



NATO Disaster Relief Operations: an analysis of an underexposed field of activity of the Alliance

Dissertation

MA in Governance, Leadership and Democracy Studies
Catholic University of Portugal, Institute for Political Studies

Britta Weijers 104513008

Supervisor: Lt Gen António Luciano Fontes Ramos

Co-supervisor: Mónica Dias

30 June 2015

Abstract

Natural disasters are happening more frequently and are becoming increasingly destructive. In the wake of this trend, NATO has increased its prominence in international disaster relief assistance. Consequently, critics have expressed doubts whether disaster relief operations are an appropriate field of activity for the Alliance. The purpose of the dissertation is to justify NATO's involvement by revealing that disaster relief operations are in accordance with the founding principles of the Alliance and further by demonstrating its added value. Supported by a case study, an extensive literature review shows that NATO's involvement is indeed appropriate and above all effective, although there are still areas for improvement.

Key concepts:

Disaster assistance; humanitarian assistance; relief operations; natural disasters, civil-military cooperation; the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); international organizations; Civil Emergency Planning (CEP); NATO Response Force (NRF)

Number of words: 26,564

Acknowledgment

First of all, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Lieutenant-General António Fontes Ramos. With his impressive experience, endless knowledge, contagious enthusiasm, and limitless helpfulness, he has been of indispensable value and I could honestly not have wished for a better supervisor. Whereas people sometimes get tired of their dissertation's topic, he has only sparked my enthusiasm for NATO.

In addition, I am also thankful to my co-supervisor Mónica Dias for her support when needed.

Besides my supervisors, I would like to thank the Institute for Political Studies and its professors for making these 1,5 years a very educational and rewarding experience.

I am also grateful to Colonel Lemos Pires, as he was willing to meet me and give me a unique insight into NATO's relief operation in Pakistan.

Finally, a special thanks to my parents – without them I would not have even been here, brother, and close friends back in the Netherlands, because although far away, they have always been greatly supportive and attentive. Also my friends in Lisbon, especially my classmate Laís because we were in this together, have always been a great source of motivation, and Sam most of all a great, but mostly welcome, distraction.

List of Abbreviations

ACO	Allied Command Operation
ACT	Allied Command Transformation
AST	Advisory Support Team
CEP	Civil Emergency Planning
CIMIC	Civil Military Cooperation
CJTF	Combined Joint Task Force
CSCE	Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
DJTF (HQ)	Deployed Joint Task Force (Headquarters)
EADRCC	Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre
EADRU	Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council
ERC	Emergency Relief Cell
FRC	Federal Relief Commission
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
IDP	Internal Displaced Persons
IDRA	International Disaster Relief Assistance
IO	International Organization
IS	International Staff
JC	Joint Command
JFC	Joint Force Command
JOA	Joint Operation Area
LOC	Line of Control
MC	Military Committee
MCDA	Military Civil Defence Assets
MNH	Military Emergency Hospital (Militair Noodhospitaal)
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
NA5CRO	Non-Article 5 Crisis Response Operations
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDRT	NATO Disaster Relief Team
NFS	NATO Force Structure
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRF	NATO Response Force
OCHA CMCS	OCHA Civil-Military Coordination Section
PfP	Partnership for Peace
SACEUR	Supreme Allied Commander Europe
SACT	Supreme Allied Commander Transformation
SCEPC	Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee
SITCEN	Situation Centre
TOA	Transfer of Authority
UN	United Nations
UN HCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UN MCDA	United Nations Military Civil Defence Assets
UN OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
VJTF	Very High Readiness Joint Task Force

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	6
CHAPTER 1 - ANALYSIS OF THE ALLIANCE PURPOSE.....	10
§1.1 THE SECURITY CONTEXT OF THE ALLIANCE	10
<i>The founding principles</i>	<i>11</i>
§1.2 THE EVOLUTION OF NATO'S STRATEGIC POSTURE	12
<i>Post Cold War NATO.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Strengthening cooperation and partnership.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>New challenges ahead</i>	<i>16</i>
CHAPTER 2 - NATO'S HUMANITARIAN APPROACH.....	20
§2.1 CIVIL EMERGENCY PLANNING.....	21
§2.2 NATO'S CIVIL EMERGENCY RESPONSE MECHANISMS	22
<i>The EADRCC</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>The Rapid Reaction Team and the Advisory Support Team (AST)</i>	<i>25</i>
§2.3 CIVIL-MILITARY COORDINATION IN HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCIES	26
<i>The Oslo Guidelines</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>A controversial matter</i>	<i>30</i>
CHAPTER 3 - NATO'S INVOLVEMENT IN DISASTER ASSISTANCE	35
§3.1 THE EVOLUTION OF NATO DISASTER RELIEF OPERATIONS.....	35
<i>Toward enhanced cooperation.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>The 1998 Albanian refugee crisis as a decisive event.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Recent operations.....</i>	<i>38</i>
§3.2 TYPES OF DISASTER ASSISTANCE	39
CHAPTER 4 - NATO'S ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE	42
§4.1 CIVILIAN STRUCTURE.....	42
§4.2 MILITARY STRUCTURE	43
<i>The Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>The NATO Response Force</i>	<i>46</i>
CHAPTER 5 - CASE STUDY: PAKISTAN EARTHQUAKE RELIEF OPERATION	50
§5.1 THE EARTHQUAKE	50
<i>Context in which the earthquake occurred</i>	<i>50</i>
§5.2 THE NATO RESPONSE	51
<i>Decision-making process.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Operation objectives.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>DEPLOYMENT</i>	<i>54</i>
§5.3 THE UN CLUSTER APPROACH.....	56
§5.4 AN EVALUATION.....	58
A) OBSTRUCTING FACTORS	58
B) WHAT WENT WELL?	66
§5.5 CONCLUSION.....	69
CONCLUSION	72
LIST OF REFERENCES	76
APPENDIX 1 - GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	84
APPENDIX 2 - FRAMEWORKS FOR DISASTER REDUCTION	87
APPENDIX 3 – NATO'S MILITARY STRUCTURE	90
APPENDIX 4 – CONTEXT IN WHICH THE EARTHQUAKE OCCURRED.....	93

