



**Power of humanity**

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

10-11 November 2017, Turkey



**EN**

**CD/17/R1**

**Original: English  
Adopted**

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

Antalya, Turkey  
10–11 November 2017

**Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation (SMCC)**

**RESOLUTION**

**Document prepared by the International Committee of the Red Cross and the  
International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in consultation with  
National Societies**

Antalya, November 2017

## RESOLUTION

### Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation (SMCC)

The Council of Delegates,

*noting with appreciation* the steady and demonstrated improvements in Movement coordination and cooperation and the efforts made to optimize the contributions of all components of the Movement since the 2015 Council of Delegates in preparation for and in response to emergencies across the world, as witnessed in several contexts,

*confident* that the ongoing improvements to Movement coordination and cooperation are contributing to further increasing the Movement's humanitarian reach for the benefit of affected populations, independently of the scale of the emergency, in accordance with the aspirations of the Vision for the Movement adopted by the 2015 Council of Delegates,

*acknowledging* the continuously growing demands on humanitarian actors, including the Movement, to respond more efficiently to the increasing complexity of emergencies on a greater scale, and efforts to position the Movement as a leading and cost-effective humanitarian network, committed to ensuring the best possible complementarity between local and international response,

*recalling* Resolution 1 of the 2015 Council of Delegates and Resolution 4 of the 2013 Council of Delegates, both of which tasked the ICRC and the International Federation to continue their joint work on strengthening Movement coordination and cooperation (ref. CD/15/R1 & CD/13/R4),

*further recalling* Resolution 6 of the 1997 Council of Delegates, which adopted the "Agreement on the organization of the international activities of the components of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement" (the Seville Agreement); Resolution 8 of the 2005 Council of Delegates, which adopted the "Supplementary Measures to Enhance the Implementation of the Seville Agreement" (SA/SM); and their follow-up reports as foundations of Movement coordination and cooperation,

*acknowledging and welcoming* the enabling and positive environment that the SMCC process has created within the Movement for building collective positioning and speaking with a coherent voice on global humanitarian issues,

*expressing its appreciation and support* for the engagement and work of the International Federation, the ICRC and all National Societies involved in the implementation of the SMCC Plan of Action, which addressed current challenges and opportunities in Movement coordination, preparedness and response, as described in the annexed Progress Report,

*recognizing* the specific attention paid to ensuring the operational relevance of the SMCC outputs by testing in the field, especially through the identification of five country "laboratories", where SMCC tools were piloted, existing best practices captured and the "SMCC spirit" strengthened,

*mindful of* the remaining challenges to improving Movement coordination and cooperation, especially diverse organizational cultures, communication difficulties, the limited contribution from Movement components and varying levels of awareness of the coordination tools and mechanisms, as well as increasing challenges from external stakeholders,

*recognizing* the need to pursue stronger Movement coordination and cooperation after the 2017 Council of Delegates, by reflecting on the transformative changes required at institutional and organizational levels and consolidating the advances deriving from the implementation of Resolution 1 of the 2015 Council of Delegates,

*resolves* as follows:

- A. *welcomes and endorses* the fact-based recommendations listed in the Progress Report and summarized as follows:
1. Drawing from reinforced leadership commitment, continue to increase SMCC literacy, promote coordination in all situations and further strengthen dialogue on policy issues.
  2. Ensure that the presentation on the regulatory framework is disseminated, that evidence on its effectiveness is gathered and that integrity issues affecting compliance are adequately addressed.
  3. Promote the use of updated coordination tools and mechanisms through an easily accessible online tool-kit and facilitate replication and communication between local and national levels.
  4. Continue deployment of joint preparedness tools, roll out training on Movement coordination and ensure the inclusion of National Society capacity strengthening in emergency response.
  5. Clarify security agreements and streamline security management tools and training with increased involvement of National Societies to strengthen their capacities in safety and security.
  6. Increase coordination on communication through the use of joint statements, tripartite committees and training, while developing further the exchange of information and data.
  7. Continue to develop synergies between the surge capacities of Movement components and learn from and adapt deployment of Movement coordination officers.
  8. Improve the concept and implementation of *One International Appeal* and explore securing wider financial support while better depicting the overall Movement response.
  9. Develop further the interoperability of logistics services and a long-term plan of action.
- B. *tasks* the ICRC and the International Federation, with active engagement and contributions from National Societies, to oversee the implementation of recommendations and to report back to the 2019 Council of Delegates on the progress made;
- C. *calls for* sustained investment and firm leadership commitment from all Movement components to create an enabling environment for Movement coordination and cooperation ahead of the 2019 Council of Delegates;

- D. *endorses* the following three new priorities for the SMCC process up to the 2019 Council of Delegates, with the aim of deepening the humanitarian reach of the Movement and triggering a positive impact on its cost-effectiveness, access, acceptance, visibility and credibility:
1. increase **literacy** in and the use of the Movement's coordination tools and mechanisms and contribute to **mindset change** through:
    - (1) improved knowledge of the tool-kit and training on coordination
    - (2) continuous adaptation of tools and dissemination of best practices
    - (3) further alignment of systems, notably surge and data management
    - (4) promotion of constant and meaningful dialogue to support mindset change
  2. improve the cost-effective and operationally relevant **provision of "services and support"** in high-interest areas where the Movement can assert its know-how and demonstrate its added-value by:
    - (1) further developing interoperability in logistics
    - (2) strengthening interaction and dialogue on security
    - (3) clarifying security management agreements in operational contexts and streamlining training
  3. continue building on successful examples of joint **resource mobilization** by:
    - (1) further improving the concept and mechanism for *One International Appeal*
    - (2) attracting more resources and support for response to large-scale emergencies in a timely manner
    - (3) improving the capacity to project and promote the overall Movement footprint
- E. *requests* all components of the Movement to continue supporting and providing adequate resources for the implementation of the recommendations, including through the adoption of the necessary changes in their own training, procedures and operational policies and practices.

## **PROGRESS REPORT**

### **Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation**

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Launched by Resolution 4 adopted at the 2013 Council of Delegates (CoD), the Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation (SMCC) initiative has gained significant momentum in the past two years, improving the Movement's capacity for efficient large-scale emergency responses. Directly supported by over 40 National Societies, implementation of SMCC has initiated a gradual change process and fostered a positive "SMCC spirit" among Movement components, positioning the Movement on the "front foot" in the evolving humanitarian ecosystem.

Findings presented in this report are based on data gathered in various settings as well as from close monitoring of five specific contexts chosen as country "laboratories" (Haiti, Philippines, South Sudan, Syria and Ukraine) that benefited from a greater focus from the project's coordination team. SMCC implementation has translated into a number of achievements which are grouped into three categories in this progress report, namely coordination, preparedness and response.

As evidenced by the feedback received, many activities undertaken under the SMCC Plan of Action improved the accessibility of coordination tools and mechanisms for National Societies. For instance, the Movement Response Cycle, forming the basis of the Movement coordination online toolkit, enables all Movement personnel to obtain relevant information and examples for successful coordination. In addition, institutional training courses, such as the International Mobilization and Preparedness for Action Training Course and the Movement Induction Course for senior leaders, now include the most current information on Movement coordination and highlight the importance of a coordination mindset and the SMCC spirit, also captured in a promotional video.

Collective preparedness at the field level has been enhanced by introducing specific tools, such as Movement country plans and contingency planning. Through their implementation, these tools have contributed to increased transparency and trust between Movement partners. In addition, harmonized National Society development approaches, featured in the SMCC Plan of Action, also led to improved communications between Movement components.

In operational responses, the successful and often combined use of various Movement coordination tools, for example, in Haiti's response to Hurricane Matthew, triggered broader interest in SMCC. This interest resulted in the application of SMCC tools in smaller-scale emergencies and development contexts. One such tool receiving wide usage is the *Mini-Summit* which sets out the Movement response within the first 48 hours of an emergency. The *Mini-Summit* has proven effective and has the most visible SMCC impact on operations.

Feedback received from field experience confirms the benefits of improved coordination and cooperation on the delivery of operations, improved institutional relationships at field level and National Society capacity development. However, it also notes that challenges to effective coordination at the field and headquarters level are still linked to issues such as trust, mutual respect and contextually-driven solutions.

Diverse organizational cultures, which come with conflicting interests and difficult-to-align systems, communication difficulties notably between geographical levels (i.e. local – regional – global) and negative incentives from external stakeholders with respect to specific requirements and earmarking from back donors, remain key challenges for continuing

implementation of the SMCC process. Overcoming these challenges also comes at a high transactional cost for the Movement.

