



Australian Government
Australian Civil-Military Centre



SAME SPACE – DIFFERENT MANDATES

**A Civil-Military Guide to Australian
Stakeholders in International Disaster
and Conflict Response**

About the APMC

The Australian Civil-Military Centre (formerly the Asia Pacific Civil-Military Centre of Excellence) was established in November 2008, in recognition of the growing importance of civil-military interaction and is evidence of Australia's commitment to sustainable peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond.

The Centre's mission is to support the development of national civil-military capabilities to prevent, prepare for and respond more effectively to conflicts and disasters overseas. At its core is a multi-agency approach, with staff from a number of Australian Government departments and agencies, the New Zealand Government and the non-government organisation (NGO) sector.

Applying this collaborative approach to working with other government agencies, the United Nations and other relevant stakeholders, the Centre seeks to improve civil-military education and training, and develop civil-military doctrine and guiding principles.

Through its research program, the Centre seeks to identify best practice responses to key lessons learned - important for developing doctrine and facilitating training programs - to contribute directly to the ability of the Australian Government to develop a more effective civil-military capacity for conflict prevention and disaster management overseas.

<http://www.acmc.gov.au>

About ACFID

The Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) is the peak council for Australian NGOs working in the field of international aid and development to attain a world where gross inequality and extreme poverty are eradicated.

The ACFID Humanitarian Reference Group and ACFID Civil-Military Task Force are, respectively, a delegated committee of the Executive and a peer-learning network. Both are actively engaged in addressing civil-military issues from an Australian perspective to improve impact for beneficiaries in humanitarian response.

ACFID has more than 75 members operating in more than 110 developing countries working to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). ACFID administers a rigorous Code of Conduct for the Australian Aid sector. The Code represents the active commitment of 122 overseas aid and development agencies to conduct their activities with integrity and accountability.

The aid and development sector has a combined regular supporter base of 2.12 million households, jointly donating upwards of \$850 million in 2009/10. With AusAID and other donor funding added, total expenditure by ACFID members was \$1.212 billion in 2009/10.

For more about ACFID see www.acfid.asn.au

Disclaimer:

The content is published under a Creative Commons by Attribution 3.0 Australia <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/licence>. All parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored in retrieval systems, and transmitted by any means without the written permission of the publisher.

ISBN: 978-1-921933-34-9

Published May 2012

This document will be reviewed periodically. Your comments and suggestions are appreciated and should be sent to: info@acmc.gov.au

Contents

Foreword	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
1 Same Space – Different Mandates: What’s the Issue?	1
2 Divided by a Common Language?	5
Foundational terms	5
3 Who are the Key Civil-Military Stakeholders?	13
Host country	13
Aid community	14
Government agencies	19
Military	21
Police	23
Managing contractors	26
Before we move on, we need to move on	26
Want to know more?	27
4 Response to International Natural Disasters in Times of Peace	29
So, what are the key challenges?	29
How do we respond better?	32
Want to know more?	34
5 Response to Complex Emergencies	35
So, what are the key challenges?	36
Want to know more?	47
6 What’s Next?	49
ANNEX 1 Commonly Used Terms	53
ANNEX 2 Acronyms	57
ANNEX 3 Useful References	59
ANNEX 4 Australian Defence Force Ranks and Badges	62
ANNEX 5 Australian Federal Police Ranks and Badges	63

Foreword

In response to overseas natural or man-made disasters and complex emergencies, the Australian Defence Force, the Australian Federal Police, Australian Government agencies and the aid community often find themselves operating in the same physical space as one another. Unfortunately, a lack of understanding and confusion over stakeholder roles, responsibilities, cultures and terminologies can impede communication and coherency in program implementation, leading to reduced effectiveness in meeting the needs of the host population. Issues—such as shrinkage of humanitarian space due to restrictions on humanitarian access; perceptions regarding subordination of humanitarian principles; the tensions that arise between political, humanitarian and military objectives within integrated multi-agency stabilisation efforts; and the increase in the number of organisations and individuals operating in these environments—all serve to add a degree of confusion and potential for discord. However, experience has shown that improved mutual understanding of the roles, mandates, principles, cultures and objectives of the various civil-military stakeholders enhances constructive engagement, dialogue and communication both prior to and during deployments. With this dialogue and communication comes greater opportunity to achieve maximum benefits for people and nations affected by natural disasters and conflict.

To this end, the Australian Civil-Military Centre and the Australian Council for International Development—in collaboration with the Australian Defence Force, the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Agency for International Development, Australian non-government organisations, and the Australian Red Cross—have developed this document, *Same Space—Different Mandates*. Building and expanding upon a UK Ministry of Defence document¹, *Same Space—Different Mandates* aims to improve the collective understanding of civil-military stakeholders responding to international natural disasters and complex

1 Sharing the Space: A Guide to Constructive Engagement with Non-Governmental Organisations and the Aid Community, UK Ministry of Defence - available at: www.dcdc.mod.uk

emergencies and, in doing so, to create greater opportunity for constructive engagement amongst them.

It is our hope that this document will influence policy and become a useful educational tool to support all stakeholders engaged in disaster and conflict response, as well as help inform better field practices through improved collective dialogue, communication and interaction.

Dr Alan Ryan
Executive Director
Australian Civil-Military
Centre

Mr Marc Purcell
Executive Director
Australian Council for
International Development

Acknowledgments

Same Space—Different Mandates is the result of a one-year collaborative effort between multiple institutions and agencies. Special thanks go to the Working Group who created this guide. Specifically, and in alphabetical order: Australian Defence College (ADC), Steph Cousins (Oxfam Australia), Beth Eggleston (Oxfam Australia), LTCOL Sue Graham (ADF), Kate Hacking (AusAID), Louis Henley (AusAID), Susan Hutchinson (ACFID), Penny Jones (ACFID), Nell Kennon (World Vision Australia), Joanna Lindner (ACFID), Michele Lipner (ACMC), Karene Melloul (AFP), Louise McCosker (Australian Red Cross), Supt. Karen Newett (AFP), Renee Paxton (AusAID), CAPT Stephen O’Keefe (ADF), Anthea Spinks (World Vision Australia), CMDR Kevin Turner (ADF) and Tim Wilcox (AusAID).

CHAPTER 1

SAME SPACE – DIFFERENT MANDATES
WHAT'S THE ISSUE?

1 | Same Space – Different Mandates

What's the Issue?

We have all witnessed the significant human toll and suffering brought about by natural and manmade disasters. In terms of natural disasters, the Asia-Pacific is considered the most disaster-prone region in the world. To illustrate, between 1980 and 2009, 45 per cent of all disasters worldwide occurred in this region. Further, from 2000 and 2008, the Asia-Pacific region accounted for 83 per cent of global deaths from natural disasters, although it represented 61 per cent of the world's population. In the same period, the region generated only 25 per cent of the world's gross domestic product, yet suffered 42 per cent of the world's economic losses from disasters.² The region is vulnerable not only because of geography but also because of manmade pressures, including underdevelopment, overpopulation in urban centres and climate change.

In addition to natural disasters, intra-state and inter-state conflicts have generated complex emergencies³ resulting in significant humanitarian and development challenges, including population displacement, breakdown of fragile governance structures and the rule of law, human rights violations and insecurity. Examples of this can be seen in Afghanistan, the Sudan region, Somalia and East Timor.

Both natural disasters and complex emergencies can create significant humanitarian crises and the responses to address emergent needs are often multinational and multi-agency. These responses may include the provision of humanitarian assistance, the deployment of peacekeeping missions mandated by the United Nations (UN) or regional organisations such as the African Union (AU), peacebuilding initiatives, stabilisation efforts, or a combination of some or all of these interventions. The multitude of agencies and organisations that respond to these crises will have different mandates, cultures, responsibilities, modes of operation and objectives. Many of these same stakeholders will also be operating in the same space at the same time.

2 UNESCAP and ISDR, Protecting Development Gains, Reducing Disaster Vulnerability and Building Resilience in Asia and the Pacific, The Asia-Pacific Disaster Report, 2010, p. 2.

3 Complex emergencies will be used throughout this guide to denote both countries/regions in conflict or emerging from conflict, protracted crises and fragile/emerging states. The commonality is that these emergencies/crises are manmade in origin rather than a result of natural disasters. Refer to Annex 1 for a definition of complex emergency.

These stakeholders—whether an international military or police force, a donor or an aid agency—all have critical and often complementary roles to play in disaster response and complex emergencies. Yet, it is often the case that a lack of mutual understanding, as well as confusion over roles, responsibilities, cultures and terminologies, impedes communication and overall effectiveness.

In recent years, efforts have been made to improve civil-military stakeholder interactions and mutual understanding. In support of these efforts, and to create opportunities for enhanced dialogue and coordination, Same Space—Different Mandates provides an overview of the principles, operational styles and expectations of key civilian, military and police stakeholders who respond to natural disasters and complex emergencies overseas. The document has been developed to be both a guide and a primer on the nature and character of first, key Australian stakeholders, and second, the broader stakeholder community that respond to these situations. This guide clarifies **how** these stakeholders are distinguished from one another, **where** they may have similarities and/or complementarities and **what** principles guide their engagement with others. Same Space—Different Mandates is not intended to lay out guidelines for how different stakeholders **should** interact, but rather to lay a foundation for improved mutual understanding. More specifically, the key objectives of Same Space—Different Mandates are to:

- provide an overview of militaries, police, government agencies and the aid community and their responses to natural disasters and complex emergencies overseas;
- clarify key terminologies used within these contexts as a means of helping to create at a minimum understanding and, ideally, an ability to communicate more effectively;
- highlight the complexities, challenges and limitations of engagement between the various stakeholders within the civil-military-police dimension;
- enhance understanding and utilisation of the major agreed civil-military guidelines; and
- provide a set of key references and publications to help further inform all stakeholders.

Same Space—Different Mandates is designed to be used as a reference for basic educational and training purposes for Australian government agencies, particularly the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the Department of Defence including the Australian Defence Force (ADF), the Attorney-General's Department (AGD) including Emergency Management Australia (EMA), the Australian Federal Police (AFP), the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the Australian Civilian Corps (ACC) as well as the Australian aid community, Australian volunteers and those on technical/specialist registers. It should also help inform and influence policy and planning, as well as serve as a pocket guide for practitioners during field operations and deployments. The Australian Civil-Military Centre (ACMC) will periodically review this guide with key Australian government and non-government civil-military stakeholders to ensure currency, utility and uptake.

CHAPTER 2

DIVIDED BY A
COMMON LANGUAGE?

2 | Divided by a Common Language?

One of the concerns we often hear when speaking about the challenges of different civil-military stakeholders working alongside one another in natural disaster response and complex emergencies is that we are divided by a common language. What does this actually mean?