Introduction

Background

In the past decade, the international community has been overwhelmed by the impacts of several major natural disasters, such as the Indian Tsunami in 2004, and Hurricane Katrina and the Pakistan Earthquake in 2005. Haque (2005) provides us with the following definition of natural disasters: “Natural disasters are broadly understood to be consequences of the interface of a natural hazard and a vulnerable human community” (p. 371). Natural disasters are becoming increasingly destructive and are happening on a more frequent basis. Accordingly, NATO’s policy on international disaster relief (1998) acknowledges that natural disasters are posing an increasing risk to the international communities and predicts that, “the number of people at risk to natural and technological disasters will increase dramatically over the next two decades” (“EAPC policy on enhanced practical cooperation in the field of international disaster relief”, para. 2).

In the wake of this trend, NATO has prominently assumed an important role in international disaster relief by becoming involved in the provision of relief following natural disasters. Importantly, this is not a recent trend: “As early as 1953, following disastrous North Sea floods, NATO had an agreed disaster assistance scheme” (NATO, 2001b, p. 5). Ever since, NATO’s involvement in disaster assistance has evolved, namely with the adoption of new tasks and activities as a part of the comprehensive approach, designed to make the Alliance more capable to deal with the new threats and challenges of the contemporary security environment following the end of the Cold War. An important component of this new approach is NATO’s growing humanitarian role. The general public usually links NATO’s growing humanitarian role to the humanitarian interventions, such as in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, or Libya. However, less attention is paid to NATO’s disaster relief operations, which aim to protect populations from the consequences of disasters, such as floods and earthquakes.

The topic is relevant, as both the frequency and the impact of natural disasters have increased drastically over the years. Coppola (2015) explains, “more disasters are occurring each year, with greater intensity, and that a great many more people are affected by them, either indirectly or directly” (p. 20). What is more, “despite even the best efforts, however, the fury of nature regularly results in disastrous events that overwhelm not only local response capacities, but also the response capacities of entire nations, even entire regions” (Coppola, 2015, p. xxiii). It is in these situations that the

deployment of military capabilities, which can come from the Alliance but also from other actors, can be of great value in the overall disaster response. Accordingly, NATO can assist affected states in responding to humanitarian emergencies following disasters by making available military assets. A coinciding trend is that the use of foreign military assets during disaster response operations has become the norm, which means that humanitarian actors and military actors have to work together (civil-military coordination). However, in the wake of this trend, many have voiced their criticism on NATO's involvement in disaster relief, questioning whether it is an inappropriate field of activity for the Alliance.

Focus

The central aim of this dissertation is to shed light on an underexposed aspect of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, namely its involvement in disaster assistance. It does so by showing that disaster relief operations are in the spirit of the 1949 founding Treaty, therefore revealing an attitude of NATO that is coherent, although it is usually not understood as such. The dissertation intends to contribute to the understanding of NATO's role in international disaster relief assistance, by discussing its added value, but also by giving an insight to the possible implications that its involvement can prompt, and identifying areas for improvement. Although disasters can be man-made as well, the focus of this dissertation is mainly on natural disasters.

Following NATO's participation in more high-profile disaster responses, among which the relief operation in response to the earthquake in Pakistan-administered Kashmir, which likewise serves as the case study for this dissertation, questions have been raised whether it is appropriate for NATO to participate in disaster response operations, which simultaneously serves as the basis for the central research question:

- ***Is NATO's involvement in disaster relief operations appropriate?***

Structure

In order to research whether NATO's involvement in disaster relief operations is appropriate, the dissertation first of all highlights the crucial aspects of the Alliance's founding Treaty of 1949 and discusses NATO's evolution toward the contemporary security context over the years. Then, it focuses more specifically on NATO's increased involvement in humanitarian assistance by discussing NATO's growing concerns with the protection of civilian populations through civil emergency planning. Moreover, special attention will be paid to civil-military coordination, as the increased presence of

military assets in disaster responses has become the norm, while at the same time being a cause for friction. Next, NATO's involvement in disaster assistance will be examined by discussing its history, decision-making processes, just as relevant frameworks and policies. Also, a brief overview of NATO's relevant civil and military structures for disaster relief operations will be provided, which at the same time provides a basis for the following case study on the Pakistan earthquake relief operation in 2005, in which NATO's role will be thoroughly evaluated. Finally, a conclusion will be drawn.

Methods and materials

The dissertation will be written from an institutional liberalist point of view. Chatterjee (2010) defines the theory as follows: "Institutional liberalism holds the view that international institutions like the UNO (United Nations Organization), WTO (World Trade Organization), NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), European Union (EU) help promote cooperation among states in the world and strengthen efforts for international peace" (p. 11).

Robert Keohane (2012), one of the most prominent institutional liberals, argues, "institutions serve a crucial social purpose because they are essential for sustained cooperation that enhances the interest of most, if not all, people". What is more, he claims that institutional liberalism is "an antidote to fatalism and a source of hope" ("Twenty Years of Institutional Liberalism", p. 27). Institutional liberalism, therefore, strives to build a cooperative international order for consolidating international peace and ensuring good human conditions.

Within this theoretical framework, NATO is characterized by continuous functional and institutional reforms, eventually resulting in increased cooperation between states. Institutional liberals therefore perceive NATO as a persisting effective actor in today's changing security environment. Whereas institutional liberals are in favor of NATO's evolving role after the end of the Cold War, realists opine that the Alliance has lost its importance and that NATO is solely an instrument for the Americans to maintain its influence on the European military and foreign policies (Little and Smith, 2006, p. 106).