Moreover, further transformational changes, such as the use of the One International Appeal between the ICRC and the International Federation, have highlighted other key issues, such as the challenging alignment of strategies or shortcomings in portraying the full extent of the Movement response. This will therefore require further development in the next phase of the project.

To sustain the traction of SMCC progress gained to date, recommendations build on the encouraging advances while focusing investment on areas that combine operational cost-benefit and donors' interests to achieve the best humanitarian impact. It is therefore proposed to focus in the next phase on a) increasing SMCC literacy and fostering a global mindset for coordination and cooperation and b) enhancing interoperability and alignment of support and services, especially in security and logistics.

## 1. BACKGROUND

Efforts to work together better as a Movement are not new. The process to strengthen coordination and cooperation within the Movement gained significant momentum in 2013, with the adoption of Resolution 4<sup>1</sup> at the CoD in Sydney, Australia. This launched a comprehensive and inclusive Movement-wide consultation process in 2014–2015, with the participation of over 140 National Societies. The results of the consultations and ensuing recommendations were presented to the 2015 CoD in a progress report<sup>2</sup> which identified the necessity of enhanced Movement coordination in humanitarian crises and a strong willingness among Movement components to work together to fulfil the Movement's common goals. This positive momentum and spirit is reflected in Resolution 1,<sup>3</sup> which was adopted by consensus at the CoD in 2015 and tasked the Movement with implementing the SMCC Plan of Action for 2015–2017.

### 1.1 SMCC Plan of Action and set-up

The 2015 Plan of Action was based on the progress report recommendations, which were translated into eight objectives that aimed to increase Movement response to large-scale emergencies. These objectives can be summed up as follows: inclusiveness and trust; support to National Societies; contextualization of the response; collective preparedness; coordination from the onset of emergencies; coherence of communication; complementarity of resource mobilization; and, lastly, compliance with standards.

To implement the action points related to these objectives, Joint Implementation Teams (JITs) composed of senior staff members from the ICRC and the International Federation were formed, with all National Societies invited to participate. These teams were responsible for identifying the most appropriate ways to ensure that National Society perspectives were included in implementation and to secure financial and other resources to assist effective implementation, thus complying with the Resolution's request for all Movement components to support and resource the implementation of the SMCC Plan of Action.

The Senior Management Steering Team, the ICRC Deputy Director General and the Under-Secretary General for Programmes and Operations of the International Federation took overall responsibility for the implementation of the Plan of Action, guided the process and ensured timelines were met and progress was recorded. The Senior Management Steering Team was supported by a joint coordination team.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://rcrcconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/2013-Council-of-Delegates-resolution-booklet.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> [http://rcrcconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CoD15\\_SMCC\\_report-FINAL-EN.pdf](http://rcrcconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CoD15_SMCC_report-FINAL-EN.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [http://rcrcconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CoD15-R1-SMCC\\_EN.pdf](http://rcrcconference.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CoD15-R1-SMCC_EN.pdf)

The SMCC Resolution received wide endorsement, and 24 National Societies responded to the call for interest and expressed their willingness to contribute to the implementation of the Plan of Action. In addition, more than 20 additional National Societies contributed to the work of the various JITs, resulting in over 44 National Societies actively engaged in the SMCC process.

### **1.2 SMCC operational implementation**

Maintaining the practical focus of the SMCC process, the development of concepts and the implementation of newly developed tools and mechanisms were undertaken simultaneously. In addition, efforts were made to gather existing best practices and experiences in various contexts to inform SMCC implementation.

To make this real-time learning possible, one context per region, later labelled SMCC country “laboratories”, was identified after extensive discussion with stakeholders. The countries nominated as country laboratories (in alphabetical order) are: Haiti, Philippines, South Sudan, Syria<sup>4</sup> and Ukraine. The decision to use the SMCC tools and mechanisms most appropriate for the operation in question was left to the Movement components in these contexts. While special attention was paid to these countries, this did not prevent progress on SMCC implementation in countries outside these five contexts.<sup>5</sup>

During the implementation process, it became clear that some deliverables and targets included in the Plan of Action were too ambitious in terms of timing and scope. Further adjustment was needed to allow for realistic and participatory implementation. This had a positive effect on SMCC implementation but also highlighted the fact that efforts to strengthen Movement coordination and cooperation are time-consuming and require continuous effort and support.

It is worth highlighting that while the SMCC Plan of Action promoted new tools to enhance Movement coordination and cooperation in large-scale emergencies, it also reinforced the use of existing Movement tools and mechanisms. In further testimony to the SMCC spirit a number of countries also applied tools and mechanisms included in the SMCC Plan of Action, especially in relation to preparedness, in contexts outside the initially established SMCC implementation parameter of large-scale emergencies.

Consequently, wide promotion of the SMCC spirit influenced other initiatives and policy development within the Movement, such as its collective positioning on certain issues of common concern (localization agenda, migration, etc.).

### **1.3 SMCC visibility and information sharing**

To keep all Movement components updated on developments and to showcase good practice, two SMCC newsletters (July 2016 and January 2017) were sent to leaders of all National Societies. While some 40 percent of the recipients opened the second SMCC newsletter, feedback indicates that the information rarely reached the National Societies’ operational staff.

Additional communication activities included the promotion and presentation of SMCC at several Movement meetings, such as the annual logistics meeting, the leadership meeting of Eastern European, Baltic, Southern Caucasus and Central Asian National Societies, the legal advisors and Disaster Management Working Group meetings and the Regional Partnership

---

<sup>4</sup> Syria: no official confirmation received due to change in leadership as well as ongoing operational response.

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, the [Movement response/narrative to Food Crisis in Africa](#) in April 2017 relating to Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen.

Meeting for Europe. Further to these meetings, a promotional video on the SMCC process was developed and integrated into existing training programmes.

Despite these efforts to keep Movement components informed about SMCC developments, there remains much work to be done to further develop adequate knowledge and ownership of the SMCC process and tools among Movement personnel globally.

## 2. ANALYSIS / PROGRESS

The findings, comments and recommendations included in this section of the progress report have been collected and consolidated from specific reports produced either by JITs or country “laboratories” as well as from other sources, such as real-time evaluations and activity reports. Reports from the JITs and from the country laboratories can be made available by request to the SMCC coordination team.

Although information provided in this report may be relevant across several domains pertinent to coordination and cooperation, for ease of reading the findings and recommendations have been grouped as follows: general findings, coordination mechanisms and tools, preparedness and response.

### 2.1 General findings

Regular engagement with stakeholders suggests that, notwithstanding the remaining challenges and the work/commitment necessary to achieve coordination, the SMCC process successfully enhanced the **Movement’s public profile, operational impact and efficiency**.

Movement partners, notably in Haiti, South Sudan and Armenia, acknowledge that, in addition to the tangible benefits of SMCC implementation, the process has also proved a valuable vehicle for increasing **trust and mutual understanding**, essential for effective Movement coordination.

*“The Movement response during the events in South Sudan was a concerted effort between Movement partners. The ICRC, the South Sudan Red Cross and the International Federation worked together in good coordination to assist those who were affected and were seen as the Red Cross family.”*  
ICRC cooperation delegate in South Sudan

Yet coordination still does not occur naturally. Coordination and cooperation concepts are closely linked and require a **change of mindset** that the SMCC process has helped foster in many of the contexts concerned. **Continued meaningful commitment and coherent communication** from the **leadership of each Movement component** is key to creating and maintaining a constructive approach to coordination that benefits from strongly aligned leadership at field and headquarters levels.

Since the start of implementation of the SMCC process, there has been a shift from coordination as the mere exchange of information to the development of genuine partnerships with shared objectives achieved by complementary activities. Experience has also demonstrated that to be effective, coordination needs to have a clear focus, be well planned and build on the right mindset. It needs to be kept simple, results-oriented and relevant to field conditions and to empower individuals to prioritize the interests of the Movement over of the interests of the institutions they represent.

Strengthening Movement coordination is a **daily endeavour**. Although emergencies provide the most visible examples of good coordination, efforts to strengthen coordination should **not be limited to situations of large-scale emergencies**. In several contexts, such as Nepal, Gambia and Myanmar, Movement components have shown the benefit of preparing in

“normal” times in order to cooperate well in protracted emergencies or in post-emergency settings.

One main challenge to improved Movement coordination is the frequent perception of SMCC as a complex endeavour. While acknowledging that SMCC implementation can trigger complex, new and challenging processes, the importance of persevering and offering hands-on support was regularly highlighted as one way of generating learning. Although SMCC implementation was an overall positive experience, **misunderstandings, distrust and prejudice are still present** across the Movement and can only be partially addressed through communication endeavours.

