerned?*
- § *What measures were taken to ensure that the Host NS is the Primary Partner of the Lead Agency (if Host NS is not Lead Agency)*
- § *Measures being taken to establish and/or improve coordination mechanisms that ensure timely and effective responses.*

³ Agreement on the Organization of the International Activities of the Components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, adopted at the Council of Delegates in 1997.

⁴ Supplementary Measures to Enhance the Implementation of the Seville Agreement, adopted by Resolution 8 of the Council of Delegates in 2005.

⁵ The Group established by Resolution 8, point 6, Council of Delegates 2005, comprising the four elected vice presidents of the International Federation and a member of the Governing Board representing the Middle East and North Africa region, plus two representatives each of the ICRC and the International Federation Secretariat, to monitor implementation of the Seville Agreement and the Supplementary Measures (by establishing a monitoring and reporting framework) and to address all cooperation and coordination issues in the Movement.

In accordance with Article 1.1 of the Seville Agreement, the scope of the monitoring activities for this framework is: *“those international activities which the components are called upon to carry out in cooperation, on a bilateral or multilateral basis, to the exclusion of the activities which the Statutes of the Movement and the Geneva Conventions entrust to the components individually”*.

3 Intended use of the monitoring framework

The monitoring framework provides guidance to any Movement component wishing to assess its activities in relation to the requirements of the SA & SM.

The framework can monitor interaction between Movement components and the steps taken to ensure effective and efficient use of resources in delivering services to beneficiaries.

The framework will gain maximum benefit if all Movement components involved in a Movement response participate in the monitoring process.

The expected results of the framework include long-term goals that will take 5–10 years to achieve. Nevertheless, it sets out a general direction for the main areas in which progress is expected. It is designed to be used on an annual basis to assess year-on-year progress.

4 Monitoring framework

Q.1 What is being done to ensure that the SA & SM are known and applied by all those most concerned?

Measure	Expected results	Implementation	Checklist of questions
Awareness raising/training in the substance of the SA & SM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Movement components are aware of the substance of the SA & SM. § Movement components have knowledge and understanding of how to implement programmes that fall within the framework of the SA & SM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Information activities and training are carried out jointly or separately by the Host National Society, the International Federation and/or the ICRC (where present). § The SA & SM are used as reference policies by operational managers of Movement responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Are your members of staff aware of the substance of the SA & SM? § Are the SA & SM included in the briefing of staff working overseas? § Are the SA & SM readily available to your staff members? § Have you carried out specific training in the SA & SM? § Do performance assessments of your staff include implementation of the SA & SM?
Contingency planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § A country-level framework for the organization of a Movement response is established and known. § Roles and responsibilities of Movement partners are mapped out within the contingency plan. § Contingency planning is based on the capacities and competencies of Movement components. § Contingency planning makes reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the capacities of the Host National Society; ○ neighbouring and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Contingency planning is carried out by the Host National Society, the International Federation and the ICRC (where present) and Partner National Societies, where operational. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Have contingency planning meetings been held with all Movement components present in the country? § Are there contingency plans in place that specify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the capacities of each Movement component; ○ resources at the disposal of each Movement component; ○ the management system for mobilizing and coordinating capacities and resources in case of need?

	Partner National Societies; ○ other partners.		
Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), including roles and responsibilities of Movement components	§ Country-level MoUs setting out the respective roles and responsibilities of Movement components are developed.	§ Country-level MoUs are under development and/or signed.	§ Have discussions on the roles and responsibilities of each Movement component taken place in your own country? § Have steps been taken to agree on and formalize the respective roles and responsibilities of each Movement component in your own country?
Problem-solving mechanisms established and known	§ Points of divergence between Movement components are identified and addressed through country-level coordination mechanisms. § Problem-solving mechanisms are developed, implemented and used.	§ Problem-solving mechanisms are developed, implemented and used.	§ Do fora (e.g. meetings) exist where points of divergence between Movement components present are discussed? § What processes have been used to solve problems? § What significant unresolved problems exist in your country of operation, and how do you think they should be addressed?