We all use concepts that are critical to our understanding of the specific work we do. At the same time, there are also phrases and concepts we use that may look the same but in fact have different and/or multiple meanings depending on whether we are coming from a military, police or civilian perspective. As the first step towards mutual understanding, a number of foundational concepts are presented below. While not exhaustive, these highlight the importance of gaining a shared understanding of what we each mean when we say what we say. Definitions are based on international and/or standard references and documents.⁴ A number of terms in this guide and commonly used within the civil-military-police construct are also explained in Annex 1.

Foundational terms

Civil–military relations

The concept of civil-military relations has different meanings depending on the context within which it is used.

Military

From a military perspective, the concept has been born out of the need for the military to confront tasks that are not precisely 'military' in nature. The most widely used term, especially in the western military community, is Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC). CIMIC has been adopted by the ADF and a number of other militaries. Of importance is the recognition that the underlying purpose of civil-military relations within the military construct is to support the achievement of the military mission.

CIMIC (ADF Civil-Military Cooperation): The ADF defines CIMIC as the coordination and cooperation, in support of the military mission,

4 Annex 3 contains references to source documents.

between the Force Commander and civil actors, including the national population and local authorities, as well as international, national and non-government organisations (NGOs) and agencies.

Aid community


The United Nations (and more specifically the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs or OCHA), has adopted the terminology UN Humanitarian CMCoord (United Nations Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination) to describe the civil-military relationship in natural disasters and complex emergencies. This relationship, illustrated in Figure 1, is defined as the following:

UN Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination (UN-CMCoord):

The essential dialogue and interaction between civilian and military actors in humanitarian emergencies that is necessary to protect and promote humanitarian principles, avoid competition, minimize inconsistency and, when appropriate, pursue common goals.

Basic strategies range from coexistence to cooperation. Coordination is a shared responsibility facilitated by liaison and common training.

Figure 1 The civil-military relationship⁵



⁵ See Civil-Military Guidelines and References for Complex Emergencies, UNOCHA and IASC, (2008) p. 17.

While many in the aid community outside of the UN subscribe to this approach, some do not and have, instead, developed their own approaches/policy and doctrine in this area.⁶

UN Cluster approach

The concept of the Cluster approach was an outcome of the UN's humanitarian reform process in 2005, which sought to strengthen the capacity of the humanitarian response system. Generally, the approach is a mechanism employed by the UN and broader aid community to address identified gaps in response and enhance the quality of humanitarian action. It is intended to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies by ensuring predictable leadership and accountability in all the main sectors or areas of humanitarian response. Clusters operate at both a global and country level in an effort to ensure improved coordination. Clusters groupings are made up of UN and government agencies, NGOs and other international organisations. There are eleven global Clusters and each is led by a designated agency.

6 See, for example, Steering Committee on Humanitarian Response (SCHR) Position Paper on Humanitarian-Military Relations.

Figure 2 Global Clusters and lead agencies⁷

Sector or Area of Activity			Global Cluster Lead
Agriculture			FAO
Camp Coordination/ Management:	IDPs ⁸ (from conflict)		UNHCR
	Disaster situations		IOM
Early Recovery			UNDP
Education			UNICEF Save The Children - United Kingdom
Emergency Shelter:	IDPs (from conflict)		UNHCR
	Disaster situations		IFRC (Convener)
Emergency Telecommunications			OCHA/UNICEF/WFP
Health			WHO
Logistics			WFP
Nutrition			UNICEF
Protection:	IDPs (from conflict		UNHCR
	Disasters/civilians affected by conflict (other than IDPs)		UNHCR/OHCHR/UNICEF
Water, Sanitation and Hygiene			UNICEF

Do no harm

This principle is part of the civil-military construct and used by many in the aid community in the execution of their work. From a civil-military perspective, 'do no harm' means that all civil-military coordination activities will not knowingly contribute to further conflict or harm or endanger the beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance. Within the aid community, this principle states that its members should prevent, to the best of their ability, any unintended negative consequences of their actions to affected populations.

⁷ See www.humanitarianreform.org

⁸ Internally displaced persons

Donor

This phrase is commonly used to denote those agencies or organisations that provide funding to other entities to undertake humanitarian and/or development work on their behalf. In this guide, ‘donor’ refers to government agencies that provide both funding for humanitarian and development activities and strategic policy that underpins the government’s overseas aid and development portfolio. Donors fund, for example, intergovernmental organisations (IGOs), the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, NGOs, private contractors and regional organisations. They also enter into bilateral agreements with their partner host countries.

Good Humanitarian Donorship principles

The Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative, supported by the Australian Government, recognises that, by working together, donors can more effectively encourage and stimulate principled donor behaviour and, by extension, improved humanitarian action. The 23 Principles and Good Practice provide both a framework to guide official humanitarian aid and a mechanism to encourage greater donor accountability. These were drawn up to enhance the coherence and effectiveness of donor action, as well as their accountability to beneficiaries, implementing organisations and domestic constituencies (see reference in Annex 3).

Humanitarian imperative

The humanitarian imperative is a core value that guides humanitarian activity undertaken by the aid community. It refers to the right to receive humanitarian assistance, and to offer it, as a fundamental humanitarian principle that should be enjoyed by all people. The aid community recognises its obligation to provide humanitarian assistance wherever it is needed. When this aid is given, it is not a partisan or political act; the prime motivation of the humanitarian imperative is to save lives and alleviate human suffering of those most in need. The core humanitarian principles are described in Box 1.

Governments that provide funding to the aid community generally understand the need for, and support efforts of, their humanitarian partners to maintain their neutrality in humanitarian response. At the same time, it is acknowledged that government responses may be influenced by other political objectives.

Box 1 Core humanitarian principles

To realise the humanitarian imperative, many within the aid community share and adhere to a number of core humanitarian principles that underpin their activities. These principles are translated into practical measures to secure access to those in need, deliver effective humanitarian assistance and protect staff from harm. These principles are based on the UN General Assembly Resolution 46/182, which states that humanitarian assistance must be provided in accordance with the principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality. Core principles were further developed and embedded within the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief.⁹

- **Humanity:** To save and protect life and dignity and prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it is found.
- **Impartiality:** Help that is based solely on need. Assistance provided will not discriminate on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, political affiliation, sexual orientation or social status.
- **Independence:** Humanitarian aid activities will be implemented separate from political, military, commercial or other objectives.
- **Neutrality:** Assistance must be provided without taking sides in controversy that is of a political, military, religious or ideological nature. (Some agencies do not consider neutrality a core principle due to the nature of their advocacy work).

Humanitarian space

Humanitarian space not only relates to a physical environment, but more broadly to principles, codes of conduct and ways of working that apply to the provision of humanitarian assistance. In order to ensure that core humanitarian principles are upheld, the aid community believes it should have access to all vulnerable people in all areas and be free to negotiate such access with all parties to a conflict, without fear of attack, retribution or undue pressure.

⁹ See <http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/publication/p1067.htm>

The aid community also believes that maintaining a clear distinction—real or perceived—between the role and function of humanitarian actors from that of a military force that is a party to the conflict is a determining factor in creating an operating environment in which aid agencies can discharge their responsibilities both effectively and safely. As a result, many in the aid community insist on the ability to work independent of and separate from the military, police, government and related aid agencies that comprise whole-of-government,¹⁰ UN or multinational missions responding to humanitarian crises or complex emergencies.

Option of last resort

Particularly from the viewpoint of UN agencies and the broader aid community, the use of international military assets, armed escorts, joint humanitarian-military operations and other actions involving visible interaction with the military should be the option of last resort. Such actions should take place only where there is no comparable civilian alternative and the use of military support can meet a critical humanitarian need. The Australian Government follows an approach where military and defence assets will normally be used when there is no civilian alternative assistance available at the time.¹¹

Protection of civilians

Protection of civilians (POC) has become an increasingly important component of the tasks performed by the military, police and civilian agencies (including the aid community) in disaster response, peacekeeping missions and more generally in complex environments. While the UN has been developing POC guidelines to assist in civil-military coordination, more work is required to achieve conformity in definition amongst key stakeholders and to clarify roles and responsibilities amongst them.

Military

Within the military context, POC is primarily viewed in terms of military activities, including an armed response, to ensure the physical protection of people under imminent threat of violence.

¹⁰ See Annex 1 for definition.

¹¹ See Chapter 4 for further information on guidelines on the use of foreign military and civil defence assets.

Police

For the police, POC encompasses activities aimed at securing full respect for the rights of individuals, utilising the rule of law and the physical protection of people under imminent threat of violence.

Aid community

Generally, the aid community views POC as encompassing activities aimed at securing full respect for the rights of individuals—women, men, girls and boys—in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the relevant bodies of human rights, humanitarian and refugee law. Protection activities aim to create an environment where human dignity is respected, specific patterns of abuse are prevented and/or their immediate effects alleviated and dignified conditions of life are restored.

CHAPTER 3

WHO ARE THE KEY
CIVIL-MILITARY STAKEHOLDERS?

3 | Who are the Key Civil-Military Stakeholders?

Often, the greatest potential source of confusion and miscommunication within the civil-military-police context is lack of understanding and appreciation of each other's mandates. This can lead to significant misperception and stereotyping. In this chapter, a broad overview of the key stakeholders in disaster response and complex emergencies is provided.

Host country

The host country,¹² which is where the natural disaster or complex emergency occurs, should be the first and pre-eminent authority in disaster response and complex emergencies. In general, there will be no international response unless at the express request of and upon host country acceptance of international offers of assistance. Further, international response, once provided, is expected to respect host country ownership and leadership. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), to which the Australian Government adheres, commits signatories to respecting partner host country leadership and helping strengthen their capacity to exercise it.¹³ Furthermore, it commits donors to basing their overall support on partner host countries' national development strategies, institutions and procedures. This highlights the importance of working with host governments, including national disaster management offices. AusAID's Humanitarian Action Policy (HAP) supports the primary responsibility of the state to protect and assist its citizens in times of crisis.¹⁴

It should be noted, however, that in situations where national authorities of the host country are engaged in armed conflict or violence involving other actors within the territory, it may be difficult for humanitarian agencies to work alongside or cooperate with the national authorities without compromising their neutrality or independence.

12 Host country is sometimes referred to as host nation/region, affected state/region, affected nation or partner country.

13 See, for example <http://www.aisaid.gov.au/ode/default.cfm>

14 See <http://www.aisaid.gov.au>

In addition to national authorities, international military, police and the aid community are likely to encounter a range of other important and influential stakeholders in the host country. Stakeholders include local civil society and NGOs, tribal/factional leaders, religious organisations and the private sector. These entities range from credible, professional organisations with strong popular support, to ineffective organisations or groups with criminal ties. It is important to remember that not only is the affected population always the first responder, but that, when possible, local capacities should be an option of first resort in facilitating a comprehensive response.