Some contexts have been emblematic in showing that, with limited guidance or instructions, efficient Movement **coordination is achievable if the right spirit is applied**, for example, Myanmar, Gabon and The Gambia/Senegal. Conversely, other contexts have demonstrated how fragile Movement coordination is and how dependent it is on mindset and individuals.

In terms of policy, several positive developments have occurred in collective initiatives that have **strengthened the overall positioning, image, influence and credibility of the Movement**. Probably the most telling development is linked to the **World Humanitarian Summit (WHS)**, a meeting organized by the United Nations in May 2016 to reshape the humanitarian system. At the Summit, the Movement presented the report *Istanbul and beyond*<sup>6</sup> with joint positions on several issues which are high on the global humanitarian agenda. Being able to make clear links to the Movement’s existing practice and collectively present the common ambitions and a

*“The Movement. The ICRC and the International Federation both did well. The former won praise for what people continue to see as its singular role on the frontlines of humanitarian action while the International Federation, with its National Societies, is the embodiment of local knowledge and grassroots engagement.”*  
*Nick van Praag, director of Ground Truth Solutions*

united approach has allowed the Movement to demonstrate its massive reach and potential in the delivery of humanitarian aid, making the Movement one of the “winners” at the WHS.<sup>7</sup> For the **Grand Bargain**, an agreement made between donors and aid organizations to seek greater efficiency and improved incentives in financing humanitarian action, the ICRC and the International Federation prepared a *Joint International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement paper on the Grand Bargain*. Both institutions participated and spoke with one voice on applying the Grand Bargain. With respect to **civil-military coordination**, the Movement strengthened its position and influence by providing consolidated feedback to UN OCHA on the draft standards on humanitarian civil-military coordination. The ICRC has also supported the International Federation’s Regional Office in Asia Pacific with the secondment of a civil-military advisor supporting the establishment of an Asia Pacific Movement strategy for civil-military relations.

While it is not possible to attribute any of these achievements to the SMCC process alone, it is fair to say that the SMCC spirit has been instrumental in each of these achievements. According to many senior leaders within the Movement, there is no doubt that **SMCC has constructively influenced the interactions between the Movement components** and has

<sup>6</sup> Humanitarian principles, access and proximity, international humanitarian law, accountability to the people we serve, volunteer safety, sexual and gender-based violence and health services in crisis <http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Documents/Secretariat/201605/WHS%20report-A4-EN-LR.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Nick van Praag, director of Ground Truth Solutions

<http://groundtruthsolutions.org/2016/05/31/whsummit-scorecard-winners-and-others/>

paved the way for closer alignment on policy issues. SMCC has brought dialogue between components to a new level.

### Recommendations

#### 1. **Commitment to the SMCC process:**

With the reinforced commitment from senior leadership of all Movement components:

- a) Continue to increase literacy about SMCC and its benefits at every level and among all Movement components.
- b) Continue to promote improved coordination in all situations in which several Movement components are present.
- c) Further strengthen Movement dialogue on policy issues to consolidate Movement's influence in the humanitarian sector.

## 2.2 **Coordination mechanisms and tools**

Knowledge about and abidance by the Movement's regulatory framework are essential for good Movement coordination and cooperation in emergencies. During implementation of the Plan of Action, following up on concerns about the relevance of the regulatory framework to Movement coordination – highlighted during the consultation process in 2014 – it was confirmed that **the regulatory framework is not hampering good coordination**.

Real-time evaluations of a number of large-scale operations confirmed similar impressions but also highlighted that awareness of the regulatory framework could be increased. The usefulness of the regulatory framework was further assessed in questionnaires sent to Movement partners in selected contexts which have experienced a joint Movement response.<sup>8</sup> Results showed that the regulatory framework assisted decision-making and was referred to when discussing the allocation of roles and responsibilities (Haiti). In another context, it was not considered necessary to even discuss the regulatory framework because of the spirit of open cooperation (Gabon).

*Participation in the SMCC process has proven integral in shifting mindsets and fostering an enabling environment to increase humanitarian reach.*

A major development at the regional level has seen the ICRC and the International Federation agree on a **Concerted Approach for Africa**. Focusing on common priority areas, such as the implementation of the SMCC Plan of Action for the continent as well as emergency preparedness and response and National Society development, it also addresses integrity issues and ways to better position the Movement to maintain relevance and visibility. Replication of this concerted approach is envisaged in other regions. While this was a positive achievement in this region, challenges remain and

misunderstandings still occur, often due to **weak vertical and horizontal communication**.

At country level, the **Movement Coordination Agreement (MCA)** broadly frames interaction between the Movement components. It is a **key element for efficient coordination**, especially with respect to implementing the three levels of coordination (strategic, operational and technical) and reinforcing interaction and the flow of information between them. However, it is vital that these mechanisms, among others, do not turn out to be mere exchange-of-information forums. To provide added value, discussions must be transparent and decision-oriented. When well implemented, as was the case in Haiti, **the coordination mechanisms are clearly a catalyst for the inclusive and complementary conduct of activities**.

<sup>8</sup> Gabon, Haiti and The Gambia/Senegal.

One such mechanism is the SMCC-developed **Mini-Summit**. Over the past two years, there have been several examples where this decision-making meeting, held within the first 24–48 hours of the onset of an emergency between the National Society in the affected country, the International Federation and the ICRC, **has allowed Movement operations to proceed on the right track from the start.**

This was the case in Haiti following Hurricane Matthew, in Bangladesh in the wake of Cyclone Mora and massive landslides, in South Sudan in response to the violence, in Indonesia after an earthquake, in the Philippines in response to the events in Marawi and in Ukraine. In the situation in The Gambia/Senegal and in Gabon, Movement partners communicated remotely in the early hours of the crisis to ensure a successful and well-coordinated Movement response. While these latter examples did not involve *Mini-Summits* in the strictest sense, they show that the key element of the *Mini-Summit* – coordinating with each other at the onset of an emergency – was successfully adopted and adapted to the context. The *Mini-Summit* mechanism, supported by a short guidance note and checklist, has proven efficient and certainly had the most visible SMCC impact on the collective running of operations.

**The Operational Movement Coordination (OMC) tool**, which translates the coordination functions of the Seville Agreement into questions enabling an inclusive allocation of responsibilities amongst Movement partners, has been acknowledged by the Disaster Management Working Group as useful during preparedness and pre-emergency planning phases when the time is at hand. To overcome the limitations posed by its size, the tool will be adapted for inclusion in training on Movement coordination.

Misunderstandings and varying interpretations between Movement components of the purpose of a **Movement country plan** and its constituent elements have caused problems during SMCC implementation. It appears that this was, in part, due to the pre-existing use of this term within the Movement for slightly different planning purposes. Following consultations, it has been clarified that the Movement country plan is a foundation document that seeks to ensure that all Movement components share a common understanding of the likely evolution of the context over a predefined period. The Movement country plan can be used by Movement components according to their contextual requirements, for example, for operational alignment or promotional or fundraising purposes. In contexts like Ukraine or South Sudan, where it is currently being tested, it has **proven to be a driver of transparency and mutual respect** by forcing partners to debate substantial issues relating to the operating environment, the identity of the Movement and its operational ambitions.

**Lack of compliance** with the coordination framework had been identified as a cause of concern as compliance is one of the key aspects that contribute to strengthening Movement coordination. The JIT with responsibility for this objective held web-discussions with several National Societies and collected information through a questionnaire that was shared with twelve National Societies as well as four ICRC and International Federation delegations. While the findings confirmed that there are challenges to ensuring compliance with the coordination mechanisms and principles, the majority of them are directly or indirectly addressed by SMCC implementation. In the meantime, it is crucial to find ways to better monitor non-compliance of Movement components with the coordination framework as there are at times **negative incentives** (for example, States or back donors imposing priorities, activities or a particular *modus operandi*) which have a direct impact on the way some Movement components operate. These are not therefore purely coordination issues but may be symptoms of a deeper institutional lack of compliance with the Movement's principles, rules and regulations. Such issues might therefore need to be addressed **in a holistic manner** through other processes.

Finally, a central element of the coordination mechanisms, **the Movement coordination online toolkit**, containing all templates, guidance notes, checklists and other tools for Movement coordination, is accessible via a password-free, web-based format. This toolkit is

based on the Movement Response Cycle (annexed to SMCC Resolution 1, 2015 CoD) through which documents and related relevant explanations are linked. Further investigations into the suitability of a mobile application for the Movement coordination online toolkit will be carried out in the next phase.