David and Lévesque (1999) reason that member countries are in favor of multilateral cooperation through institutions such as NATO, as they are unable to address most contemporary security problems individually. Moreover, NATO reduces "the significance of often divergent national interests by forcing states to negotiate and to

respect common principles and standards” (p. 18). Accordingly, the role that NATO assumed in the changing security environment is necessary to strengthen the security community and to ensure peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

A deductive approach was used by analyzing material from a literature review, supplemented by an analysis of a case study of the 2005 NATO earthquake relief operation in Pakistan. The case study was selected because it was the first time that NATO took on such a prominent role in an international disaster response of such clear humanitarian nature.

Most information for the dissertation was retrieved through desk research, in which relevant literature was reviewed. In order to establish a comprehensive view of the evolution of NATO, from the creation of the Alliance to its current role in the contemporary security environment, mostly official NATO publications such as books and readers have been consulted, just as official documents such as treaties, strategic concepts, and policies. The dissertation also sheds light on the criticism of NATO's increased presence in the humanitarian sphere, mainly by analyzing reports from independent humanitarian organizations and researchers, giving way to the matter of civil-military coordination. Also policies, guidelines, and frameworks relevant to disaster relief operations have been examined, such as the UN Oslo Guidelines. In order to accurately outline NATO's exact roles and functions in disaster assistance, official documents of the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) were of great value. Moreover, working papers and articles in official journals by independent researchers and official situation reports by international organizations were important sources of information. The main source of information for the case study was the personal interview with Colonel Lemos Pires, who was involved in the supervision of the NATO rescue operation Pakistan-administered Kashmir.

Chapter 1 - Analysis of the Alliance purpose

§1.1 The security context of the Alliance

The Second World War left Europe in ruins. Although the Allies had triumphed, they had suffered heavy losses in human lives, millions of refugees were scattered over the continent, and Europe's economy was shattered. Europe struggled to recover from this sweeping destruction, and although it was liberated, new tensions arose among Europe's communities. Throughout the continent, but particularly in Germany and Italy, social and political structures had broken down completely. The institutions that ensured peace, stability, and law and order before had vanished. As a result, Europe was caught in the mire of fragmentation, disorder, and savagery. Lowe (2012) explains that the situation was problematic as such, "that American observers were warning of the possibility of Europe-wide civil war" (p. xxi). Besides tensions occurring within the continent, the Soviet Union posed a great external threat, as it was making forceful attempts to establish communist regimes in European countries. This development was denounced by Churchill's famous "Iron Curtain" speech in Fulton on 5 March 1946:

"A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organization intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies" (Rosenberg, n.d., para. 21).

The communist insurgency in Greece marked a decisive shift, materialized by President Truman's response on 12 March 1947, spelling a new American policy "to help free peoples who are resisting subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure" (Norman, 1997, p. 1063). The new posture of the American administration developed in a postulate widely known as containment, which was of defensive nature, calling for close observations and a measured reaction to the Soviet's policy shifts and manoeuvres. In July of the same year, another gesture marked the American preoccupation with a very instable and weak Europe. The Secretary of State George Marshall presented the European Recovery Program, "to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace" (Davies, 1997, p. 1063). Naturally, this fostered cooperation between Europe and the United States, but at the same time deepened the East-West division. As the Soviet Union rejected the economic support and continued to firmly push through its area of influence, the need for mutual defense among Western European countries became more urgent than ever (NATO, 2001a, p. 29). For this reason, talks were held

that envisioned the articulation of an Alliance involving both sides of the Atlantic designed to guarantee its defense, preserve the democratic values, and safeguard peace and freedom in the area. Eventually, these talks resulted in the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949.

The ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949 embodied the determination of Western governments to deter Soviet expansionism. Besides, the need for European political integration became stronger and a North American presence was also desirable for preventing nationalist militarism to revive (NATO, n.d., "A short history of NATO", para. 1). The Treaty laid the foundation for a common defense system and simultaneously strengthened the ties between the member countries.

The founding principles

The 1949 Treaty has remained unchanged ever since its creation. It is thus important to underline that all NATO's activities are conducted in accordance with, and therefore justified by, the Treaty's principles.

The Treaty's preamble starts by acknowledging the importance of the UN by reaffirming the Parties' "faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations", followed by expressing its determination to "safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law". Further, the Alliance seeks to "promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic Area" and is "resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security" (NATO, 1949, "The North Atlantic Treaty", para. 1).

The second sentence has been understood as the affirmation of the grand principle underlying the Treaty. The latter two sentences, in turn, represent the different strategic ways to achieve this grand principle. Kissinger (2001), among others, recognizes the success of the Alliance's basic principle: "The Wilsonian ideal of an international order based on a common devotion to democratic institutions and settling its disputes by negotiations rather than war has triumphed among the nations bordering the North Atlantic" (p. 32). The objective of achieving stability is then developed in Articles 1 and 2 of the Treaty, dealing with the peaceful settlement of disputes in which they may be involved and the development of "peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being" (NATO, 1949, "The North Atlantic Treaty", para. 3). The aim of achieving their collective defense is outlined in Article 3, related to the development of

the Allies' "individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack". Next, Article 4 sets out the principle of mutual consult if any of the Parties feel threatened, and Article 5 defines the principle of mutual defense, which means that an armed attack against any Party shall be considered as an attack against them all and therefore each of them will assist that or those attacked "as it deems necessary" (NATO, 1965, p. 15). Over time, this meaningful triad of democracy, stability and collective defense has been maintained, recognized, and in fact prioritized as a result of the changing international security context.

At the turn of the century, also Zorgbibe noted that NATO developed three functions. The dissuasion of an eventual aggression, centered on the mutual assistance principle; an "implicit" function of the integration the Allied states' integration via the interdependence and a common culture developed over time; and the function of "organizing the international political space" (Zorgbibe, 2002, pp. 12-13). In addition, following the discussions about NATO's options after the end of the Cold War and its out of area intervention in the Balkans, Morrison (1995) concludes that it "all boils down" to whether the priority is given to "collective defense" or "collective security". That is, should NATO "focus on collective defense as emphasized in the preamble and Articles 3-6 of the North Atlantic Treaty, or be transformed into or become part of a collective security arrangement" (p. 2). However, this is a matter of the best strategy for each situation and not a change in NATO's purpose or even character.