Aid community

Intergovernmental organisations

Intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) are made up primarily of sovereign entities, for example the United Nations (UN), the European Union (an example of a supranational organisation) and its humanitarian arm, the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO) as well as international financial institutions such as the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Some IGOs that work in the Asia-Pacific region include the UN, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the WB. These bodies work across the relief to development continuum and some address peace and security issues as well.

United Nations

The UN comprises many agencies, funds and programmes with specialised agencies, including World Food Programme (WFP), UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP).

In a disaster response, the lead UN department to facilitate the coordination of the international humanitarian response is OCHA. OCHA has both a humanitarian and civil-military coordination function. Regionally, OCHA coordinates the Pacific Humanitarian Team (PHT) which includes donors, agencies from the aid community, UN agencies and others and supports host governments to prepare contingency plans, run scenarios and then respond when a disaster strikes.

After the immediate humanitarian response, the agency usually tasked with coordinating the UN development response is the UNDP.

In situations of conflict or instability, the UN will, when called upon by the UN Security Council, authorise peacekeeping missions in countries/regions affected by conflict. These missions often involve a combination of military, political and humanitarian/development objectives to support peacebuilding efforts.

UN agencies are **not** NGOs and NGOs are **not** part of the UN, although NGOs are implementing partners for many UN agencies.

Asia-Pacific regional intergovernmental bodies and agreements

There are many regional bodies worldwide that have a development, disaster response and/or conflict resolution mandate. In the Asia-Pacific region, these include: the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF); East Asian Summit (EAS); the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and its Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC); the Pacific Island Forum (PIF); the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC); the Asian Development Bank (ADB); and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP).

In addition to regional intergovernmental bodies, there are a number of regional intergovernmental agreements. Notably, disaster relief coordination arrangements exist between France, Australia and New Zealand (FRANZ) within the FRANZ Agreement on Disaster Relief Cooperation in the South Pacific (1992). This agreement is primarily a coordination mechanism between the three countries and is activated through a request from the host country following a natural disaster in the Pacific region. When activated, signatories will identify ways to coordinate response efforts and optimise resources and assets.

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement (the Movement) has three components: two international institutions, specifically the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent

Societies (Federation),¹⁵ and national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies located in 188 countries. While the ICRC protects and assists victims of armed conflict and other situations of violence, the Federation directs and coordinates international assistance of the Movement to victims of natural and technological disasters.

The ICRC, whose mandate is to assist and protect people affected by armed conflict, is given international legal status by the Geneva Conventions of 1949.¹⁶ The ICRC is the guardian and promoter of international humanitarian law (IHL) also known as the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC). These laws aim to protect groups such as civilians and the wounded and to reduce human suffering at times of armed conflict. The ICRC is known for its rigorous adherence to the principles of neutrality, independence and impartiality and it has well-established procedures for operating within conflict zones. Within situations of armed conflict and other situations of violence, the ICRC's services include protection, health services (war surgery, primary health care and orthopaedics), economic security (food, household items and livelihood support), water, sanitation and shelter.

The ICRC's protection roles are mandated by the Geneva Conventions and include visiting detainees (including prisoners of war) to assess the conditions of their detention and work with authorities to improve them where necessary, and tracing—essentially the search for separated or missing family members, exchanging family messages, reuniting families and seeking to clarify the fate of those who remain missing. The ICRC also reminds the parties to a conflict of the rules governing the conduct of hostilities as well as the rules relating to the use of force in law enforcement operations. Finally, the ICRC acts as a neutral intermediary (providing a neutral channel or zone for the achievement of humanitarian outcomes) when and where requested and agreed to by national authorities or any other party involved. The ICRC coordinates and directs international assistance within the Movement at times of armed conflict.

The Federation acts as the secretariat and policy development body for the member national societies. It coordinates and directs international assistance within the Movement following natural disasters in non-conflict situations. It works with national societies to

¹⁵ The Federation is also referred to as the IFRC.

¹⁶ See <http://www.icrc.org/> for more information on the Geneva Conventions.

build their capacities and respond to disasters and refugee outflows. Its relief operations are conducted with and through national societies and combined with its development work. The Federation is also the convenor of the Shelter Cluster in natural disasters and the promoter of the International Disaster Response Law (IDRL) guidelines.

National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, such as Australian Red Cross, form the backbone of the Movement. Each national society is made up of members, volunteers and staff who provide a wide range of services, including disaster preparedness and response, health services and community welfare programs. Specific programs vary per country depending on needs and capacity, but standing programs usually include first-aid training, support to blood banks, restoring family links, support to vulnerable communities and promoting IHL.

To support the work of the Movement internationally, national societies also send funds, delegates and supplies abroad during natural disasters or conflict situations, under the coordination of the Federation or the ICRC respectively. Domestically, national societies are auxiliary to host governments and usually sit on national disaster management committees. However, they retain their independence through adherence to their Fundamental Principles.

Due to its specific legal status, **no part** of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement is a UN entity or an NGO.

Non-government organisations

NGOs are civilian and not-for-profit-organisations that may be international, national or local and some may be faith-based in their focus.¹⁷ Some are part of global confederations or alliances and others may be very small, unaffiliated organisations that address niche needs. In any one country, there may be anywhere from just a few to thousands of NGOs present with a range of mandates, objectives, operations, organisational structures, impact and effectiveness. While NGOs may have a voluntary aspect to their organisations, the majority of individuals working for them are trained professionals. Some of the largest NGOs present in Australia and internationally that respond to humanitarian emergencies include CARE, Caritas, Plan, Oxfam, Save the Children and World Vision. NGOs usually receive their funding

¹⁷ Unless otherwise noted, NGOs refer to both humanitarian and development NGOs.

from private individuals and groups as well as from government and UN agencies. NGOs are not part of a whole-of-government response, even though their funding may come in part from government. Many NGOs cap the amount of government funding they will accept; some do not accept any government funding so they can maintain their independence.

NGOs may be singularly focused or have multiple mandates. These mandates may include humanitarian assistance, longer term development and/or advocacy. While most advocacy NGOs engage in aid operations, not all NGOs engage in advocacy.

There are a number of NGO peak bodies that work to promote best practice and enhanced coordination in humanitarian and development aid delivery.¹⁸ In Australia, the peak body for the NGO community is the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID). NGOs that are members of ACFID also sign up to a Code of Conduct that defines standards of good practice for international development organisations and represents the active commitment of its signatories to conduct their activities with integrity and accountability.

In addition to regional and international peak bodies, there are often peak bodies in the host countries themselves that seek to facilitate NGO coordination and advocate on behalf of the NGO community. Some examples in the Asia-Pacific region include the East Timor NGO Forum (FONGTIL), the Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief (ACBAR) and the Pacific Island Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (PIANGO).

NGOs tend to work in ways that build the capacity of partners, including host governments, local organisations and local communities. Increasingly, international NGOs rely more on partnerships with host country organisations and groups and less on international staff directly implementing responses. NGOs work with communities to enhance their resilience to vulnerabilities and promote sustainable and enduring development. Many NGOs discourage the notion of handouts and instead emphasise the importance of local ownership and empowerment. NGOs strive to design and implement programs that actively reduce people's vulnerability and risk to future disasters as well

¹⁸ International peak bodies include the Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies (VOICE) in Europe, InterAction in the USA and the global International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA).

as to help communities rebuild; this is known as ‘building back better’. This emphasis on sustainability ensures that agencies assist communities to overcome poverty and injustice over the long term. Within the NGO mandate, it is not just *what is done* but *how it is done* that informs their engagement and is believed to be critical to long-term success.

NGOs are **not** part of the UN, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement or government agencies.

Government agencies

Increasingly across the world, governments are adopting a multi-agency or whole-of-government approach that seeks to integrate all government resources supporting responses to natural disasters and complex emergencies. This is true for Australia with a number of key agencies outlined below.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

The Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) is directed by Cabinet to oversee the Australian Government’s response to all overseas crises, whether in relation to natural disasters or complex emergencies. DFAT chairs the key committee that coordinates the government’s crisis responses for the particular emergency, the Inter-Departmental Emergency Task Force (IDETF). This committee draws together senior representatives from key agencies involved in any response, including AusAID and Defence. Key decisions about the Australian Government’s response to major crises overseas are discussed at the IDETF.

In a host country where Australia has established a foreign mission, the DFAT Head of Mission is responsible for overseeing both the Australian Government’s official liaison with local leadership and all aspects of its response in-country, including consular and humanitarian efforts. DFAT provides strategic direction, coordination and oversight of mission activities, engagement with local leaders (official and unofficial) to influence political processes, public advocacy in support of mission objectives and facilitation of regional/international cooperation.

Australian Agency for International Development

AusAID is responsible to the Minister for Foreign Affairs for managing Australia's overseas aid program, including Australia's assistance to developing countries after disasters.¹⁹ AusAID has a formal role to lead the coordination of the humanitarian response component of the Australian Government response to disasters and crises in developing countries. In accordance with its mandate as a development agency, AusAID's response to a disaster or crisis is focused on supporting the needs of the people of the host country and the disaster management priorities of the partner host government.

The Australian Government provides humanitarian assistance at the request of the government of a host country, which is relayed to the Australian Government via normal diplomatic processes. AusAID then develops a course of action to deliver appropriate and effective assistance, which can include:

- contributing funds to trusted Australian, international and local partners with local capability and specialist knowledge to deliver emergency relief assistance on the ground;
- providing relief supplies to meet urgent needs of affected communities; and
- deploying experts and specialist teams with required skills, including through standing arrangements with other Australian government agencies such as Emergency Management Australia (EMA) for state-based assets such as Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) teams or the Department of Health and Ageing for Medical Assistance Teams (AusMAT).

It is important to note that AusAID is an Australian Government agency and therefore is neither an NGO nor a part of the UN.

Australian Civilian Corps

The ACC is managed by AusAID and acts as a bridge between humanitarian and emergency response measures and long-term development programs. It complements the work already facilitated by

¹⁹ Other international government donor agencies include the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and within that, the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), the UK Department for International Development (DfID) and the New Zealand Aid Program (NZAP).

AusAID in the areas of emergency response and ongoing humanitarian aid. The ACC deploys civilian specialists to countries experiencing or emerging from disaster or conflict. It supports stabilisation, recovery and development planning. Generally, ACC specialists work with and within host governments to rebuild state functions, the rule of law and essential service delivery.

Military

Military forces differ from country to country. However, some commonalities can include:

- they employ a hierarchical command structure, which enables the control of many tasks occurring over a wide area;
- they use assumption-based planning, which enables troops and assets to be moved to where they will be required prior to all the facts being known; and
- communications and reporting lines, particularly to the higher headquarters, are important as this enables confirmation of facts from those on the ground and informs further planning.