### Recommendations

#### **2. Movement Regulatory Framework:**

- Ensure appropriate dissemination and use of the newly developed presentation on Movement regulatory framework to raise awareness and build knowledge.
- Continue to gather evidence on the effectiveness of the Movement regulatory framework and mainstream it into the existing evaluation processes.
- Propose to tackle integrity issues affecting compliance with coordination mechanisms within broader Movement reflection.

#### **3. Movement Cooperation and Coordination:**

- Promote the use of MCA`s in all contexts where several partners are present and ensure effective setting up of the coordination mechanisms as well as the use of *Mini-Summit* at the onset of emergencies.
- Promote the Movement coordination online toolkit, adapt it based on learnings and evaluate whether a mobile version, accessible on smartphones, would bring added value.
- Ensure that Movement coordination at national headquarter level is replicated at the branch levels of National Societies and that communication between them is established and maintained.

## **2.3 Preparedness**

The value and collective gains of preparing well together were evident during the consultation process prior to the 2015 CoD, leading to a strong push in that direction within the adopted SMCC Plan of Action.

While developing a **joint Movement contingency plan is crucial to ensuring potential future joint response**, it also proved a meaningful process in reinforcing interaction between Movement components. Though many Movement components have already established contingency plans to varying extents and depths, it is not yet common practice. To facilitate this work, a review of the existing internal guidance on the subject was conducted. The conclusions from the review recognized that there was no need to develop any new Movement tools but rather guide Movement partners in selecting what is relevant according to circumstances. As a result, a simple guidance note was developed, intended to help the **Movement partners bring together their experience and expertise** without having to “reinvent the wheel”. The note is available in the Movement coordination online toolkit.

Operationally, within SMCC country “laboratories” or outside them, the endeavour of **developing joint contingency plans appears to have sparked the most interest** amongst Movement partners. Indeed, at the time of writing the progress report, several contexts were developing, or considering developing, a Movement contingency plan. Though only limited evidence is available, it seems that key success factors in this field are a) genuine investment from all partners and an all-encompassing integration of Movement assets, b) the pragmatism and user-friendliness of the tool c) a results-oriented process and d) regular testing (simulation) and evaluation of scenarios. Perhaps the main challenge is building synergies with similar plans from external actors without being adversely influenced by them and losing independence.

Capacity building is of great importance to support National Societies of affected countries in carrying out their roles efficiently during emergency response.<sup>9</sup> Special efforts were made within the project to develop a shared approach on capacity building, review and harmonize tools and processes and conduct a lessons-learned exercise in three contexts. Overall, the findings showed that the SMCC process contributed to improved coordination, although mainly at the headquarters level of National Societies. While there were genuine efforts to avoid duplication of support at the national level, so far less has been done to address obvious imbalances in the capacity-building support provided to branches in certain areas of work.

According to the findings, lack of coordination on capacity building between Movement partners means that investment is often concentrated on branches where operations are carried out while other branches are left unsupported. This was particularly obvious for support in the fields of branch development and security. The review also highlighted that unless capacity-building efforts and the SMCC process give more attention to coordination at branch level, where the operation is being implemented, and to coordination between headquarters and field levels, the SMCC process will be incomplete. The JIT on existing tools and processes also found that **several well-aligned and well-known assessment tools exist** and that there is no need to further streamline them. However, what remains to be done is to **jointly develop proactive training for National Society personnel**, mainly at field level, where they might be asked to take up coordination roles and responsibilities. Additionally, there is work to be done to strengthen the perception that National Society development is to be prioritized in emergency response.

*Coherent and consistent  
Movement security is  
beneficial to common  
Movement response as it  
allows access to and  
acceptance by vulnerable  
populations.*

While only five National Societies formally responded to repeated calls by the International Federation and ICRC leadership to contribute to Movement Security collaboration efforts, numerous consultations and interactions took place on this question, notably through engagement with the Movement Security Focal Points Network or the sharing of a specific questionnaire with a sample of National Societies. It must be noted that a great opportunity and **willingness to increase synergies within security management practices**

among Movement partners was identified. There is, however, no consensus on total security management integration under one single mechanism as each organization has its own duty of care obligations and resource capacities.

As a way forward, it will be important to increase joint investment and the **focus on partnership over mere cooperation**, especially in higher-risk environments, thereby maximizing the resources of each Movement partner. Security management support agreements need to be further clarified, and interaction and collaboration increased in security management support as per current efforts in a number of operational contexts. **Greater involvement of National Societies** is needed for wider Movement consultation inclusion, as are greater efforts on safety and security management capacity building. It is important to ensure consistent application of institutional guidance in sensitive areas of safety and security management.

<sup>9</sup> There are also efforts outside the SMCC process to strengthen and align the Movement approach to National Society capacity building, such as the National Society Investment Mechanism.

### Recommendations

#### **4. Preparedness and capacity building:**

- a) Continue developing Movement contingency plans and maintaining them in all emergency-prone contexts. Capture and share best practice across the Movement.
- b) Design, pilot-test and roll-out proactive training for National Society staff on Movement coordination.
- c) Ensure that National Society capacity strengthening is included in emergency response.

#### **5. Security management:**

- a) Clarify security management agreements to the greatest extent possible as per current efforts in several operational contexts.
- b) Streamline security management tools and training in line with recommendations from the Movement Security Focal Points working groups.
- c) Increase the involvement of National Societies through (a) participation in the Movement Security Focal Points Network and (b) alternate consultation forums with other National Societies.
- d) Strengthen capacity-building support in safety and security management for National Societies.

## **2.4 Response**

It is in Movement response that the achievements and impact of SMCC have been most visible, as was intended. Some of the flagship implementations of the SMCC Plan of Action include operations in Ecuador, Haiti, the countries affected by the Africa food crisis (Nigeria, South Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia), Senegal/The Gambia, Myanmar, Bangladesh, Ukraine and Yemen.

The operational importance of the *Mini-Summit* has already been discussed under the coordination section of this report. However, to maximize the efficiency of the *Mini-Summit* a **joint statement** has proven useful. This is a vital tool used to disseminate the analysis and subsequent decisions reached during the *Mini-Summit* throughout the Movement, thus guiding an appropriate operational response. Importantly, joint statements clearly define what the “ask” (or the “non-ask”) is for the rest of the Movement. **This is crucial to avoid unsolicited support** for the emergency. The final template for this document states that the “ask” must be explicit. Constructive and meaningful joint statements have been issued in Indonesia, Myanmar, Haiti, Peru and South Sudan.

The communication JIT worked on **positioning the Movement effectively by presenting strong and coherent messages**, maximizing the communications potential of each component and enhancing the public profile of the Movement during large-scale emergencies. Working and consulting with a group of ten National Societies, the JIT has been able to finalize a framework and guiding standard operating procedures for Movement communication coordination and a pre-disaster agreement template for communication response. It has also produced a template for Movement communication strategy and a standard checklist of communication deliverables for emergencies and developed community engagement and accountability guidelines. In the meantime, successful efforts have been undertaken in Yemen and Syria (joint ICRC/International Federation messaging at both pledging conferences), in Haiti, Myanmar, Bangladesh and Fiji and in the Movement’s response to the Africa food crisis. The most telling, although at times challenging, example is the response to the food crisis, for

which a Movement narrative<sup>10</sup> was agreed between all Movement components, including the National Societies of Nigeria, South Sudan, Somalia, Ethiopia, Yemen and Kenya, and shared with all National Societies.

The communication team identified a need for more clarity on circumstances in which **joint communication efforts are feasible and realistic**, possibly departing from the initial large-scale-emergency-only scope of the SMCC process. They also noted that there has been an over-emphasis on joint communications where agreement can be challenging to reach due to the different mandates and structures of the Movement components, which often have different approaches, audiences and goals for their communications. This can bring challenges to communications coordination and involve cumbersome clearance processes for communication material which are not fully compatible with the celerity requirement of today's media. Movement coordination in communication is uneven and most often reactive, as opposed to organized, proactive, aligned and consistent across the Movement. Shortcomings have been identified in the consistent sharing and use of tools developed under the SMCC process.

In the Plan of Action, the development of an **information-sharing portal** was identified as a way to improve Movement coordination by sharing information and data in a more timely and efficient manner. In the past two years, the importance of data collection and information sharing in supporting the conduct of operations has constantly increased. While there are many ongoing efforts to enhance the sharing of Movement data between Movement partners, a general information-sharing portal goes beyond the remit of SMCC action and could be considered a separate project. Microsites for specific tools (Movement cash in emergencies toolkit and Movement coordination online toolkit) have been found the best option for enabling immediate access to common Movement response tools.