In sum, the fundamental focus of the Alliance has been clear since the beginning, and has remained unchanged ever since. All NATO's activities are in accordance with the Treaty, even though some have criticized the Alliance of deviating from its "original purpose" by taking on new tasks. That is to say, when people criticize NATO's assumption of new tasks, such as humanitarian assistance, they tend to overlook that these activities are fully concurrent with the original principles upon which the Alliance is founded.

§1.2 The evolution of NATO's strategic posture

Post Cold War NATO

Throughout the years, NATO has transformed in many aspects. The end of the Cold War shall be identified as a major turning point for NATO's strategic posture. The Alliance was conceived in a shattered security environment, mainly focused on the deterrence of the Soviet Union and maintaining a strategic balance between East and West. But after the collapse of the Eastern bloc, however, the situation would change dramatically. The Warsaw Pact was declared dissolved in February 1991 and complex instabilities within

the Soviet Union led to its collapse and disbandment in December 1991. Hence, although the end of the Cold War was a promising event for NATO's objective of a peaceful European order, the breakdown of the Soviet Union nonetheless gave rise to regional instabilities, which thereupon induced new reasons for security concerns. The fall of the Berlin Wall, therefore, caused NATO to adopt its most far-reaching declaration thus far, designed to ensure a united and peaceful Europe. On 6 July 1990, the London Declaration on a transformed North Atlantic Alliance demonstrated NATO's immediate response to this sudden shift in the security environment. The first paragraph perfectly illustrates the changed conditions:

“Europe has entered a new, promising era. Central and Eastern Europe is liberating itself. The Soviet Union has embarked on the long journey toward a free society. The walls that once confined people and ideas are collapsing. Europeans are determining their own destiny. They are choosing freedom. They are choosing economic liberty. They are choosing peace. They are choosing a Europe whole and free. As a consequence, this Alliance must and will adapt.” (NATO, 1990, “Declaration on a transformed North Atlantic Alliance”, para. 1)

The NATO Allies moreover announced their readiness to “help build the structures of a more united continent” and declared their intention “to enhance the political component” of the Alliance as described in Article 2 of the Treaty (NATO, 1990, “Declaration of a transformed North Atlantic Alliance”, para. 2). One of the most fundamental proposals was the invitation of the Warsaw Pact members to “solemnly state that we are no longer adversaries”, and to establish diplomatic relations with NATO. A range of several new structures was about to be created.

Yet, the situation in Europe further deteriorated, particularly as a result of the several crises that resulted from the breakup of Yugoslavia, already announced after a period of political crises in the 1980s. In addition, the withdrawal of the Soviet army from Afghanistan in February 1989 gave way to the return of trained and endured Jihadists to their countries of origin, causing to further destabilize Algeria, Egypt, Bosnia, Tajikistan, Chechnya, and other regions (Hassan, 2011, pp. 123-124).

The Strategic Concept of November 1991 would represent the efforts to adapt NATO's triad of principles to a different security context. The concept therefore acknowledged the radical political change in Europe that led to the end of the threat of a massive full-scale attack against NATO; the substantial progress in several arms control agreements

like the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament (CDE), the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF), and the Confidence and Security-Building Measures Agreements under the Commission for Cooperation and Security in Europe (CSCE); and the positive role of other organizations, such as the European Commission, to constitute new forums of consultations and to help overcoming the divisions, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe (NATO, 1991, "The Alliance's New Strategic Concept", para. 1-22).

Nonetheless, although the threat of a massive, classical attack had disappeared, other risks remained that were "multi-faceted in nature and multi-directional, which makes them hard to predict and assess" (NATO, 1991, "The Alliance's New Strategic Concept", para. 8). They may result from the "serious economic, social and political difficulties, including ethnic rivalries and territorial disputes". These new risks can develop in crises perturbing and affecting the European stability and even provoking armed conflicts that can "spill over into NATO countries, having a direct effect on the security of the Alliance" (NATO, 1991, "The Alliance's New Strategic Concept", para. 9). Besides, the Strategic Concept opened the preoccupations to the Southern Flank and to the Middle East, acknowledging that peace and stability in the countries on the southern periphery were relevant to the security of the Alliance as well.

The analysis of the new security context leads to the explicit conclusion that it does not alter "the purpose or the security functions of the Alliance" but that it is necessary to develop a new strategy based on a "broad approach to security" including a wide range of problems such as organized crime, environmental challenges, and social, economic and political instabilities (The Alliance's New Strategic Concept, 1991, para. 7-14). The broad approach to security is also reflected in "three mutually reinforcing elements of Allied security policy: dialogue, co-operation, and the maintenance of a collective defence capability" (The Alliance's New Strategic Concept, 1991, para. 24). The emphasis on dialogue led to the development of a net of new official NATO bodies, briefly explained in the following paragraph. The element of cooperation, based on inseparability of security, brought together different countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa, sharing some of the risks identified before and ready to work together to solve complex crises as those arising in the Balkans. The collective defense tasks led to a profound restructure of the type and readiness of the military forces of the Alliance.

The 1991 Strategic Concept demonstrated that NATO was now moving toward a broader approach to security by setting long-term objectives and increasing

transparency. Europe was confronted with much instability, such as political and social turbulence, taking place mainly in Eastern Europe, but also out of area. NATO thus acknowledged that adopting a broader approach to security was crucial. Therefore, the 1991 Strategic Concept stressed the importance of safeguarding and expanding European security, by establishing partnerships and promoting cooperation and dialogue. Moreover, the concepts of crisis management and conflict prevention were introduced in this first unclassified NATO Strategic Concept.