In recent large-scale disasters, many governments have used military forces as first responders, particularly in domestic disasters. This has been based on the necessity for speed of reaction, including proximity of suitable resources to the disaster area, the scale of effort required or specialist skills needed to deal with the consequences of a humanitarian emergency or disaster. While the primary role of military forces is not humanitarian or disaster relief operations, military forces have the ability to quickly reorient in order to perform such operations and have specific capabilities that can complement the overall relief effort.

The military support provided can be direct to affected populations, indirect or infrastructure support and may include but is not limited to logistics, transportation, airfield management, communications, medical support, distribution of relief commodities and security.

When deployed in response to natural disasters overseas, in general it is at the express invitation of the host country with the primacy of host country's response priorities observed. This requires close interaction and/or communication with requesting host country authorities.

Deploying military forces into complex emergencies requires a legal basis for the deployment under international law; for example, an international mandate authorised by the UN Security Council or another internationally recognised body.

Under all but exceptional circumstances, military forces will be deployed in support of disaster relief efforts and will normally not assume leadership of the overall effort. This does not preclude supporting civil command and control (C2). However, wherever possible, maximum use of established infrastructure and civilian capacity should be made in order to preclude the military from becoming a hub upon which other responding agencies become reliant, thereby creating the potential for longer term dependency and making it more difficult to redeploy at the appropriate moment. The generic military role is to support and enable effort to relieve emergency needs until such time as disaster-coping capacities no longer require military support.

In response to complex emergencies, military forces are required to adopt a different approach to that employed during conflict, as an effective resolution requires a focus on the population, not just terrain or adversaries. In complex emergencies, there is a heightened imperative for military forces to gain a detailed understanding of the political dynamics within their operating area, including friendly, neutral and adversarial groups.

The support of the population is central to enabling a successful transition from conflict to a political settlement and setting the groundwork for sustainable social and economic development. To this end, militaries may be involved in a wider spectrum of activities directed towards population support (e.g. restoration of basic services such as health facilities) and capacity building.

Australian Defence Force

In the event of an international natural disaster response or complex emergency, the ADF will support the Australian whole-of-government response. As a result, ADF capabilities deployed will be mission specific, determined in response to Australian government guidance and in concert with the other Australian government agencies involved in the response. The size and range of ADF capabilities deployed will also change over the course of an extended commitment in response to the changing operating environment, revised Australian

government guidance and changes in host nation requests or within international mandates.

The focus of any international disaster response will be to save human life, alleviate suffering and foster recovery efforts. The ADF's role in this response is to provide high-impact, short-duration assistance and relief efforts to establish humanitarian conditions conducive to delivering effective ongoing relief provisions, provided by specialist government and non-government providers. Within a complex emergency the ADF role may initially be focused on security operations, which will have a higher priority in the execution of the military mission.

In general, when responding to either an international natural disaster or complex emergency, the ADF, along with and through other Australian government agencies, will establish contact with key stakeholders within the local population and supporting international response community. These activities will be on behalf of the ADF Commander and to support the overall military mission. However, informed by recent operational experiences, the ADF is aware that the IGO and NGO communities in host countries have often been in place long before the ADF arrived and will remain long after the ADF has left. A key goal will be to minimise the impact of military operations on the local population and to seek areas of cooperation between the ADF, the host country, IGO and NGO providers.

On deployment the ADF will establish contact with host country stakeholders, OCHA and other stakeholders to understand the host country, IGO and NGO structures in place. The ADF may deploy a CIMIC team to support these interactions. As the environment permits, the ADF may establish a Civil Military Operations Centre (CMOC) as a place where IGOs and NGOs can meet with the ADF and exchange information. This centre will be positioned away from the ADF operating facilities, as the threat allows.

Police

The police mandate is to keep the peace and enforce criminal law with protection of life and property as their primary function. Other activities undertaken include maintaining order and controlling crime through deterrence and the provision of social services (i.e. working with youth groups and neighbourhood watch).

Policing around the world varies depending on whether the police are accountable to a local or national authority, how they are structured (i.e. nationally or decentralised), their legal powers and how the use of force is regulated. A legal basis is also required to deploy police contingents overseas; for example, a request from a host government or authorisation by a UN Security Council resolution. These deployments may be as Formed Police Units (FPU) or as individual secondees.

Police, unlike the military, are usually civilians and have non-combatant status under international law.

Australian Federal Police

The International Deployment Group (IDG) of the AFP was established to lead offshore law enforcement missions and programs on behalf of the Australian Government. The AFP supports the promotion of regional stability and security through delivery of, or contributions to, international peacekeeping and police development missions. The IDG was the first and remains the only national standing deployable policing capability in the world. It contributes to improved rule of law in developing nations.

The deployment of the AFP IDG to another sovereign state will only occur at the invitation of that state and will be the subject of a formalised agreement that establishes the conditions and principles under which the deployment will take place.

In the aftermath of a disaster, the AFP coordinates the responses of Australian police jurisdictions in an overseas context to restore law and order by bolstering local police services that have been diminished or overwhelmed. Depending on existing agreements with other countries, the deployed AFP members can receive authority to exercise legal powers and participate in joint teams with the local police. Police responses include protecting businesses and residences from looting and other forms of social disorder and maintaining the integrity of a disaster scene for investigation.

The AFP, through various government plans, usually coordinates the Australian policing response overseas in Disaster Victim Identification (DVI). These protocols are internationally recognised and enunciated through Interpol DVI Guidelines. The AFP and Australian state/territory

police agencies may provide some Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) trained personnel but fire brigades/services usually have the core responsibility, expertise and equipment.

The AFP's role in complex emergencies has changed dramatically from basic peacekeeping functions (monitoring and supervisory role, often as observers only) or the establishment of police networks to help fight transnational crime, to one that focuses on restoration of the rule of law, which is seen as essential to lasting peace. AFP officers deliver a different approach to civil security than the approach in military interventions. The first duty of a police officer, through a preferably unarmed interaction with the community, is to cooperate with others in maintaining law and order. In peacekeeping operations, this principle is fundamental to promoting the rule of law and community policing.

The AFP deploys police contingents to UN or regional peacekeeping and stabilisation missions that involve a police component. AFP members deployed on these missions may hold executive policing powers and usually aim to restore public order (sometimes in conjunction with military personnel from partner nations), provide a response capability for members of the public calling for assistance, investigate serious offences and at times human rights abuses, provide support to the judicial system and assist in maintaining functions crucial to state security such as the protection of key political figures. These functions are consistent with the mission's mandate, the local legal framework and the transitional justice mechanisms that may be established in a post-conflict environment.

The AFP is increasingly focused on capacity building and developing host nation police. The AFP predominantly enters into a partnership with the local police force and officers may utilise a combination of institution building; policy dialogue on the appropriate model of policing or development of a police legal framework; training in specialist areas; mentoring and coaching in operational issues; and organisational and administrative objectives. Police development and reform relies on political will and needs to be cognisant of traditional and cultural dispute resolution mechanisms that are legitimate, affordable and in place in the community.

Managing contractors

The private for-profit sector has become increasingly active and widespread in international disaster response and complex emergencies. Managing contractors receive funding from government bodies as well as from other for-profit entities and are often found implementing donor programs in developing countries. In Australia, managing contractors include companies such as GRM, Coffey, URS and ANU Enterprise.

Managing contractors are **not** part of the government, they are **not** NGOs, they are **not** intergovernmental organisations and they are **not** part of the UN.

Before we move on, we need to move on

There are many stereotypes that the military, police and the aid community hold in relation to one another. In fact, they are often untrue, over-exaggerated and almost always unhelpful. Rather than detailing and therefore reinforcing these views, it is more constructive to stress how a little effort in communicating with each other can lead to changes in the quality and effectiveness of a response. The foundation for such communication is based on relationship building before crises occur and acceptance of the different mandates to which organisations work.

Want to know more?

- ACFID: <http://www.acfid.asn.au/>
- ADF: <http://www.defence.gov.au/>
- AFP: <http://www.afp.gov.au/>
- Australian Civil-Military Centre: <http://www.acmc.gov.au/>
- AusAID: <http://www.aisaid.gov.au/>
- Australian Red Cross: <http://www.redcross.org.au/>
- The Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief. Available at: <http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/publication/p1067.htm>
- Humanitarian Accountability Partnership. Available at: <http://www.hapinternational.org/>
- International Committee of the Red Cross: <http://www.icrc.org/>
- International Federation of the Red Cross: <http://www.ifrc.org/>
- OCHA: <http://www.unocha.org/>
- Strengthening Australia's Conflict and Disaster Management Overseas (2010). Available at: <http://acmc.gov.au/resources/publications/strengthening-australia%e2%80%99s-conflict-and-disaster-management-overseas/>

CHAPTER 4

RESPONSE TO INTERNATIONAL
NATURAL DISASTERS IN TIMES OF PEACE

4 | Response to International Natural Disasters in Times of Peace

In any natural disaster it is the primary responsibility of the host country to respond to an emergency and provide its citizens with adequate assistance and protection. It is only if that situation has overwhelmed the capacity of the government to respond that outside assistance is either requested or accepted. This assistance may span the spectrum of international humanitarian organisations (both NGO and IGO) to multinational police and military forces, as briefly described in Chapter 3.

In this crowded environment, it is understandable that there will be challenges and issues that arise as agencies respond in line with their organisational mandates, objectives, cultures, languages and philosophies. What follows in this chapter is a brief description of these challenges, specifically in relation to natural disasters occurring in times of peace. While this emphasis on disasters in peacetime may seem an arbitrary distinction to some, in fact it is often the case that the challenges involved, the international laws invoked and the existing guidance documents used are different from those used in complex emergencies and thus deserve separate attention. Complex emergencies are covered in Chapter 5.

So, what are the key challenges?

Natural disaster response is an area where civil-military-police relationships tend to be less contested and contentious. In the Asia-Pacific region, particularly, host country militaries play a substantial role in disaster response. Many governments in the Asia-Pacific region look to their militaries to be a principal responder to domestic disasters and often are the first major responder outside of the affected population itself. Further, in a natural disaster environment, the aid community not only acknowledges that military deployments to disaster zones may follow government direction, but also recognises the capacity of the military to provide rapid deployment of medical, logistics and engineering capabilities. In this context, non-military stakeholders are more likely to coordinate their activities with the military. Nevertheless, challenges and issues remain and are discussed below.