The terms of reference and the administrative parameters for **Movement Coordination Officers** (MCOs) have been produced and are ready for testing. They describe in detail the role and responsibilities of this position and confirm the exclusively advisory dimension of the task in support of the strategic-level coordination team to ensure quality coordination through the appropriate use of existing tools and mechanisms. A roster, composed of National Society, International Federation and ICRC personnel ready for deployment, has been established. A test deployment in Haiti at the end of 2016 had to be cancelled due to the inability to reach decisions within an acceptable time-frame. This highlighted key lessons learnt which have been addressed by adopting the standard operating procedures for surge support.

Responding to large-scale emergencies can at times overwhelm the capacities of Movement components. Both the ICRC and the International Federation have developed **surge mechanisms** which can be activated to provide additional personnel or other resources for unplanned or unforeseen emergencies. Although there has always been a certain degree of collaboration between the International Federation and the ICRC on surge mechanisms, the SMCC process tasked both institutions with continuing to work on aligning surge capacities to respond rapidly and professionally on a vast array of different crises.

Both institutions have ensured that their respective surge mechanisms contain key aspects of the SMCC process, such as the *Mini-Summit*, joint communications and reference to the SMCC spirit. The recent International Federation global tools review was scoped to include the ICRC rapid deployment mechanism, and the resulting "**surge optimization**" process was

---

10

[https://fednet.ifrc.org/FedNet/Resources\\_and\\_Services/Human%20Diplomacy/Communication/Comm%20Packs/2017/AFRICA/RCRC%20Movement-Act%20now%c2%adact%20fast-EN-LR.pdf](https://fednet.ifrc.org/FedNet/Resources_and_Services/Human%20Diplomacy/Communication/Comm%20Packs/2017/AFRICA/RCRC%20Movement-Act%20now%c2%adact%20fast-EN-LR.pdf)

based on reference groups driven by National Societies, the ICRC and the International Federation. In addition, the International Federation has integrated the ICRC's Restoring Family Links pool in its surge network – an important step in the implementation of the Restoring Family Links (RFL) Strategy for the Movement. A surge mechanism based on best practices and lessons learnt from the deployment of ICRC Restoring Family Links staff was developed to allow the scaling-up of operations with ICRC and National Society capacities and is now in the process of being finalized. To achieve more aligned training for surge mechanisms, the International Federation has been including ICRC participants in its surge training. During the most recent FACT training events, all relevant aspects of SMCC were included in the sessions and exercises. Despite these achievements, mechanisms still need to be adequately fine-tuned as part of surge optimization efforts, tools must be better known and implemented and their use must be mainstreamed in all the Movement's humanitarian responses.

Since the initial implementation of SMCC, **resource mobilization** has been a central topic which had already seen some positive outcomes before the 2015 CoD. The JIT continued on the same path, ensuring that coordinated appeals are the acceptable minimum while further developing the concept of One International Appeal, which was first and rather successfully tested in Nepal in 2015. The idea of One International Appeal is that in response to a large-scale emergency, the ICRC and the International Federation present one appeal to donors with one institution incorporating its activities into the appeal of the other. The signing of the Funding Modality Agreement framing this concept has been a highlight of SMCC since the 2015 CoD and the basis on which several more One International Appeals have been implemented, for example, for Haiti, Nigeria, Yemen and South Sudan.

In Haiti for example, the ICRC's activities relating to Restoring Family Links, the Safer Access Framework and First Aid as well as support to operational and strategic coordination have been integrated, together with a number of activities of Participating National Societies, into the International Federation appeal launched in response to Hurricane Matthew. The reception from donors has been very positive, thus raising expectations that this could, as a minimum, become standard practice in the Movement. Shortcomings and challenges must not, however, be overlooked and should be addressed. They include reducing the high transactional costs, at the field and regional levels, of developing One International Appeals. Indeed, the process as well as the intended purpose of projecting an image of unity has, at times, taken precedence over operational coherence. This can be addressed by acknowledging that the One International Appeal is ideally not the driver but rather the result of good coordination. In this light, producing and disseminating clear, focused and realistic standard operating procedures/guidance for the operational personnel concerned at every level becomes as much of a priority as conducting a lessons-learnt exercise. Given the difficulties observed, it has been decided not to pursue, at this stage, the exploration of the more complex concept of "joint appeals" which would require considerable and far-reaching alignment of systems between partners. In the meantime, the opportunity remains to more widely promote the Movement's One International Appeal among donors and the general public, leveraging the reach of the Red Cross and Red Crescent network to achieve adequate financial support for operations.

During the Movement-wide consultation process 2013–2015, reflections arose on the delivery of shared services, such as logistics, with the SMCC Plan of Action tasking the ICRC, the International Federation and National Societies with exploring the feasibility of improving service provision within the Movement. Given the internal restructuring of some services and with a view to prioritizing services with the highest possible **operational and value-for-money impact**, the partners decided to focus on **logistics**. During a meeting in early 2017 with the main National Societies involved in this

*Increasing collaboration on logistics across the Movement and leveraging our assets and expertise are essential to achieve economies of scale and to reach more affected populations.*

field, it was decided to go beyond just exploring the feasibility of aligning logistics services and to also focus on National Society capacity enhancement, on logistics support for cash transfer programmes and on stockpiling and procurement. It is important to note that more coordination and/or sharing of capacities would bring longer-term effectiveness and savings only after an initial investment is made. These efforts go beyond SMCC in the sense that improved logistics and supply chain coordination and optimization would impact more than the large-scale emergencies that were the original focus of the SMCC process. A sound and agreed funding model for such services would need to be established. In order to achieve further optimization and interoperability in sharing assets or services in the supply chain across the Movement, it is critical to develop a long-term plan of action clarifying the scope, priorities, timelines and complexity of implementation. Improving the interoperability of logistics services is an important step in responding to growing external pressure for leaner and better aligned services.

## 2.5 Country “laboratories”

Although much work has been done and progress achieved in a variety of countries, it is important to showcase specific achievements, comments, ideas and recommendations from the five country laboratories in order to benefit from the collective investment in these countries in SMCC implementation. The points below are specific inputs from these country laboratories, although they only present a selection of the advancements highlighted in their feedback. Due to obvious operational constraints, the implementation of SMCC in Syria, while commendable, has been slower and only a few results are captured in this document.

Overall, country laboratories acknowledged that the implementation of SMCC, with its focus on complementarity and non-competition, while requiring commitment and investment **has positively influenced Movement coordination and ultimately Movement response in country.**

### Ukraine

- In a protracted crisis under continuous evolution such as the one in Ukraine, the holding of a *Mini-Summit* is required on a regular basis.
- Implementing SMCC provides a good opportunity for all Movement partners to work together and show the power of the Movement, reflecting that it is not a theory but a mindset that brings advantages to all partners.
- Coordination in general benefits from the presence of experienced Movement representatives, meaning personnel that grasp the wider implications of Movement coordination
- Any form of coordination, not just SMCC, requires investment in terms of time and an appropriate structure. The tools developed for SMCC can help to save time by creating synergies and using resources more efficiently.
- Recognizing the expertise of the International Federation and its essential role in creating a strong Movement presence and supporting National Society development, the ICRC has agreed to finance part of the International Federation’s activities and core costs over a limited period of time.
- At the end of the day, SMCC will only work when the participants respect each other and are eager to work together. Trust should be the dominant factor.
- Developing a Movement country plan has been chosen as a priority in SMCC implementation, as has establishing meaningful coordination mechanisms at every level.

### Haiti

- The SMCC spirit has prevailed throughout the emergency phase of the Hurricane Matthew response, ensuring better operational response than in previous emergencies according to the real-time evaluation.

- In the midst of an emergency, in order to transition quickly from willingness to concrete application of Movement coordination, it is essential to rely on tools already developed. The tools utilized, such as the *Mini-Summit* and joint statement, the MCA and established coordination mechanisms, One International Appeal and a Movement communication plan, have proven to constitute a robust basis for the implementation of SMCC.
- The use of the One International Appeal, which included activities of the ICRC and the Participating National Societies, permitted Movement members to complement one another and to build upon their previous work with the National Society and local communities. The strategic coordination mechanism continued to address all functional responsibilities throughout the emergency phase. It is clear, however, that responsibilities attached to resource mobilization would benefit from further clarifications, notably on the scope and extent of an appeal.
- The Movement rapidly deployed its surge capacity in Haiti. Surge mobilization needs to be adapted from traditional models to the context. More should be done to integrate Participating National Societies and sub-regional capacities at lower cost.
- It was recognized that roles and responsibilities have been attributed pragmatically and that this distribution does not contravene the current Movement regulatory framework.