Strengthening cooperation and partnership

The 1991 Rome Declaration marked the era in which institutions would prove to gain importance. The North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) was established one month following the 1991 Rome Declaration and provided a new forum for consultation through the expanded participation of Central and Eastern European countries, previously belonging to the Warsaw Pact or the USSR. The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), in addition, was viewed as an interlocking institution to respond to regional problems that arose after the dissolution of the Soviet Union through opening up the possibilities for security cooperation and peacekeeping efforts. This was the first time in the history of NATO that the idea of peacekeeping activities was put forward. Moreover, the Alliance also expanded the cooperation southward by the creation of the Mediterranean Dialogue, involving six non-member countries, seeking to foster security in stability in the Mediterranean through dialogue. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) eventually replaced the NACC in 1997 and the Partnership for Peace (PfP) would prove to become an important actor in NATO's expanded framework, preparing partners to participate in common peace support operations in the Balkans. Members of the PfP have the opportunity to consult NATO in case of direct security threats, which eventually results in better political and military cooperation for crisis management actions. Throughout the years, NATO has continued to accept new members and create new partnerships.

In 1997, NATO institutionalized its relations with Russia through the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security "partly to pacify Russian concern over NATO enlargement" that included Poland, The Czech Republic, and Hungary (Kissinger, 2001, p. 44). Subsequently, the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council was established, involving all NATO members and the Russian representative. In the same year, a similar development took place after the signing of the NATO-Ukraine Charter on a Distinctive Partnership, resulting in the NATO-Ukraine Commission. In 2002, the NATO-Russia Council replaced the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council.

Specifically important for this thesis is the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC), as created by EAPC in 1998. The Centre's task is to make sure that all actors work together effectively when responding to natural or man-made disasters. The EADRCC is thus NATO's most important disaster response mechanism in the Euro-Atlantic area. The first operation carried out was to deal with the troublesome flow of refugees in the Balkans following the Kosovo conflict, and ever since, the centre has been involved in numerous disaster response operations.

New challenges ahead

Despite the promising prospects after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the Alliance was faced with new security threats, some emerging outside its traditional arena. Following the unrest in the Gulf area caused by the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the failed diplomatic efforts by the UN, NATO backed the crisis response by providing measured support to the coalition force in 1990-91, mostly through command and control systems. The complexities of the Bosnian conflict, and the difficulties of the European Community and the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to stabilize the situation, eventually led to the first military intervention of the Allies in 1995, followed by the much-disputed 1999 Kosovo intervention. As a consequence, the Alliance became increasingly aware of the changing security environment and the new challenges lying ahead. The possibility of a general war within Europe had gradually vanished and was being replaced by other risks such as political and economic instability, violations of human rights, and ethnic conflicts.

The Balkan crisis eventually resulted in NATO's first out of area military crisis management operation. Therefore, NATO's experiences during the Balkan intervention had an impact on the new Strategic Concept that was agreed upon during the Washington Summit meeting in 1999, demonstrating NATO's transformation into a more reactive and dynamic organization. At the time of the Washington Summit, NATO was involved in the Kosovo Air Operation and Poland, Czech Republic, and Hungary participated for the first time in a NATO Summit. NATO continued to build upon the foundations as laid down during its creation. The aspiration was a comprehensive approach, by developing both political and military means and putting a strong emphasis on cooperation, rather than confrontation. Focus points of this new strategic concept were crisis response operations, increased dialogue, enlargement, and the continued development of military expertise. There was a gradual change in the allied military forces, expressed in the assumption of new tasks and an increasingly important

role on peacekeeping and crisis management operations, wherefore they became better mobilized and able to come into action more quickly.

Interestingly, Carpenter (2001) offers a rather sceptic view on the 1999 Strategic Concept and even calls it an “uneasy compromise” (p. 7). The Strategic Concept had to bridge the gap between the conflicting objectives among the members, but Carpenter believes the Alliance did a poor job in doing so and claims that the Strategic Concept is too vague. Within the Alliance there were different camps, presenting competing objectives with respect to NATO’s role for the future (Carpenter, 2001, pp. 8-15). It would have to bridge the gap between traditionalists, like Kissinger, who strongly backed the idea that NATO’s core purpose should remain centred around Article 5, and a more progressive bloc that supported the notion that NATO’s core purpose should move beyond the principle of collective defense. The progressive bloc, then again, was subdivided into two groups, which could be identified as moderately progressive and very progressive. The former supported missions outside NATO’s territory, Europe’s periphery more specifically, in order to defend the collective interests. The European NATO members mainly supported this idea. The latter group, which included the Clinton Administration, advocated for a boundless NATO, without any geographical limits. Where traditionalists rather saw NATO’s tasks restricted to its traditional territory and were not in favour of enlargement because it would implicate the process of consensus, progressives were convinced that extraterritorial activities were crucial for NATO in order to maintain its role as an important actor on the world stage, and to protect its values and interests where they were attacked. Moreover, progressives advocated for membership expansion, as it would benefit stability in the transatlantic region.

When reading the 1999 Strategic Concept, it could be argued that Carpenter’s view might have been too sceptic as the Alliance did manage to capture the different views in a positive way and subsequently shape a proper framework. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the Strategic Concept remained rather vague on some topics. For instance, the encounter of the different opinions mentioned above was that NATO “will work with other nations and organizations to advance security, prosperity and democracy throughout the Euro-Atlantic Region” (NATO, 1999, “The Alliance’s Strategic Concept”, para. 2). The text of the Strategic Concept repetitively emphasizes that the common interests should be defended, but nowhere is specified what these common interests exactly are and how to protect them. Moreover, following the enlargement process, as envisioned in the Strategic Concept, it could be questioned whether it is even possible to speak of common interests. Considering the extent of the diversity of values, interests

and objectives within the Alliance, is it even possible to have a truly unified vision? Then there is also the issue of the Europe-US relation. Some might argue that the further away actions are conducted, the more probabilities there are of increasing the divergence of interests between allies. The public debates on the Afghanistan and Iraq demonstrated this matter. These are two issues that will most likely remain topic of debate in the future.