The Cluster approach

The Clusters, as described in Chapter 2, are not command and control mechanisms and it is unlikely that directives will be given to other agencies within the Clusters. Instead they are based on consensus, cooperation and information sharing to gain a clear picture of the situation and mobilise resources to address needs and avoid duplication of effort. The Clusters can coordinate joint assessments, identify the gaps and requirements guided by Sphere Standards (see Box 2), map out the 'who is doing what where', develop action plans, engage in advocacy if appropriate and carry out evaluations and contingency planning.

From military and police perspectives, the Cluster system can seem disorganised as the web of relationships does not fit comfortably with their organisational approaches to coordination and planning. Contact with Cluster group leads may be facilitated through OCHA or, if invited, through military personnel attending Cluster meetings. It may not be appropriate for military personnel to be involved in Clusters, in which case information can be passed from a Cluster to the military through a CMCoord Officer.²⁰

It should be recognised that often many significant responders do not participate in the Cluster system. This is a reminder that coordination goes beyond the Cluster system and this arrangement cannot be expected to resolve or solve all major coordination issues.

Prioritisation

In disaster response, there are competing needs and not every stakeholder shares the same priorities. The host country's military response and supporting international military forces will be guided by the host country's priorities. In most disaster responses, this will align with the efforts of the international aid community; however, in circumstances where there may be competing priorities, the host country priorities will be upheld. For the military, this often requires managing others' expectations of how and where military assets are

20 A UN CMCoord Officer advises the humanitarian community leadership on civil-military issues and facilitates the establishment, maintenance and review of appropriate relations between humanitarian and armed actors present in a disaster response or complex emergency. For more information, see United Nations Civil-Military Coordination Officer Field Handbook, version E1.1 2008.

allocated. For the aid community this means being realistic in requests for support from military assets.

Access to resources

A practical challenge in disaster response is competition over resources, whether those resources are, for example, commodities, ports, airports, air space or transport facilities. This competition for access and use affects all key stakeholders. Coordinating these efforts, prioritising need, allocating and tasking resources and assets can create significant challenges. Stakeholder operational and organisational demands can strain the best of intentions for cooperation and/or coordination of effort. This highlights the need for enhanced communication amongst stakeholders.

Planning approaches

A distinction between military and civilian agencies is their different approaches to planning. The military employ assumption-based planning while police and the aid sector conduct needs-based assessments.

The differences between these two approaches is that militaries will conduct planning based on known information and make documented assumptions about information that is not yet available, with these assumptions validated as the planning continues. The assumption-based approach allows for the military to have a plan in place faster than the needs-based approach.

Preparedness and contingency planning are also part of the aid community's disaster management cycle. However, once a disaster strikes, the aid community focuses heavily on needs-based programming and responses. This means that while some program activities are known prior to the disaster, the response will always be contextualised by the current situation, the assessed needs of the affected populations and the complementarity between agencies and government entities who are responding. As a result, needs-based planning is a longer process.

Principles not universally accepted and/or not consistently applied

Amongst the aid community, and particularly NGOs, adherence to codes of conduct is voluntary rather than mandatory. There is no one universally accepted and implemented set of principles and codes of conduct. Further, there are no country-specific or international bodies that serve as regulatory entities to enforce adherence or application.

In recent times there has been a rise in the number of NGOs operating in both disasters and complex emergencies who may not adhere to codes of conduct. In the field, this lack of uniformity in response by the NGO community in relation to codes of conduct and application of principles can create confusion, mixed messages and conflict internally within the NGO community as well as between the NGO community and other key stakeholders including military and police forces. Due to the diversity and number of aid agencies in the field, it is challenging to promote good practice within the civil-military-police context when standards of behaviour amongst the aid agencies may differ so significantly.

How do we respond better?

The accepted norm amongst all stakeholders is that disaster relief should be as civilian as possible and as military as necessary. Recognised international guidance recommends that military assets only be used when 'no comparable civilian alternative' is available. The Oslo Guidelines (see Box 2) offers guidance on when and how militaries are used within disaster response. Specifically:

- when there is a humanitarian gap: no comparable civilian alternative to meet humanitarian needs;
- military assets should complement existing relief mechanisms to provide specific support to specific requirements;
- at the request (or at least with the consent) of the affected state;
- the relief actions remain the overall responsibility of the affected state;
- civilian control: meaning civilian direction and coordination;
- at no cost to the affected state and in principle covered by funds other than those for international development activities;
- avoid dependency on military resources; and
- limited time frame.

Within the Asia-Pacific region many governments have determined that their militaries are first responders to natural disasters. To this end, guidelines have been developed to assist all stakeholders in managing their relations (Box 2).

Box 2 Guidelines and minimum standards in disaster response

There are a number of very important guidelines of which all stakeholders need to be aware. The first two speak to the issue of the use of military defence assets in disaster response, broadly and regionally, respectively. The third speaks to the issue of minimum standards for humanitarian response in both disasters and complex emergencies.

The voluntary and non-binding Oslo Guidelines, officially known as the 'Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief', address the use of foreign military and civil defence assets following natural, technological and environmental emergencies in times of peace. They cover the use of UN military and civilian defence assets (MCDA) requested by UN humanitarian agencies and deployed under UN control specifically to support humanitarian activities, as well as other foreign military and civil defence assets that might be available. Under the guidelines, MCDA should be viewed as a tool complementing existing relief mechanisms in order to provide specific support to specific requirements, in response to the acknowledged humanitarian gap between the disaster needs that the relief community is being asked to satisfy and the resources available to meet them.

The Asia-Pacific Conferences on Military Assistance to Disaster Relief Operations (APC-MADRO) have developed the Asia-Pacific Regional Guidelines for the Use of Foreign Military Assets in National Disaster Operations to complement other existing and emerging regional guidelines on effective and principled foreign military assistance to disaster relief operations in the region. These guidelines are also voluntary and non-binding.

The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response, sets out minimum standards of response in key life-saving sectors: water supply,

sanitation and hygiene promotion; food security and nutrition; shelter, settlement and non-food items; protection principles and health action. The Sphere Handbook outlines the ideal minimum standards that all stakeholders should aim to achieve in any humanitarian response in order for disaster-affected populations to survive and recover in stable conditions and with dignity. These guidelines are intended for use by the aid community in a range of settings, including natural disasters and complex emergencies.

Want to know more?

- The Asia-Pacific Regional Guidelines for the Use of Foreign Military Assets in Natural Disaster Response Operations. Available at: <http://ochaonline.un.org/roap/APCMADRO/tabid/7303/language/en-US/Default.aspx>
- AusAID Humanitarian Action Policy. Available at: http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/humanitarian_policy.pdf
- Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief (Oslo Guidelines). Updated November 2006 (Revision 1.1 November 2007). Available at: <http://reliefweb.int/node/22924>
- Sphere Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response. The Sphere Project (2011). Available at: <http://www.sphereproject.org/handbook/index.htm>

CHAPTER 5

RESPONSE TO COMPLEX EMERGENCIES

5 | Response to Complex Emergencies

Increasingly, many parts of the world have been immersed in complex emergencies. Complex emergencies typically create significant humanitarian crises and needs. These crises:

- tend to be more intra-state versus inter-state in nature; for example, Afghanistan, the Sudan region and East Timor;
- are areas where local allegiances are often blurred or unclear and where there is an abundance of non-state actors engaged in the conflict;
- tend to see humanitarian and development assistance delivered by entities that may also be a party to the conflict;
- are highly politicised and/or militarised operating environments that have heightened security and risk for all involved, whether a member of an international military or police force, government agencies or aid community members; and
- pose significant issues around protection, human rights violations and the targeting of civilians.

It is in complex emergencies that there is the greatest international effort to promote stabilisation²¹ through peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities and missions. It is also in these environments where multiple stakeholders provide an array of services, ranging from humanitarian and development assistance to inputs into stabilisation activities such as rule of law, security sector reform, reconciliation and good governance. In these environments there is now the implementation of 'comprehensive' and whole-of-government approaches to combating conflict, where political, economic, military, humanitarian and development assistance are being used to win the peace and bring stability. The obligations of IHL in environments of armed conflict are extremely important in these circumstances.

21 See Annex 1 for definition of stabilisation.

The interaction between civilian, police and military components in complex emergencies is far more difficult and challenging than might be found in a natural disaster. In these settings, it may be the case that humanitarian and development programs are being implemented at the same time that there is open conflict or peace may still be fragile. Thus, along with the aid community and donors, there may also be host country, multinational and peacekeeping military forces and police units. Humanitarian and development aid, once provided primarily by aid agencies, may now be provided by more non-traditional stakeholders such as military and police. This aid may be in support of counter-insurgency strategy,²² larger stabilisation efforts or peacebuilding initiatives.

So, what are the key challenges?

Unlike disaster response where civil-military-police relationships tend to be less contentious, the challenges in complex emergencies can be polarising. This polarisation is partly due to the environment and partly a result of stakeholders with different mandates operating in the same space. To help tease out these complexities, key stakeholder challenges are highlighted, followed by a brief discussion of shared challenges.

Challenges through the lens of the aid community

First, it must be remembered that, despite some similarities, there are three distinct types of aid agencies and their relationships with armed actors and with governments vary accordingly. This relates directly to the roles and responsibilities of the different agencies.

UN agencies have a responsibility under the UN Charter to be directly involved with issues of international peace and security and they have an obligation to work with their members—the states that make up the United Nations. They are therefore very likely to work closely with host country and member state government departments, including those involved in law and order. They may work directly on security issues, be comfortable with travelling together with government and military actors in the field and may even perform a security function directly. Specialist

22 Counter-insurgency strategy, also known as COIN strategy, is largely a military term that is used to describe civil-military approaches to combat insurgency in complex emergencies. Under this approach, military, aid and development activities are integrated to achieve more effective overall (military) campaign objectives.

UN humanitarian agencies—most notably OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP—may aim for more independence particularly in relation to the populations and partners they are trying to assist. All will accept armed escort pending the decision of the senior UN official in-country.

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement has a different role with governments either as independent auxiliaries to the humanitarian services of government (in the case of national societies) or as an entirely independent and neutral humanitarian organisation operating under a legal mandate provided to it by the Geneva Conventions (in the case of the ICRC). In both cases, the Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement mean that the Movement must consistently demonstrate absolute neutrality, independence and impartiality. They will not accept armed escorts (except for possible extraction operations *in extremis*) and will take care to distance themselves in the field. However, the ICRC will work very closely, constructively and confidentially with militaries and police forces in regard to monitoring compliance with IHL.

Amongst NGOs, individual agencies vary greatly in their attitude to interaction with military personnel. In some circumstances no contact at all will be advocated, particularly where the military is a party to the conflict. Managing relationships with armed groups in a way that protects the principles and safety of humanitarian staff and the communities they serve has been, and always will be, a very complex task on the ground. Operationally, NGO staff may face particular issues such as whether to use military assets, how to share information appropriately, how to approach armed security, what to do in the event of witnessing abuses by armed actors and irregular demands for payment or other relief assets. An appreciation of the diversity of armed groups encountered by NGOs is particularly important at an operational level.