#### South Sudan

- Effective coordination and cooperation among the Movement partners has led to a common approach for principled action that supports consistency in communication, quality in operations, coherency in actions and enhanced acceptance among stakeholders, thereby reinforcing the joint positioning, image and identity of the Movement.
- Ensuring inclusiveness, agreement and consensus among the Movement partners is challenging and time-consuming.
- The differences in messages given by Movement partners at field and headquarters level can sometimes complicate the coordination process. Better understanding of the added value of SMCC is required.
- The main focus of SMCC implementation has been on the Movement country plan.

#### The Philippines

- The Philippine Red Cross, the International Federation and the ICRC developed a Movement Access Map, which strengthened Movement coordination by regularly assessing the level of access of Movement partners in the country.
- During disasters, SMCC has generated a practice of mutual support and solidarity among the Movement components under the leadership of the Philippine Red Cross, taking into account their respective capacities and humanitarian needs on the ground. It also strengthened constant interaction between the Philippine Red Cross, the International Federation, the ICRC and Participating National Societies for different programmes.
- Meaningful dialogue and awareness among Movement partners continues, with a growing focus on the management of staff and volunteer security.
- Improved coordination has led to better responsiveness to routine emergencies. Movement components are in a strong position to prepare and respond to large-scale emergencies as well as to minor emergencies.

#### Syria

- In Syria, even before the start of SMCC, a Memorandum of Understanding/Movement Tripartite Agreement was signed between the Syrian Arab Red Crescent, the International Federation and the ICRC and is still valid today. It outlines the roles and responsibilities of the Movement partners when responding to the humanitarian needs emerging from the Syria crisis.

- Two technical Movement coordination committees are in place in Syria: one for the coordination of livelihood activities and another for the coordination of the primary health-care activities of Movement partners.

### Recommendations

#### **6. Communication:**

- Promote the joint statement template, including the “ask”, and replicate the tripartite communications coordination committee.
- Increase coordination on communication by aligning communications, leveraging the Movement’s unique position through information and content sharing and furthering the use of tools and processes through comprehensive training.
- Increase cross-coordination between operations and communications to ensure effective and timely outcomes.
- Continue to explore the possibility of having a proper Movement data and information-sharing portal and promote cross-sharing of datasets.

#### **7. Surge deployment:**

- Continue developing synergies among the surge capacities of the Movement in accordance with surge optimization criteria and explore ways of enhancing the alignment of training courses to ensure surge personnel can be easily deployed through different mechanisms.
- Ensure efficient deployment of Movement coordination officers when needed in future emergencies and adapt the concept based on lessons learnt.

#### **8. Resource mobilization:**

- Improve the concept and implementation of One International Appeal based on best practices and ensure increased awareness of the process at every level of the institutions.
- Explore the feasibility of using One International Appeal to secure wider financial support and provide donors with an overall picture of the Movement response.

#### **9. Interoperability of logistics services:**

- Further develop the interoperability of logistics services as well as a long-term plan of action clarifying the scope, priorities, timelines and complexity of implementation.

### **3. CONCLUSION AND WAY FORWARD**

Findings provided in this progress report highlight that effective humanitarian reach is dependent upon continuous review and improvement of operational Movement coordination. In many regards, the SMCC process can either initiate or strengthen such initiatives through the use of its tools and mechanisms. Strong commitment to the “red pillar” by all Movement components is key to facing common challenges and leveraging its collective influence in global initiatives such as the Grand Bargain.

While outcomes have been generally positive in terms of perception, resource mobilization and operational reach, coordination still does not occur as a natural process.

Through implementation of the SMCC Plan of Action, key lessons learnt have been captured on both the benefits and shortcomings of improved Movement coordination. Analysis of various cases and coordination practices has shown that the SMCC spirit has enabled both individuals and institutions to overcome obstacles. Evidence from the country “laboratories” in particular

stresses that all Movement components, especially the National Society in the affected country, benefit from implementation of the spirit and letter of SMCC.

Collective efforts to streamline Movement coordination must be developed in a more focused manner while transformative changes are further explored. In achieving this, it is essential that the investment and commitment continue to be shared among all Movement components. Improving SMCC literacy, promoting adequate mindset change and capturing evidence of the progress of Movement coordination are essential steps in maintaining the positive momentum generated by the SMCC process.

It is proposed that the work carried out between now and the 2019 CoD move forward with a sharper focus and under a simplified and lighter management structure. The Movement also needs to continue to invest in improving its delivery of services and support in areas such as security, logistics and resource mobilization, which have a potentially high impact on Movement operations, its value-for-money and its credibility, ultimately benefitting the Movement's collective action to assist affected populations.

To summarize, the progress made through SMCC implementation has built a solid platform of experience that, combined with the SMCC spirit, provides momentum to address barriers to effective Movement coordination and promotes the scale and reach of the Movement. While optimizing Movement coordination has been an intrinsic challenge to many operations for decades, now, more than ever, is the time to further solidify the advances made and to position the Movement as the humanitarian network of choice.

## Annex 1

## Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation

### Report on Plan of Action 2016-2017



| <b>Overall objective statement: The Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement significantly increases its humanitarian impact through improved coordination and cooperation before, during and after large-scale emergency operations</b> |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Objective 1: The Movement coordination regulatory framework is known and applied in a spirit of inclusiveness and trust thanks to relevant implementation mechanisms, preparedness and training.</b>                             |  |   |  |   |
| <b>Action</b>   | <b>Outcome(s)</b>  | <b>Deliverable(s)</b>   | <b>Target</b>  | <b>Results</b>  |
| ICRC, the Federation and NS document challenges and successes in the implementation of the regulatory framework in large-scale emergencies  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential challenges, gaps, incoherencies, successes are identified and evidenced</li> <li>Examples of how the regulatory framework facilitates or hampers effective Movement coordination and cooperation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence-based lessons learnt, including joint RTEs</li> </ul> | Inclusion of key findings in the report to CoD 2017                                    | <b>Besides one general feedback received from a National Society, no evidence of the regulatory framework hampering Movement coordination was received. Instead, two real-time evaluations (RTE) of the Movement response in Ecuador and Haiti confirmed successful and improved Movement coordination and a clear willingness to respect the roles and responsibilities as described in the regulatory framework. They also highlighted that the awareness of the regulatory framework could be increased.</b> |
| ICRC and the Federation continue to develop the Operational Movement Coordination Tool (OMC) to assist in the dialogue on   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The application of the regulatory framework is facilitated by a simple and user-friendly tool</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OMC Tool</li> </ul>  | OMC tool is disseminated and applied in large-scale emergency contexts by January 2017 | <b>While accepted in preparedness the OMC toolkit must be refined and made simpler to be tested in large-scale emergencies or for inclusion in Movement coordination trainings. The perceived complexity of the</b>   |

| allocation of responsibilities in large-scale emergencies (in preparedness and response), test the tool in the field and adapt it accordingly.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trust has increased as a result of increased predictability.</li> </ul>  |   |   | <b>original document explains the delays in getting traction for its use.</b>  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| ICRC and the Federation, with the involvement of NS, jointly produce a training module and a video on coordination and cooperation in large-scale disasters (including the Movement coordination regulatory framework, available tools and mechanisms). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Movement coordination framework is explained in accessible terms.</li> </ul> <p>The general knowledge and understanding of the Movement coordination and available tools and mechanisms is improved.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Movement video in English, Spanish, French, Arabic</li> <li>Training module on Movement coordination for ICRC, Federation and NS operational leaders integrated into existing trainings (IMPACT, MIC, etc.)</li> </ul> | <p>Video is disseminated within the Movement by January 2017</p> <p>By the end of 2017, 40% of operational leaders have participated in the training module</p> | <p><b>A promotional video has been produced, describing the operating environment of Movement components and offering motivation for a strengthened Movement coordination and cooperation.</b></p> <p><b>SMCC training modules have been added, amongst others, to the IMPACT training and the Movement Induction Courses for senior leaders of National Societies. Development of more agile trainings is being presently explored.</b></p> <p><b>The standard presentation on the regulatory framework was revised and made available.</b></p> |
| <b>Objective 2: The National Society of the affected country is supported in its role throughout the Movement response and beyond.</b>  |   |   |   |  |
| <b>Action</b>   | <b>Outcome(s)</b>   | <b>Deliverable(s)</b>   | <b>Target</b>   | <b>Results</b>   |
| Movement components develop a shared approach for NS capacity building in the field of operational leadership and coordination.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A more efficient, coherent and complementary Movement approach to NS capacity building at country-level.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aligned capacity building activities in relevant contexts</li> </ul>   | By 2017, a Movement agreement for capacity building is developed in at least 15 contexts likely to  | <b>After identification of the SMCC country labs, a shared approach for National Society capacity building has been reached in three of the five country labs (Philippines, South Sudan and Ukraine). Note that it was a deliberate choice to focus on the country labs to demonstrate</b>   |