Notwithstanding these two issues of debate, the 1999 Strategic Concept has been a positive development from a general viewpoint, as it established new patterns of cooperation and expanded its tasks that benefited stability in the Euro-Atlantic region and most importantly reaffirmed NATO's importance. After the end of the Cold War, the traditional role of NATO faded away and therefore it had to find a new way to remain an important actor to respond to the new challenges in the international security environment.

In November 2010, the Strategic Concept was updated once again, and basically followed the steps of the 1999 Strategic Concept by stressing the importance of crisis management and the promotion of international security through cooperation, while not losing out of sight its traditional functions. Whereas the previous strategic concept did not clearly define the security threats, the 2010 one did. Extremism and terrorism are explicitly mentioned as being direct threats to the security of NATO countries, just as the role of technology in modern-day threats. The September 11 attacks are the main reason for this clear definition of security threats, as this act of terrorism has given a new dimension to the arena of global conflict. Ambassador Daniel R. Coats accurately remarks that besides the end of the Cold War, September 11 was "a defining moment that changed many things from that point forward" (Weissinger-Baylon, 2002, p. xxix). As the phenomenon of terrorism is something completely different from traditional conflicts, it needed an entirely new approach. Consequently, NATO developed counter-terrorism policy guidelines. Moreover, in contrast to the 1999 Strategic Concept, natural disasters are also listed as being a part of the security environment, and therefore have "the potential to significantly affect NATO planning and operations" (NATO, 2010b, "Strategic Concept", p. 13).

In sum, ever since its creation after the end of the Second World War the Alliance has continuously reinvented itself, while abiding by the fundamental principles of the founding treaty. NATO showed to be a spirited organization able to identify the new

threats and challenges, and respond to these accordingly through constantly adapting its approach to security by adopting new tasks and activities.

Chapter 2 - NATO's humanitarian approach

Over the years, NATO has been actively present in the sphere of civil protection and humanitarian support. Already since the creation of the Alliance in 1949, NATO's commitment to the protection of the civilian population became evident. During the Cold War NATO started to develop its expertise in the field of Civil Emergency Planning (CEP) in order to be able to protect the populations in case a severe conflict would erupt in Europe, particularly with respect to the possible catastrophic escalation of the nuclear threshold. In fact, the primary aim of CEP was to maintain "the social and economic life of member nations and ensuring the survival of their populations during and after hostilities" (NATO, 1989, p. 259). Hence, civil protection initially focused on the consequences of war.

There would soon be a shift in focus, however. In 1953, instead of responding to a conflict, NATO conducted its first disaster assistance operation following a natural disaster. The North Sea floods had left England, but most of all the Netherlands in a state of destruction. At the time when the floods hit, both countries were still suffering from the damage caused by the Second World War, therefore the already strongly weakened infrastructures of the countries could not stand up against the massive floods. From this point onward, NATO strongly developed its expertise in the area of disaster relief assistance and civilian protection. After the fall of the Berlin wall, more changes came about as NATO included more members and developed friendly relations and partnerships with countries spreading from Central Europe to Eastern Russia. As already mentioned in Chapter 1, the understanding of security had enlarged, encompassing issues that could endanger common peace and stability, such as regional crises and tensions that could lead to instabilities or conflicts. Over time, NATO would receive demands for humanitarian support not only from allies, but also from partners like Armenia, Kirghizstan or Moldavia, which will be briefly discussed in the next chapter. NATO moreover participated in out of area peace operations and crisis management operations in the Balkans.

Over time, the role of civil emergency planning has been subject to adaptations. In 2006, NATO provided the following definition:

The aim of Civil Emergency Planning (CEP) in NATO is to collect, analyze and share information on national planning activity to ensure the most effective use of civil resources for use during emergency situations, in accordance with Alliance objectives. It enables Allies and Partner nations to assist each other in preparing for and dealing with the consequences of

crisis, disaster or conflict. (NATO, 2006, p. 1)

The emphasis on civil emergency planning has not gone unnoticed. As Byman et al. (2000) already accurately pointed out: where NATO was “once a marginal actor in relation to relief operations, it is now an important vehicle for civilian and military planning in this sphere” (p. 131).

In order to clarify the scope of this dissertation, it is important to make the distinction between humanitarian assistance and humanitarian intervention, which are different concepts. Military interventions, either in typical war actions or crisis management operations, can have a humanitarian component. There may even be military operations to enforce peace in which the aim is of humanitarian nature. These types of operations are typically called humanitarian interventions. As underlined by Bercovitch and Jackson (2009): “Humanitarian intervention is coercive and implies the use of force for humanitarian aims; assistance, on the other hand, is associated with the provision of relief” (p. 103). Peacekeeping missions, therefore, do not fall within the scope of this dissertation, as those types of missions are considered humanitarian interventions. Disaster assistance, on the other hand, is categorized as humanitarian assistance and is a specifically important component of NATO’s civil emergency planning, which gives prominence to the civilian feature of NATO’s crisis management activities, and is the primary focus of this dissertation.

§2.1 Civil Emergency Planning

Due to the emergence of new demands for civil protection, the concept of CEP underwent many changes over time. Byman et al. (2000) confirm that NATO has now broadened the civil emergency focus, which traditionally was “managing refugee crises behind a conventional front in Western Europe or reconstruction after nuclear attack” (p. 131). Whereas natural disasters continue to pose a great threat to civilian populations, the world also has been exposed to new threats that go beyond the national borders. One of the main events causing the shift toward threats with a transatlantic character have been the September 11 attacks, which caused terrorism to become one of the most prominent threats to civilian populations nowadays. The current security environment is thus characterized by threats that are both asymmetric and transnational. It is for this reason that civil emergency planning has become more important than ever, allowing an adequate and effective response during civilian crises. NATO civil emergency planning, hence, is a small-scale but at the same time wide-ranging activity, covering various facets of crisis response operations.