The alignment of aid activities, real or perceived, with political objectives can result in aid organisations being labelled as legitimate targets by parties to the conflict. One of the greatest challenges for NGOs providing humanitarian assistance is how to avoid becoming, or even the appearance of becoming, an instrument of political or ideological objectives, while maintaining access and operational

capability. Multi-mandated organisations are caught in this paradox, as agencies committed to providing relief (according to the humanitarian principles), they also conduct public and private advocacy and carry out development programs that may align with the interests of host and/or donor governments.

Comprehensive or whole-of-government approaches and the UN integrated mission model²³ may increase fears amongst NGOs and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and even some specialist humanitarian UN agencies of the subordination of humanitarian action to broader political or military goals. On the other hand, many of these players recognise that some degree of coordination, consultative planning and good working relations are crucial for effective and safe operations.

The challenge to aid agencies is how to work with other stakeholders without compromising the humanitarian principles and thus risk being targeted or losing acceptance from the local population. A more pragmatic approach may be appropriate in some circumstances while strict adherence to principles may be more appropriate in others.

Similarly, there is a growing concern amongst humanitarian actors over the militarisation of aid. Militaries are perceived as encroaching on what traditionally have been seen as the humanitarian and development domains, eroding humanitarian space as the distinctions become blurred. NGO use of indirect military support to meet a critical humanitarian need can further blur distinctions. The types of activity militaries undertake under the banners of 'consent winning activities' or 'hearts and minds'—often quite legitimately aimed at stabilisation goals and enhancing force protection—cause concern to aid agencies and communities as *how* and *by whom* these activities are done are often as important as *what* is done.

In addition to the points raised above, other challenges exist:

- Although there is a range of globally agreed civil-military guidelines and some country specific guidelines (e.g. Liberia, Afghanistan, Sudan, Haiti, Pakistan and Democratic Republic of Congo) there still seems to be a very limited uptake and socialisation of these concepts and practices.

23 See Annex 1 for definition.

- Terminology is still a challenging area for communication between the humanitarian community and militaries, as noted in Chapter 2.
- There is still a view that ‘we (military, police and aid community) are all here for the same reason’—which is inherently not the case. A clear understanding of different mandates is needed before real dialogue or coordination can take place.

It is important to understand that the aid community does not take direction from militaries or governments, they do not gather intelligence, they do not engage in hearts and minds projects and they are not force multipliers.

Challenges through the lens of the military

Given the scope of tasks within complex emergencies, the ADF will deploy as part of a multi-agency endeavour. The key focus of ADF involvement will be on improving the security situation sufficiently to allow the appropriate civilian organisations to operate effectively and safely. In circumstances of extreme insecurity, military forces may be required to contribute to wider civil tasks in addition to establishing a robust security framework. In fact, the Law of Armed Conflict obligates parties to a conflict to facilitate and allow the passage of impartial humanitarian relief through territory under their control, in order to access civilians in need.²⁴ In addition, they impose a further obligation on all parties to provide basic food, shelter and medical supplies and services to the civilian population, within their capabilities. These obligations will continue post-conflict, in areas under their control or occupation. Civilian expertise should be integrated into operational planning and execution of civil tasks whenever possible.

The manner in which immediate humanitarian needs are met may affect long-term development and governance structures in a way that could undermine the authority of the host government. This process should be consistent with the needs and priorities of the local population. As permissiveness increases, civil tasks should be handed over, as soon as is practicable, to the host country government and/or other civilian agencies.

²⁴ The Law of Armed Conflict is also known as international humanitarian law (IHL).

Specific challenges for the military include the following:

- Strict military security protocols will likely impede the timely release of information sought by IGOs and NGOs.
- Many IGOs and NGOs will seek military protection *in extremis* and, if necessary, support to evacuate. If this expectation of *in extremis* support is within these organisations' emergency plans, then these expectations need to be discussed and negotiated with the military as early as possible in their planning processes. Preferably this should be conducted through civil-military coordination mechanisms and in accordance with existing guidelines.
- The ability of militaries, IGOs and NGOs to meet in a neutral setting may be limited. At times a meeting house will be established on the outside of a secure military perimeter but often, as movement to this location is limited or undesirable, alternate and creative methods to communicate are required, including the identification and utilisation of existing coordination mechanisms. In the first instance contact should be made with the UN CMCoord Officer to facilitate communication.

Challenges through the lens of the police

Security during peacetime is mostly a policing function. In complex emergencies police can share security enforcement mandates with the military. Fragile states²⁵ in particular are vulnerable to transnational organised crime, reinforcing the need for the strengthening of police institutions and for multi-jurisdictional cooperation in these circumstances.

Interoperability between police and military is a prime concern. As peacekeeping was, and still is, largely dominated by military thinking and practice, several issues in relation to interoperability must be addressed. Although police and defence forces look similar, with their uniforms, hierarchical rank and command structure, there are significant differences. For example, Australian police are civilians and have non-combatant status. They are trained to use the minimum force necessary to perform their law enforcement functions, using lethal force in limited circumstances, in accordance with applicable law. Given that, negotiation and conflict management are core components

²⁵ See Annex 1 for definition.

of police training. Specific authorisation is also needed for Australian police to carry weapons on overseas deployments. Finally, police are empowered legally and organisationally to exercise autonomous responsibility at all levels, with accountability through the law.

Specific challenges for the police include the following:

- Expectation management in relation to what duties police can perform. Members of the aid community and military may have preconceived ideas of the role of the police in their home country and think that police can perform this same role in the host country.
- There needs to be a clear understanding of the different mandates that police have in complex emergencies. For example, one mandate may authorise the police to actively investigate crime and/or be armed, but others may not.
- Recognition that Australian police are not a 'paramilitary force' unlike other models of policing.
- Information sharing protocols vary between the police and military and may affect timely sharing of information.
- In non-permissive environments, there is a requirement for military security support. This requires increased liaison with the military and necessitates police officers developing an understanding of military protocols to work effectively and safely together.
- Policing roles, standards and common policing concepts such as community policing vary around the world. To work effectively together, police need to develop an understanding of their role within the mission and find commonalities with other police officers to achieve both a good working relationship and the mission's mandate.
- Increasingly police are involved in longer term capacity-building initiatives, which may be initiated as part of the response to a complex emergency. The challenge is to convey to other stakeholders that, although results may not be evident in the short term, these initiatives will lead to improved law and order in the longer term.

Shared/thematic challenges

In addition to sector-specific challenges, there are challenges that affect multiple stakeholders. Significant are the following:

Coordination

Coordination is a challenge for all stakeholders—both within and between organisations, at headquarters and on the ground—not to mention with the host government, within a whole-of-government approach, amongst donors and with additional stakeholders becoming involved as attention shifts from humanitarian to longer term development, reconstruction and stabilisation. There are also a range of stakeholders who are outside any formal coordination mechanism, be they from the aid community, non-state armed actors, local communities or non-traditional/emerging NGOs and donors.

Coordination is limited by both the level of participation the aid community has the capacity to allocate and the appropriateness of military personnel being directly involved, or not, in formal coordination mechanisms like the Cluster system. In complex emergencies, coordination can be the cause of great sensitivity and friction between the military, police and the aid community; hence it is helpful to understand the interaction continuum described in Chapter 2. Even the term coordination can be problematic, as for the aid community it generally means information sharing and consensus building on the best way forward to address all needs, while for military and police stakeholders it can be more about alignment of activities and resource mobilisation. One of the most important challenges to understand when coordinating during a complex emergency is that the aid community places as much emphasis on the process as the result of the response. This means that relationships, perceptions, local capacity building and local ownership are paramount, even if this takes more time. This emphasis can be perceived by military and police stakeholders as inefficient and even ineffective in a crisis situation.

Ultimately the level of coordination is very context specific and can change drastically after a major security or political event.

Most important for all stakeholders to remember is that **coordination *with* can be acceptable, coordination *by* is not.**

Different security requirements

All stakeholders, including military, police, government agencies, the UN, NGOs and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement have different security requirements for operating in insecure environments. This can, as a result, complicate the way they interact with each other.

The aid community generally believes that military or armed protection for humanitarian actors or for specific humanitarian activities should occur only in exceptional circumstances where there is no alternative. NGOs will tend to prefer area security to personnel escorts as the former helps to maintain humanitarian space and benefits the local community. However as NGOs differ in their approach to security and personal protection, this can cause confusion among other stakeholders, noting the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement will not use armed security at all.

Both the military and police will have their own security protocols for the environment, which determines where they are able to travel, the level of force that can legally be applied and if they will be armed. Similarly, each government agency may have different security procedures and some may require armed escorts and/or the use of armoured vehicles.

Thus, at times conflicting security requirements of different stakeholders can make building relationships and understanding of organisations' different mandates challenging. For example, the use of armed escorts can mean that parts of the aid community will not meet with other stakeholders, even in neutral venues, as it may compromise their perceived neutrality and/or independence.²⁶

26 See Use of Military or Armed Escorts for Humanitarian Convoys – Discussion Paper and Non-Binding Guidelines (14 September 2001).

Disaster response in complex environments

Increasingly, stakeholders have been called upon to respond to natural disasters occurring in complex emergencies. The challenges of working in these environments are multiple, not just from a single agency or sector perspective, but in relation to stakeholder relationships.

Even before the natural disaster strikes, these environments are characterised by insecurity and weak or weakened institutions and systems. In these fragile environments, a natural disaster may further destabilise the affected state and create additional pressures and demands on existing capacities. Response can be significantly hampered if, for example, those who have previously deployed and/or been posted to an affected state as part of a mission or agency response are themselves victims of the disaster such as happened in the 2010 Haiti earthquake. Further, decision making regarding redirection of assets and personnel must be weighed against impact on ongoing activities. Allocation of resources, mobilisation of multiple stakeholder effort and access to those most in need become critical and pose significant and unique coordination challenges. Other responses ranging from provision of security, protection of civilians and intra-agency coordination overlayed with an increased number of intra-sector stakeholders (e.g. both affected state and foreign militaries) all require a level of understanding and stakeholder cooperation/coordination that is yet to be fully developed amongst stakeholders.