|  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  |   | see a Movement-wide response.  | <b>interaction between the various mechanisms instead of working in isolated contexts.</b>   |
| ICRC, the Federation and NS review their key capacity building tools/processes for harmonisation and complementarity, including plans for resourcing capacity building.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased coherence and efficiency in the implementation of capacity building plans.</li> <li>Continued dialogue on capacity building tools and processes.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harmonised and aligned capacity building tools</li> </ul>  | Key Federation, ICRC and NS capacity building tools are reviewed by 2017   | <b>In the review of existing ICRC, International Federation and National Society tools and processes, it was found that several well aligned and well-known assessment tools exist and there is no need to streamline these further. What remains to be done is to jointly develop a proactive training for National Societies staff mainly at field level for situations when they might be asked to take up coordination roles and responsibilities.</b> |
| Movement components conduct a lessons learnt exercise based on previous and ongoing country plans (e.g. for larger Syria crisis, Philippines Typhoon Haiyan, Nepal earthquake) further develop the “Movement country plan” approach. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Movement response planning is coherent and builds on commonly agreed needs assessment, NS capacities and the complementarity of Movement components.</li> <li>The role of the NS and its independence are supported. The NS is left in a stronger position after the Movement response.</li> <li>Increased opportunities and incentives for PNS to support HNS in a coordinated way.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons learnt are documented, shared and applied in the next context.</li> <li>Model, template and examples for one Movement country plan.</li> </ul> | <p>Report on lessons learned at the CoD 2017</p> <p>By 2017, a template for Movement country plan is used in at least 10 contexts.</p> | <p><b>In Philippines, South Sudan and Ukraine, discussions around and drafting of a Movement country plan including a coherent approach to capacity building, have started. These efforts to develop a Movement country plan have shown to be a driver of transparency, understanding and mutual respect.</b></p> <p><b>An adaptable template will be developed based on the learnings from these various pilots.</b></p>                                  |

| <b>Objective 3: The Movement response is adapted to the context for increased relevance and effectiveness</b>   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Action</b>   | <b>Outcome(s)</b>   | <b>Deliverable(s)</b>   | <b>Target</b>   | <b>Results</b>  |
| <p>In contexts where no country-specific agreement or contingency plan exists, Movement components initiate discussions in order to conclude agreements that will facilitate the design and implementation of a contextualised Movement response (using/testing the OMC Tool).</p> <p>Where country-specific agreements and contingency plans exist, these are regularly discussed and updated.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design and implementation of the Movement response to large-scale emergencies is contextualised and collectively agreed upon</li> <li>Trust has increased as a result of increased contacts, exchanges and collective planning exercises.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalised or updated Movement Coordination Agreements (MCA), tripartite Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) and/or contingency plans</li> </ul> | <p>By the end of 2017, at least 25 contexts where a Movement-wide response is likely to be seen have new or updated MCAs, complemented with relevant contingency plans.</p> | <p><b>Since the beginning of 2016, 18 MCAs have been newly signed or updated. Well-coordinated Movement responses have occurred in Haiti, Gabon, The Gambia, Yemen, South Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria, Ecuador, Fiji, Philippines, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Peru, Ghana, Iraq and Guinea.</b></p>   |
| <b>Objective 4: The Movement is better prepared to collectively respond to large-scale emergencies.</b>   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>Action</b>   | <b>Outcome(s)</b>   | <b>Deliverable(s)</b>   | <b>Target</b>   | <b>Results</b>  |
| <p>Movement components in selected contexts collectively undertake, preferably as part of contingency planning, to map capacities (expertise, assets, and resources), interests and activities of all Movement components at country/regional-level.</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased knowledge of Movement capacities and interests allows efficient definition of priorities of the Movement approach (including through identifying gaps).</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mapping of Movement capacities by context based on agreed template</li> </ul>  | <p>By the end of 2017, at least 5 contexts have produced a comprehensive mapping of Movement capacities, interests and activities</p>                                       | <p><b>Movement contingency planning has started or is underway in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Sierra Leone and Liberia. Mapping of capacities is an integral part of this work. In addition, initial mapping of contexts in which Movement contingency planning will be feasible has started. Furthermore, a guidance note is being drafted to support the teams in countries with the development of a Movement contingency plan.</b></p> |

|   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>ICRC, the Federation and NS explore the concept and parameters of a global capacity-mapping tool and of a shared global information portal.</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased knowledge of Movement capacities and interests allows efficient definition of priorities of the Movement approach at the global level.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jointly developed Terms of Reference for the development of a global tool</li> </ul>                      | <p>Concrete recommendations for next steps to the CoD 2017</p>                    | <p><b>Alignment work on shared Movement datasets between the IFRC, the ICRC and National Societies is ongoing.</b></p> <p><b>A general information sharing portal goes beyond the remit of the SMCC action and could be considered a separate project.</b></p> <p><b>Micro-sites for specific tools (Movement cash in emergencies toolkit, Movement coordination online toolkit) have been found the best option for enabling immediate access to common Movement response tools.</b></p> |
| <p>ICRC and the Federation, in consultation with NS, jointly undertake to revise main coordination tools as appropriate (e.g. revision of MCA template and guidance note) and formalise the proposed Movement Tool-Kit.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Movement tools are adapted to current practice of Movement coordination in large-scale emergencies.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A complete Movement Tool Kit is available</li> </ul>  | <p>By the end of 2016, the Movement Tool Kit is disseminated.</p>                 | <p><b>Revision and finalisation of the Movement toolkit has been finalized. The Movement toolkit, available and easily accessible as a microsite, is available and accessible and contains all relevant tools, templates and guidelines. Development of a mobile application is considered as a possibility.</b></p>  |
| <p>ICRC and the Federation security specialists, in consultation with NS, undertake a review of Movement security arrangements in large-scale operations.</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More coherent and effective security/safety management in field operations.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of Movement security arrangements, including a catalogue of options and best practices.</li> </ul> | <p>Framework for Movement security arrangements is presented to the CoD 2017.</p> | <p><b>A review of Movement security arrangements was conducted. It was agreed to clarify security management agreements to the greatest extent possible.</b></p> <p><b>Work to streamline security management tools and trainings has started and is foreseen to continue.</b></p>  |

|  |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
|  |   |  |   | <p><b>Consensus to continue working towards common safety and security risk assessment methodologies and terminologies. Feasibility study was conducted to see whether the ICRC Security Management Information Platform could be adapted to IFRC and National Societies.</b></p> <p><b>Review of Movement security frameworks in four operational contexts (Afghanistan, Haiti, South Sudan and Haiti) was conducted.</b></p> |
| <p>ICRC, the Federation and NS continue to explore the feasibility of joint service provision within the Movement.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More cost-efficient and effective Movement service delivery</li> </ul>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities of joint services provision identified and seized where appropriate.</li> </ul> | <p>Inclusion of findings/possible experiences into the report to CoD2017.</p> | <p><b>ICRC, the Federation and NS have started working through working groups on concrete improvements on capacity enhancement of National Societies, logistics support to cash transfer programs and on stockpiling and procurement.</b></p>  |
| <p>ICRC, the Federation and NS continue to explore the feasibility of aligned surge capacity (e.g. ERU, RDU etc.)</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More aligned and effective Movement surge support in large-scale operations</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities as identified further explored.</li> </ul>                                      | <p>Inclusion of findings/possible experiences into the report to CoD2017.</p> | <p><b>The Federation and ICRC have ensured that surge mechanisms contain the key aspects of the SMCC process, notably the <i>Mini-Summit</i>, joint communications and a Movement Coordination function. IFRC and ICRC are working on aligning response capacities for their surge mechanisms to further enhance the Movement’s capacity to respond rapidly and professionally on a vast array of different crisis.</b></p>    |