At the core of NATO CEP stands a network of experts who are specialized in the area of civilian resources. Given the fact that the use of civilian resources during a military operation is a vital part of CEP, this network of experts allows NATO to offer countries the best possible guidance on the effective use of civil resources during a disaster relief operation (NATO, 2001a, p. 188). Besides this network of civil experts, the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC) serves as the top NATO advisory body for disaster relief operations, as its role is to ensure that support for national authorities is executed in accordance with the Alliance's objectives. The SCEPC's strength is that it brings together national government officials and experts from both the civil and military area in order to optimize guidance for civil emergency planning.

A key feature of CEP is the central role and the responsibility of the national authorities. It is for this reason that the question of what happens with civil assets remains a domestic affair; therefore each country should bear the primary responsibility for civil emergency planning. However, when a disaster has struck on such a large scale, causing the country to be incapable of providing the necessary disaster assistance, NATO gets involved. NATO's primary function is thus to help nations to such an extent, allowing them to adequately protect their civilian populations in times of crisis. It does so by first of all serving as a forum where knowledge can be exchanged on how to deal with civil emergencies. In addition, the Alliance offers assistance in the coordination of civil emergency operations by making available the necessary assets in case jointly action is needed. Subsequently, "NATO Civil Emergency Planning activities benefit the NATO Allies and Partners nations who gain from cooperation at international level to better handle emergency situations, particularly those with trans-national dimensions" (NATO, 2006, p. 6).

§2.2 NATO's civil emergency response mechanisms

The EADRCC

Within the perimeter of the civil emergency structure, the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) serves as NATO's primary practical civil emergency response mechanism and is responsible for the coordination of international relief efforts in any of the 50 EAPC states. The creation EADRCC was initiated following a proposal from Russia to enhance the Euro-Atlantic response capability, resulting in the "EAPC Policy on Enhanced Practical Cooperation in the field of International Disaster Relief". The policy, developed by the SCEPC and endorsed by the EAPC in 1998, stresses

that natural and technological disasters pose an ever-increasing risk to populations of EAPC members, even more than other types of emergencies (NATO, 1998, “EAPC Policy on enhanced practical cooperation in the field of international disaster relief”, p. 1). Simultaneously, this implies a rising need for international support in the area of disaster assistance. The policy furthermore stresses that the UNOCHA remains the primary actor in international disaster management, and that the EADRCC’s role is a complementary one. As Hough (2013) points out, “The EADRCC represents a means of assisting UN relief when disaster occurs in a EAPC state or of coordinating assistance within the EAPC area if the UN-OCHA is distracted elsewhere” (p. 210).

Already in 1994, the UN acknowledged that natural disasters pose an increasing risk to civilian populations. As a consequence, frameworks for disaster reduction have been established with the objective to save human lives through an integrated approach for disaster management, therefore reducing the level of destruction following a disaster. This integrated approach mainly focuses on improving and promoting disaster prevention and preparedness. So far, there have been created three frameworks: Yokohama Strategy (1994), the Hyogo Framework (2005), and the Sendai Framework (2015). Each framework can be seen as an improved and updated version of the previous one. For a brief explanation of the frameworks please refer to Appendix 2.

The EADRCC monitors the deployment of the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit (EADRU). Where the Centre coordinates the disaster response of NATO members, the Unit gets detached to the disaster site upon request of the stricken country. “The EADRU will be considered to have been activated whenever one or more EAPC member countries deploy capabilities in response to the initiative of the EADRCC” (NATO, 1998, “EAPC policy on enhanced practical cooperation in the field of international disaster relief”, p. 5). The Unit comprises a mixture of civilian and military elements that are contributed by EAPC. These contributions can for example be medical and rescue personnel, but also equipment and other types of assets. The unit operates in close cooperation with the UN and relevant international organizations (IOs). Naturally, the EADRU can only be deployed within the EAPC area. However, “In exceptional circumstances, should there be a request for assistance for a stricken non-EAPC country, political guidance will be obtained as a matter of urgency before initiating any disaster response via the EADRCC” (NATO, 1998, “EAPC policy on enhanced practical cooperation in the field of international disaster relief”, p. 5).

Globally, the EADRCC fulfils three primary functions: coordination, information sharing, and training and exercises. First, the Centre has a coordinating role, in which it does not only coordinate requests from affected states, but also the offers of assistance by EAPC members. Kerigan-Kyro (2014) stresses the importance of the EADRCC's coordinating role: "EADRCC has an important coordinating role between NATO members, working closely with the military in each country, and with international organizations, enabling expertise and assistance to be on the ground very quickly" (p. 2). Accordingly, the Centre does not have a commanding role in any way. Indeed, this coordinating role takes place in close consultation with UN-OCHA and, if necessary, with other international organizations. When the Centre receives a request for assistance from a nation that has been struck by a natural or man-made disaster, it first contacts the stricken nation to confirm that the request has been received and retrieves additional information on the requirements for assistance when necessary. Next, consultations with the UN and possibly other IOs take place in order to decide what the exact response by the EADRCC will be and which elements are needed. Once the requirements for disaster assistance have been determined, the information is distributed among all EAPC members, who will then individually decide whether they will provide assistance through the EADRU. Countries can also decide to individually offer direct assistance and therefore carry out relief efforts independently. As soon as it is clear which elements the EAPC countries will deploy in response to the disaster, it is the role of the EADRCC to report this information to the affected country.

Second, the EADRCC greatly values the promotion of information sharing, and it does so by organizing seminars and conferences. In 2004, the EADRCC organized the first seminar, taking place in Dubrovnik, Croatia. The aim of the seminar was to evaluate lessons learned from NATO disaster relief efforts ever since the creation of the EADRCC in 1998. National experiences and the role of IOs during disaster relief efforts were discussed during the program. "The overall idea with the seminar is to improve the EADRCC ability to support the nations when disasters occur and international assistance is needed". Moreover, it allowed to "assess the EAPC nations capability to provide and receive assistance" (EADRCC, 2006, "Seminar on Lessons Learned from operations and exercises conducted by the EADRCC", para. 5). In 2013 the second seminar took place, and its focus was to evaluate the EADRCC operations conducted between 2004 and 2013. The objective of this seminar was the same as the previous one, namely to identify further areas of improvement for NATO's role in humanitarian operations.