Private military and security companies

The Montreux Document, while not legally binding, reaffirms the obligations of states to ensure that private military and security companies (PMSCs) working in armed conflicts comply with international humanitarian and human rights law. As outlined in the Montreux Document:

PMSCs are private business entities that provide military and/or security services, irrespective of how they describe themselves. Military and security services include: armed guarding and protection of persons and objects, such as convoys, buildings and other places; maintenance and operation of weapons systems; prisoner detention; and advice to or training of local forces and security personnel.²⁷

27 See <http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/misc/montreux-document-170908.htm>

Working in the same space as PMSCs can cause concerns for the aid community, government agencies, the military and police as there are no formal channels for communication or mechanisms for coordination. This concern creates confusion and challenges for other stakeholders, including the host country. While PMSCs have obligations under IHL and for their management under the Montreux Document, there may still be limited oversight of their activities.

Stabilisation challenges

Stabilisation promotes an integrated or comprehensive whole-of-government approach bringing together different government actors around strategic objectives within a conflict or post-conflict context. This is an evolving concept and can include a range of activities such as: establishing peace; early efforts to resuscitate markets, livelihoods and services; and efforts to build government's core capacities to manage political, security and development processes.

Stabilisation approaches differ across different countries and are not always used in situations of armed conflict. The Australian Government has used stabilisation approaches in East Timor, Afghanistan and the Solomon Islands.

Under the banner of stabilisation, stakeholders may pursue parallel sets of objectives relating to security, political and development objectives. In environments where stabilisation approaches are used, humanitarian assistance can be more easily perceived as supporting political agendas rather than humanitarian objectives. This perception may jeopardise the personal safety of the aid community and their access to affected populations. Further, it has been argued by some within the aid community that further evidence is required to demonstrate visibly improved security and stability benefits from this approach.

Information sharing

While information sharing may be an issue in disaster response, it is often a far more unwieldy issue in complex emergencies. It is recognised that there are constraints when it comes to sharing information and all stakeholders have their own protocols for

safeguarding and sharing information. This can inhibit stakeholder ability to build relationships and coordinate efforts. Likewise, a lack of understanding as to why certain pieces of information cannot be shared creates perceptions of intentional deception and/or obstruction.

In the past, information sharing has been viewed as a one-way activity, with the aid community providing awareness of the local population's requirements and concerns without the military providing any information on their activities or the overall security environment. Acknowledging this, the ADF and other militaries have worked to establish protocols that enable information sharing regarding the security environment to the IGO and NGO communities.

A two-way transparent sharing of information can benefit all through sound liaison and information exchange mechanisms. However, information sharing and management systems need to be jointly developed and used.

The distinction between information sharing and intelligence gathering remains a point of contention, confusion and sensitivity. Often the issue is one of differing expectations. For example, the military may expect the aid community to share certain types of information that the aid community may think would jeopardise their reputation, their independence or the safety and security of their staff and beneficiaries. Conversely, the aid community may expect government agencies, military and police to share information that is classified or sensitive.

Length of deployments

The length of deployments for the military, police and aid agency personnel will differ considerably so it is a constant challenge to keep track of the respective contacts from various groups. Most will be deployed for a number of months; however, individuals may rotate in and out at different times. This constant churn of personnel means that staff are frequently trying to develop working relationships with new staff when they arrive, handover efforts often suffer and knowledge management becomes a core issue. Local beneficiaries are also challenged because they need to build trust and relationships with constantly changing contacts. Trust needs to be developed between all stakeholders as soon as possible to maintain communication and understanding.

Box 3 MCDA Guidelines

Within complex emergencies, the non-binding and voluntary Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies are particularly important. Often called the 'MCDA Guidelines', they provide guidance on the use of international military and civil defence personnel, equipment, supplies and services in support of the UN's pursuit of humanitarian objectives in complex emergencies. They speak to such issues as when these resources can be used; how they should be employed; and how UN agencies can best coordinate with international military forces with regard to the use of military and civil defence assets. Concepts central to the Guidelines include the notion that: requests for such assets can only be made on humanitarian grounds; MCDA should be employed only as a last resort in the absence of civilian alternatives; humanitarian operations using military assets must retain their civilian nature and character; the use of MCDA should be limited in scale and scope; and countries providing military personnel to support such operations should ensure respect for UN Codes of Conduct and the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality. While military assets remain under military control, the humanitarian operation must remain under the overall authority and control of the responsible humanitarian organisation.

Want to know more?

- Civil-Military Guidelines and References for Complex Emergencies (2008). Available at: <http://ochaonline.un.org/cmcs/guidelines> or at <http://www.reliefweb.int>
- Civil-Military Relationship in Complex Emergencies—An IASC Reference Paper, IASC, 28 June 2004.
- Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies (MCDA Guidelines) (2003), revised January 2006.
- Guidelines on the Use of Military Escorts for Humanitarian Convoys (2001).

- United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines, ('Capstone doctrine') UN DPKO, January 2008. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/policy.shtml>
- Use of Military or Armed Escorts for Humanitarian Convoys—Discussion Paper and Non-binding Guidelines, IASC, 14 September 2001. Available at: <http://ochaonline.un.org/cmcs.guidelines>

CHAPTER 6

WHAT'S NEXT?

6 | What's Next?

This guide is ultimately about building trust, respect and relationships through shared understanding. To foster this understanding, the following are quick tips for improving civil-military-police interactions. While there will continue to be areas of disagreement, our individual and collective goal should always be to work better, whether together or separately. This **can** be achieved in the same space and with different mandates.

Seek out information	Be curious about the place—the local laws and institutions, the history—but also about the people, the culture, gender and the unwritten laws. Don't be overwhelmed, nobody knows it all. Look up guidance publications specific to your area and/or the country you are in. Read the UN Mandate—if there is one—for the country.
Try not to revert to your last deployment	Analyse information from the community you are currently in, leave your prejudice behind, listen and be patient. You have two ears, two eyes and one mouth, use them accordingly. Learn about local customs and laws, don't assume there is only one system and don't assume it is all in writing—most often these are based on unwritten traditions. Respect local customs; if that is not possible, seek advice.
Get your facts about other organisations and prioritise	All organisations active overseas have different goals, values, resources, size and limits. A little prior research and knowledge of organisational mandates, objectives, capacities and programs can go a long way to improving your job. Identify and focus on key players and main coordinators. Seek advice. Depending on context, this could be a CMCoord Officer, a UN OCHA Humanitarian Affairs Officer or a member from AusAID.

	When deployed in response to a natural disaster, it is important for all stakeholders to establish which Clusters are active and establish contact with OCHA to avoid duplication of effort and facilitate cooperation where achievable and appropriate. All stakeholders need to check the terms of reference for the Cluster with which they are interested in interacting. Don't ignore local stakeholders, including local NGOs and national Red Cross Red Crescent societies. Learn about your community through religious leaders, community representatives and others.
Simplify language—your goal is to be understood	All other stakeholders need to understand your mandate and your role in their own terms. Talk to one another. Avoid acronyms as confusion around terminology is often a barrier to mutual understanding.
Identify common program areas	Determine how your activity impacts on other organisations' activities. For example, if your mandate includes capacity building, be informed by what other stakeholders are doing in that area.
Meeting other organisations	Everyone should consider neutral venues for liaison. If you are a member of the police or the military, ensure visits to the aid community are only by prior arrangement and consider the appropriate level of interface. Many agencies within the aid community have a no-gun policy. This is also true with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. Do not enter their premises armed. Seek alternative ways to engage. Don't assume <i>Western</i> personnel are in charge. Consider the appropriate level of interface.
Take advantage of existing coordination structures	Identify if there is a civil-military coordination forum or focal point and determine if this is appropriate for you to attend or to reach out. OCHA and the Cluster system are recognised coordination mechanisms. If participating in an open forum is not appropriate, seek other ways to interact.
Be proactive in information sharing	Wherever possible, exchange information with other organisations and do not be insular. Think about information other organisations may need and that can be shared.

Commit and deliver	Never promise anything you cannot deliver or are not authorised to do, even (and especially) out of good intentions. Broken promises can have a worse effect than no promise.
Read up and stay informed	Stay aware of key publications, whether they are guidelines, updates on mission activities or situation reports. OCHA situation reports, Red Cross and Red Crescent situation reports and UN mission specific websites are particularly good sources of context specific information.
Who to contact	If you are an Australian working overseas—whether you are part of the government or non-government sector, register with Smart Traveller, as this enables DFAT to contact you in case of emergency or to warn you when the government becomes aware of particular security threats. You can also find updated information on: www.smarttraveller.gov.au

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1

Commonly Used Terms

Complex emergency

As defined by the UN, a complex emergency is a humanitarian crisis in a country, region or society where there is a total or considerable breakdown of authority resulting from internal or external conflict that requires an international response that goes beyond the mandate or capacity of any single agency and/or the ongoing United Nations country program.²⁸ Other definitions highlight more broadly the point that these emergencies refer to war-affected regions where there is a multifaceted and multinational response. These emergencies are more manmade in origin, protracted and can include areas emerging from conflict or still engaged in low-level regional/localised conflict to significant conflict. Humanitarian response is often made more problematic in the face of natural disasters (e.g. floods, drought, earthquakes) occurring in already fragile states/regions, as response often is not only one of attending to life-saving interventions but to ensuring the fragility of the 'state' is not further eroded.

Development

Development seeks to improve the conditions of communities in a sustainable way to ensure benefits will continue after development assistance has ceased. It is based on working with communities, rather than for or on behalf of communities. Development is a process where a community of people work together to break the cycle of poverty and dependence so that their fundamental needs are met and the quality of their lives enhanced. Development activities seek to address and reduce the root causes of the need identified. While sometimes used interchangeably, stabilisation and development are not one in the same. While development activities may be undertaken in support of stabilisation efforts, motivations and objectives tend to be different. (See definition of stabilisation)

Early recovery

This is a multidimensional process of recovery that begins in a humanitarian setting. It is guided by development principles that seek to build on humanitarian programs and to catalyse sustainable development opportunities.

28 IASC, December 1994.

It aims to generate self-sustaining, nationally owned, resilient processes for post-crisis recovery. It encompasses the restoration of basic services, such as livelihoods, shelter, governance, security and rule of law, as well as environment and social dimensions, including the reintegration of displaced populations.²⁹

Understanding the complexity of early recovery acknowledges that it is not an identifiable stage in a sequential 'continuum' between relief and recovery. There is overlap with a range of other activities, including stabilisation. In a humanitarian setting, the needs and opportunities for early recovery evolve over time and are subject to rapid change.

Fragile state

This term is defined differently by a number of sources, as noted below.

OECD

Fragile states are when state structures lack political will and/or capacity to provide the basic functions needed for poverty reduction, development and to safeguard the security and human rights of their populations.³⁰

Military

A fragile state still has a viable national government, but it has a reduced capability and capacity to secure, protect and govern the population. Without intervention, it is likely to become a failed state.

Humanitarian assistance/ humanitarian action

Amongst aid agencies, this term is often defined with slight variation, depending on the source agency. There is divergence in meaning between aid agencies and the military, as noted below.