| <b>Objective 5: The Movement strives to respond to large-scale emergencies in a coordinated way, with particular emphasis on the first hours of an emergency.</b>   |  |  |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Action</b>   | <b>Outcome(s)</b>  | <b>Deliverable(s)</b>  | <b>Target</b>   | <b>Results</b>   |
| Within the first 24-48 hours of a crisis, a high level <i>Mini-Summit</i> (virtual or face-to-face) is held, followed by a joint statement.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased trust and improved coordination due to a clear and commonly agreed division of responsibilities</li> </ul>  |  | By the end of 2017, the <i>Mini-Summit</i> /joint statement has been tested in 75% of new large-scale emergencies, and a lessons learnt exercise conducted. | <b>Mini-Summits have taken place in Haiti, Indonesia, South Sudan, Bangladesh and Philippines which has allowed to reaffirm the usefulness of the concept of the <i>Mini-Summit</i> while also improving the concept. In The Gambia, Senegal and Gabon, meetings resembling <i>Mini-Summits</i> were held and ensured a successful Movement response.</b>  |
| ICRC and the Federation further develop the concept of the <i>Mini-Summit</i> based on the experiences and lessons learnt.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased willingness to coordinate and be coordinated, including sharing responsibilities.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons learnt / Joint ICRC-Federation RTE focusing on Movement coordination in the response phase</li> </ul> | By the end of 2017, the <i>Mini-Summit</i> /joint statement has been tested in 75% of new large-scale emergencies, and a lessons learnt exercise conducted. | <b>Guidance note and checklist for <i>Mini-Summit</i> was developed and shared with National Societies in July 2016. It has been the basis of discussions in above situations and has demonstrated its usefulness.</b>   |
| ICRC and the Federation, together with NS, conceptualize and test the deployment of Movement Coordination Officers with a mandate to serve the common interests of the Movement in large-scale emergencies. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased trust between Movement components and in Movement coordination mechanisms</li> <li>Increased level of coordination and efficiency of Movement response</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons learnt on deployment of Movement Coordination Officers in large-scale emergency</li> </ul>            | By 2017, Movement Coordination Officers were deployed in a large-scale emergency and an evaluation with recommendations is presented to the CoD 2017.       | <b>The role and responsibilities of Movement Coordination Officer (MCO) have been captured in a Terms of Reference complemented by a document establishing the administrative parameters. Members of a roster will be identified by the time of CoD 2017. Testing will depend on upcoming opportunity for deployment where effectiveness and relevance of the position will be tested and learnt from.</b> |

| <b>Objective 6: The Movement effectively positions itself by presenting strong and coherent messages, maximising the communications potential of each component and enhancing the public profile of the Movement during large-scale emergencies.</b>    |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Action</b>   | <b>Outcome(s)</b>   | <b>Deliverable(s)</b>  | <b>Target</b>  | <b>Results</b>   |
| ICRC and the Federation, in consultation with NS, further develop and test a framework for Movement communications in large-scale emergencies outlining coordination mechanisms, decision-making and validation schemes, and roles and responsibilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Movement components' capacity to deliver joint or coordinated public communications in large-scale emergencies is increased.</li> <li>• Increased impact, credibility and reach with target audience.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework for communications in large-scale emergencies.</li> </ul>   | Framework mechanisms will be piloted in key large-scale emergencies throughout 2016 and 2017   | <b>Joint statements following disasters have been delivered in Myanmar, Peru, Indonesia, South Sudan, Haiti and a comprehensive Movement narrative has been developed for the drought in Africa, including Yemen and Nigeria. Furthermore, joint ICRC and International Federation position was presented at the pledging conferences for Syria and Yemen.</b> |
| Communications departments of ICRC, the Federation and participating NS develop joint tools for communications in large-scale emergencies including for preparedness.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Movement components' capacity to deliver joint or coordinated public communications in large-scale emergencies is increased.</li> <li>• Increased impact, credibility and reach with target audience.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information-sharing portal</li> <li>• Checklist of communications deliverables</li> <li>• Template for Movement communications strategy</li> <li>• Standard Operating Procedures</li> <li>• Guidelines for engaging with communities</li> </ul> | <p>Concept and parameters of information-sharing portal defined by the end of 2016 and portal created in 2017.</p> <p>Checklist, template, guidelines and SoPs available by the end of 2016 and applied until the end of 2017.</p> | <b>Standard operating procedures and checklists for Movement communications have been finalised. A Movement guide to community engagement and accountability was made available in January 2017 for testing. Will be modified as necessary following this testing period.</b>  |
| ICRC, Federation and NS with available capacity explore the development of a joint surge capacity and Movement coordination   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased Movement partners' capacity to support an enhanced RCRC Movement profile and positioning through</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint surge capacity defined and ready to be implemented</li> </ul>   | Inclusion of findings and recommendations in the report to the CoD 2017  | <b>ICRC communications staff loaned to the International Federation in Fiji. Movement position for community engagement in Nigeria.</b>  |

| function for communications in emergencies.  | communications, while maintaining each component’s unique identity and interests.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the meantime, surge capacity is coordinated whenever possible in large-scale emergencies</li> </ul>   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Objective 7: The Movement pursues a coherent and complementary approach to resource mobilisation in large-scale emergencies.</b>  |  |   |   |   |
| <b>Action</b>  | <b>Outcome(s)</b>  | <b>Deliverable(s)</b>   | <b>Target</b>   | <b>Results</b>  |
| ICRC and the Federation further develop, test and fine-tune the “Movement Coordinated Emergency Appeal” model for future large-scale emergencies, including donor outreach and reporting (including tracking of coordinated bilateral assistance). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated, complementary, synchronised and internally non-competing appeals for large-scale emergencies.</li> <li>Greater sense of collective responsibility for operations and accountability to donors.</li> <li>Potentially increased funds allocated to overall Movement response.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Movement Coordinated Emergency Appeals model tested during next emergency situations.</li> <li>Lessons learnt exercise, model improved and adapted.</li> </ul> | By 2017, Movement Coordinated Emergency Appeal model tested in all new large-scale emergencies                    | <b>The concept of coordinated emergency appeals has been consistently used in the past ensuring alignment and complementarity between separated appeals (Somalia, Kenya, Ethiopia amongst others).</b>  |
| ICRC and the Federation, in consultation with National Societies, further explore the feasibility of launching one international appeal which includes the objectives, activities and budgets of the other components.                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved perception of efficiency, coherence and clarity of the Movement response.</li> <li>Greater sense of collective responsibility in terms of operations and accountability to donors.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appeal model defined and requirements identified.</li> <li>MoU/Agreement template</li> </ul>   | Model defined and MoU template available by the end of 2016<br><br>The MoU template will have been tested by 2017 | <b>A specific funding agreement has been signed between IFRC and ICRC in 2016 framing the <i>One International Appeals</i>. The concept has been subsequently tested in Haiti, Nigeria and Yemen. The learnings from these examples are used to draft standard operating procedures to facilitate the appropriate use of this model and eliminate shortcomings.</b> |

|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased potential for increased funds</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| ICRC and the Federation, in consultation with National Societies, explore the move towards fully joint appeal, including challenges and possibilities and to better align its respective systems.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A fully integrated Movement response in large-scale emergencies.</li> <li>Improved perception of coherence, clarity and relevance of Movement response.</li> <li>Further increased potential for increased funds.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenges and opportunities identified.</li> </ul>   | Inclusion of recommendations into the report to the CoD 2017                                | <p><b>Given shortcomings already identified in the <i>One International Appeal</i> and the precondition of fully aligning systems to move towards joint appeals (see evaluation post Kosovo conflict) the idea of a feasibility study has been dropped. Alternative mechanism to integrate all components of the Movement in an appeal will be explored in another format.</b></p>   |
| <b>Objective 8: Movement response is predictable and accountable, in compliance with agreed rules and standards.</b>   |   |  |   |  |
| Action   | Outcome(s)  | Deliverable(s)   | Target  | Results  |
| ICRC and the Federation, in consultation with NS explore means to enhance accountability and compliance, including the following elements:<br>a) Incentives for good practice in coordination<br>b) Monitoring and enhanced transparency regarding adherence to rules and non-compliance<br>c) Dispute settlement/conflict resolution mechanism for Movement coordination disputes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased focus on how to ensure accountability for Movement coordination</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal by a joint working group for Movement-wide means to enhance accountability and compliance</li> </ul> | Inclusion into the report to the CoD 2017 of means to enhance accountability and compliance | <p><b>ICRC, the International Federation and National Societies held consultations on compliance with coordination mechanisms. A number of identified challenges raised are already addressed directly or indirectly through the SMCC process. Adherence to coordination systems is being streamlined into monitoring tools. The remaining challenges are generally translations of problems of integrity that affect compliance with coordination rules and regulation. It is therefore recommended that these challenges be addressed through other more holistic processes.</b></p> |

Annex 2