Q.2 What measures have been taken to ensure that the Host National Society is the primary partner of the Lead Agency (if it is not the Lead Agency)?

Measure	Expected results	Implementation	Checklist of questions
National Society consulted on: § analysis of the environment § needs assessment § scope and scale of the Movement response and operational strategy § plan of action § management of relations within and outside the Movement	§ The initial and ongoing Movement response takes full account of the Host National Society's views on analysis, assessment, operational strategy, plan of action and management of the Movement's response. § An increased level of involvement and responsibility of the Host National Society in the direction and coordination of the emergency operation is achieved in accordance with its capacities. § Entry and exit strategies for all Movement partners are known.	§ Consultation takes place between the Lead Agency and the Host National Society with the frequency and functionality required to achieve the expected result. § Actions are taken by all Movement components to support the Host National Society in its role as primary partner.	§ Have discussions with the Host National Society taken place on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ overall environment; ○ needs assessment; ○ scope and scale of the Movement response; ○ operational strategy; ○ plan of action; ○ management of relations within the Movement; ○ management of relations outside the Movement; ○ entry and exit strategies for Movement components in the country? § Have partners acted in a way that recognizes the primary partner role? How?
Transition is managed by the Host National Society and the Lead Agency	§ Discussions of modifications relating to the Lead Agency in transition has involved the Host National Society. § Transfer of management responsibilities from the Lead	§ Consultation takes place between the Lead Agency and the Host National Society regarding transition. § Plans for ending the lead agency role are elaborated	§ Has the transition been discussed with the Host National Society? § What measures have been put in place for termination of the lead agency function? § What information has been disseminated to Movement components operational in the country

	Agency to the Host National Society is planned in advance, is made known to relevant partners and gives the best possible results for beneficiaries.	and disseminated.	regarding ending the lead agency function?
--	--	-------------------	--

Q.3 What has been done to establish and/or improve cooperative working relationships and coordination mechanisms that ensure timely and effective responses?

Measure	Expected results	Implementation	Checklist questions
Coordination meetings are held in non-emergency situations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Movement components present in a country are aware of their respective roles and responsibilities, capacities and programmes and have open channels of communication. § Measures are taken to ensure that the SA & SM are known and applied by meeting participants. § The cooperation and coordination activities of all Movement components, e.g. Cooperation Agreement Strategies (CAS), are aligned with and complementary to the SA & SM. § The resources of neighbouring countries are considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Regular coordination meetings are held between the Movement components operational in the country. § These meetings are chaired by the Host ? National Society. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § How often do coordination meetings take place? § Who attends coordination meetings? § What is on the agenda of coordination meetings? § How are decisions taken at coordination meetings communicated to Movement components present in the country? § Does coordination take place with neighbouring countries? How? § Are roles and responsibilities of Movement components in line with the SA & SM? § How do coordination meetings relate to other cooperation processes in the country (e.g. CAS)?
Coordination meetings are held in international relief operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Movement response is managed through functional coordination meetings that include each Movement component in accordance with its specific role and responsibilities. § The parameters of the Movement's response are established through coordination meetings. § The range of meetings that take place between Movement partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Regular coordination meetings are held. § Appropriate coordination systems are established for a particular country adapted for the local conditions. § The outcomes of coordination meetings are recorded and made known to all Movement partners without delay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § How often do coordination meetings take place? § Who attends coordination meetings? § What is on the agenda of coordination meetings? § How are decisions taken at coordination meetings communicated to Movement components present in the country? § Does coordination take place with neighbouring countries? How? § Are the roles and responsibilities of Movement components in line with the SA & SM? § How do coordination meetings in the emergency

	<p>are coordinated so that they cover consultation and dialogue, rules and standard setting, the scope and scale of the Movement's response and strategic direction and coordination of the Movement's response.</p> <p>The resources of neighbouring countries are considered.</p>		<p>phase relate to the long-term capacity-building of the Host National Society?</p>
--	---	--	--