Aid community

Technical, material or logistical assistance provided for humanitarian purposes, typically in response to humanitarian crises. The primary objective of humanitarian assistance is to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity.

Military

Support provided to host governments, humanitarian and development agencies by a deployed force whose primary mission is not the provision of humanitarian aid.

Multidimensional/ integrated mission

UN multidimensional missions incorporate peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. They often not only perform more traditional cease-fire related military tasks but also employ a mix of civilian, police and military capabilities to secure a fragile peace and provide a window of opportunity for the implementation of measures designed to prevent the recurrence of conflict.

29 UNDP definition

30 OECD and the World Bank maintain lists of countries that are considered fragile. AusAID uses a combination of the two lists.

These missions often cover some or all phases of a post-conflict operation, from stabilisation and peace consolidation to longer term recovery and development. A UN integrated mission is a strategic partnership between a multidimensional mission and the UN Country Team based on a shared vision among all UN actors as to the strategic objectives of the UN presence at the country level.

Reconstruction

This reflects actions undertaken by international or national actors to support the economic and social dimensions of emergency response in post-conflict recovery. The term is used by militaries to describe engineering activities undertaken by military engineers or overseen contracted projects that are conducted to restore essential services when the security threat prevents other actors from delivering this support.

Security

This concept has multiple meanings depending on context and stakeholder, as noted below.

Aid community

Security for the aid community is often looked at in relation to humanitarian assistance and framed within the construct of 'human security', looking at issues such as physical and economic access to food (food security), minimum protection from disease and unhealthy lifestyles (health security) and protection

of people from physical violence (personal security). Security also relates to issues around degree of access to beneficiaries and degree of threat to those who provide assistance. Security in the face of physical threat is a primary consideration in determining the nature and degree of interaction between the humanitarian aid community and military forces. The aid community's physical security framework remains rooted in the concepts of acceptance, protection and deterrence.

Military

Security generally refers to protection of people, information, materiel, activities and installations from sabotage, subversion or terrorism.

Police

Security in a policing context is concern with the safety of the general populace of a country. Security can include the preservation of life and people's freedom to pursue their livelihood.

Security sector reform

Security sector reform, also known as SSR, is a multi-disciplinary, holistic and strategic approach to reform of the security institutions of a state including but not limited to armed forces and police, intelligence services, border and coast guards, oversight bodies such as the executive, legislature, ministries of defence, justice and law enforcement bodies, such as the judiciary, the prosecution and prison system and non-state or paramilitary security actors.

Stabilisation

Stabilisation is an evolving concept, usually used in a conflict or post-conflict context, and can include a range of activities such as establishing peace, early efforts to resuscitate markets, livelihoods and services and efforts to build government's core capacities to manage political, security and development processes. A useful working definition is: 'the process by which underlying tensions that might lead to resurgence in violence and break-down in law and order are managed and reduced, whilst efforts are made to support the preconditions for successful longer term development.'³¹ Activities undertaken in support of stabilisation may also include disarmament, demobilisation, reintegration and rehabilitation (DDRR) of militaries/militias.

Whole of government

For the purpose of this guide, whole of government is defined as public service agencies working across portfolio boundaries to achieve a shared goal and an integrated government response to international natural disasters and complex emergencies.

31 UK Stabilisation Unit

ANNEX 2

Acronyms

ACC	Australian Civilian Corps
ACFID	Australian Council for International Development
ACMC	Australian Civil-Military Centre
ADF	Australian Defence Force
AFP	Australian Federal Police
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
AusMAT	Medical Assistance Teams
CIMIC	Civil-Military Cooperation
CMCoord	Civil-Military Coordination
CMOC	Civil-Military Operations Centre
DFAT	[Australian] Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DVI	Disaster Victim Identification
EMA	Emergency Management Australia
GHD	Good Humanitarian Donorship
HAP	[AusAID] Humanitarian Action Policy
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDG	International Deployment Group
IFRC	International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IGO	Intergovernmental Organisation
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
MCDA	Military Civil Defence Assets

NGO	Non-Government Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PMSC	Private Military Security Company
POC	Protection of Civilians
UN	United Nations
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UN OCHA	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
USAR	Urban Search and Rescue
WFP	World Food Programme

ANNEX 3

Useful References

General

Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) Code of Conduct. Available at: <http://www.acfid.asn.au/code-of-conduct>

Australian Civil-Military Centre website: <http://www.acmc.gov.au/>

Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief (1994). Available at: <http://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/publication/p1067.htm>

Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—or War (1999). Mary B. Anderson (ed.), Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder/London.

Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles. Available at: <http://www.goodhumanitarianandonorship.org/gns/home.aspx>

IASC Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Response (2006). Available at: www.ochaonline.un.org/OchaLinkClick.aspx?link=ocha&docId=1058871

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>

Sharing the Space: A Guide to Constructive Engagement with Non-Governmental Organisations and the Aid Community. Available at: <http://www.dcdc.mod.uk/>

Steering Committee on Humanitarian Response. (SCHR) Position Paper on Humanitarian-Military Relations (2010). Available at: <http://reliefweb.int/node/25231>

United Nations Civil-Military Coordination Officer Field Handbook (2008). Available at: <http://reliefweb.int/node/23775>

United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines ('Capstone Doctrine') (2008), UN DPKO. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/policy.shtml>

Working Better Together: An NGO Perspective on Improving Australia's Coordination in Disaster Response (2010). Michele Lipner and Louis Henley, a Joint APCMCOE and ACFID Study. Available at: http://www.acfid.asn.au/resources/docs_resources/Working%20Better%20Together%202010.pdf

HISS-CAM: A Decision-Making Tool. World Vision International, 2008. Available at: http://www.worldvision.org.uk/upload/pdf/HISS-CAM_Explanation.pdf

World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development (2011). World Bank. Available at: <http://www.worldbank.org/wdr2011>

International disaster response

Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief (Oslo Guidelines), Updated November 2006 (Revision 1.1 November 2007). Available at: <http://reliefweb.int/node/22924>

Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response (The Sphere Project) (2011). Available at: <http://www.sphereproject.org/handbook/index.htm>

UN OCHA Disaster Response Preparedness Toolkit. Available at: <http://ocha.unog.ch/drptoolkit/pstandbyarrangements.html>

Complex emergencies

Aide Memoire for the Consideration of Issues Pertaining to the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict (2011), Policy and Studies Series vol. 1, no. 4, UN OCHA. Available at: <http://ochanet.unocha.org/p/Documents/Aide%20Memoire%20on%20the%20Protection%20of%20Civilians%202010.pdf>

Building Peaceful States and Societies: A DFID Practice Paper (2010). London: Department for International Development. Available at: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/governance/Building-peaceful-states-and-societies.pdf>

Civil-Military Guidelines and Reference for Complex Emergencies (2008), UN OCHA and IASC. Available at: <http://ochaonline.un.org/cmcs/guidelines>

Enhancing Protection for Civilians in Armed Conflict and Other Situations of Violence (2008). ICRC. Available at: http://www.redcross.int/EN/mag/magazine2009_1/book.html

Global Burden of Armed Violence, Geneva Declaration Secretariat (2008). Available at: <http://www.genevadeclaration.org/>

Guidelines on Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups (2006). OCHA. Available at: <http://ochaonline.un.org/humanitariannegotiations/Documents/Guidelines.pdf>

Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies ('MCDA Guidelines') (2003), revised January 2006. Available at:

<http://ochaonline.un.org/cmcs/guidelines>

Handbook on UN Multidimensional Operations. Available at: <http://www.peacekeepingbestpractices.unlb.org/Pbps/library/Handbook%20on%20UN%20PKOs.pdf>

Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups—A Manual for Practitioners (2006). OCHA. Available at: <http://ochaonline.un.org/humanitariannegotiations/Documents/Manual.pdf>

Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations (2007). Paris: OECD DAC. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/45/38368714.pdf>

Statebuilding in Situations of Conflict and Fragility, United States Agency for International Development (2011). Available at: [http://reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2011.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/EGUA-8EBMV2-full_report.pdf/\\$File/full_report.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2011.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/EGUA-8EBMV2-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf)

To Stay and Deliver: Good practice for humanitarians in complex security environments. Available at: <http://www.unocha.org/about-us/publications>

Use of Military or Armed Escorts for Humanitarian Convoys—Discussion Paper and Non-binding Guidelines (2001), IASC. Available at: <http://ochaonline.un.org/cmcs/guidelines>

Field reports

Relief Web. Available at: <http://reliefweb.int/home>



UN OCHA Situation Reports. Available at: <http://www.unocha.org/about-us/publications/situationreports>

UN OCHA Humanitarian News and Analysis. Available at: <http://www.irinnews.org/>

International Crisis Group Reports. Available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/publication-type/crisiswatch.aspx>

ANNEX 4

Australian Defence Force Ranks and Badges

NAVY											
	Admiral ADMAL	Vice Admiral VADMAL	Rear Admiral RADML	Commodore RADML	Captain CAPT	Commander CMDR	Lieutenant Commander LCDR	Lieutenant LEUT	Sub Lieutenant LEUT	Acting Sub Lieutenant LEUT	Midshipman MIDN
ARMY											
	General GEN	Lieutenant General LTGEN	Major General MAJGEN	Brigadier BRIG	Colonel COL	Lieutenant Colonel LTCOL	Major MAJ	Captain CAPT	Lieutenant LT	2nd Lieutenant 2LT	
AIR FORCE											
	Air Chief Marshal ACM	Air Marshal AIRMSHL	Vice Air Marshal AVM	Air Commodore AIRCDRE	Group Captain GPCAPT	Wing Commander WGCDR	Squadron Leader SQNLDR	Flight Lieutenant FLTLT	Flying Officer FLGOFF	Pilot Officer PLTOFF	Pilot Officer PLTOFF
NAVY											
	Warrant Officer of the Navy WO-N	Warrant Officer WO	Chief Petty Officer CPO	Petty Officer PO	Leading Seaman LS	Able Seaman AB	Seaman SMN				
ARMY										No Insignia	
	Regimental Sergeant Major of the Army RSM-A	Warrant Officer Class 1 WO1	Warrant Officer Class 2 WO2	Staff Sergeant SSGT	Sergeant SGT	Corporal or Bombardier CPL/BDR	Lance Corporal or Lance Bombardier CPL/BDR			Private PTE	
AIR FORCE											
	Warrant Officer of the Air Force WOFF-AF	Warrant Officer WOFF	Flight Sergeant FSGT	Sergeant SGT	Corporal CPL	Leading Aircraftman/Aircraftwoman LAC/W	Aircraftman/Aircraftwoman AC/W	Non-Commissioned Officer Cadet NCOCDT			

ANNEX 5

Australian Federal Police Ranks and Badges