Last, training and exercises are very important aspects for both the Centre and the Unit because it fosters effective functioning, preparedness, and maximizes the level of

interoperability. Therefore, the EADRCC's role is to "facilitate close and continuing cooperation for training and exercises among voluntary groupings of EAPC member countries" (NATO, 1998, "EAPC policy on enhanced practical cooperation in the field of international disaster relief". p. 6). NATO organizes training and exercise events on a regular basis, and these preparations are open to all partners. The protection of the civilian population is the fundamental tenet during the trainings and exercises. Field exercises are organized each year and serve the objective of enhancing cooperation between nations during operations by practicing the Centre's procedures and the Unit's capabilities. With a total number of 35 participating countries, the 2012 exercise Georgia was one of the biggest field exercises organized by the EADRCC. "It proved to be a well-developed rigorous exercise that was carried out in a safe manner with no major injuries or casualties. It was well designed, in that it promoted cooperation among responders from the participating nations" (EADRCC, 2013, "Georgia to host NATO/EAPC disaster response exercise", para. 3). Countries can individually decide what their participating role will be during the field exercise. For instance, countries can choose to send specialized teams or staff support, but also to just send observers. For each annual exercise, the scenario differs. The scenario for the Georgia exercise involved an earthquake, which would be followed by chemical incidents, transportation accidents, and other complex dangers. These types of exercises are not only very important for the EADRCC and the EADRU, but also for the country in which the field exercise takes place. To illustrate, one of the main objectives of the Georgia exercise is "to strengthen Georgia's capabilities to receive international assistance and effectively organize and co-ordinate consequence management operations involving international rescue teams" (EADRCC, 2012, "Extract from the exercise instructions – exercise Georgia 2012", p. 4). In other words, it is an extremely valuable experience for the host country as well. Besides strengthening the consequence management capabilities of the EADRCC, the EADRU and the host countries, trainings and exercises also foster cross-border cooperation between nations and IOs. Moreover, it is a good way for all parties to get familiar with the internationally agreed guidelines. Finally, field exercises can be used for lessons learned, as the scenarios are as close as possible to the possible real situation.

The Rapid Reaction Team and the Advisory Support Team (AST)

In addition, the Rapid Reaction Team and the Advisory Support Team (AST) are two other non-military instruments for CEP. The Civil Emergency Planning Rapid Reaction Team was established in 2006 by the SCEPC and has the capability to deploy a team of

civil experts shortly after a country has been struck by a disaster. Upon arrival, the team of civil experts evaluates which civil needs and capabilities are required, which is of great support during NATO disaster relief operations. Moreover, the team evaluates the situation in close cooperation with the stricken nation and the UN. Whereas the Rapid Reaction Team only provides assistance in the aftermath of a crisis, the Advisory Support Team focuses on the phase prior to a potential disaster. The team aims to prepare countries and IOs to such an extent that they will be better capable of responding to disasters. The AST thus provides nations with advice, aiming to improve the preparedness, response and, recovery capabilities of nations in case they get hit by a disaster. Besides making assessments and providing advice, the team also engages in training and exercises. An AST is solely deployed when a nation directly requests assistance through the SCEPC. Moreover, the nation is not obliged to implement the recommendations given by the AST following their assessment.

§2.3 Civil-military coordination in humanitarian emergencies

Perhaps one of the most complex aspects about disaster relief activities is the interaction between civilian actors and military authorities. Processes of disaster assistance have become intertwined, as military and civilian actors participate simultaneously in these operations. Armies increasingly engage in non-military functions, which causes military assistance in humanitarian emergencies to be specifically important in the field of civil emergency planning. In complex humanitarian situations, where regions or countries are devastated and lack administrative authorities, the military gets involved in the use of civilian resources in order to restore essential services. Logically, it depends on the nature of each situation and the extent of the crisis which services require restoration. Examples are rebuilding the infrastructure, facilitating electrical power, and protecting medical services and amenities. Before military means can be used in disaster relief operations, authorization by the NAC is necessary: “The North Atlantic Council (NAC) will have to authorize the use of collective Allied military resources for such civil activities” (Policy Coordination Group, 2001, “NATO Military Policy on Civil-Military Co-operation (Cimic)”, p. 2). Thus, the Alliance forces may contribute to managing responses to humanitarian emergencies through military assets and units, when approved by the NAC.

Civilian assets can be of great support for military operations, whereas military assets in turn can be of great value during disaster relief operations. NATO argues that the cooperation between the two actors is indispensable to these types of operations, as stressed in the 1999 Strategic Concept: “The interaction between Alliance forces and the

civil environment (both governmental and non-governmental) in which they operate is crucial to the success of operations” (NATO, 1999, “the Alliance’s Strategic Concept”, para. 60). Important is, that military forces are only deployed in the case of exceptional circumstances in which they are enabled to take on tasks that traditionally fall within the domain of civil authorities. Hence, the military only carries out these types of activities when the appropriate civil authority is unable to do so in that specific moment, in order to avoid the occurrence of a problematic power vacuum. This takeover of control by the military is only a temporary event, and that the civil authorities will pick up the threads again as soon as the situation is stabilized as such.

In order to facilitate cooperation and enhance the relationship between Alliance forces and civil actors, NATO created a policy on civil-military cooperation (CIMIC) in July 2001. CIMIC is primarily important in non-Article 5 Crisis Response Operations (NA5CRO), because the multifaceted nature of these types of operations often requires the involvement of both military and civil actors. The official policy document describes CIMIC as follows:

“The co-ordination and co-operation, in support of the mission, between the NATO Commander and civil actors, including national population and local authorities, as well as international, national and non-governmental organizations and agencies.” (Policy Coordination Group, 2001, “NATO military policy on civil-military co-operation (Cimic)”, p. 1)

The CIMIC policy acknowledges the complex circumstances caused by dissimilarities between military and civilian actors, such as cultural, political and religious differences: “It must be recognized, however, that even where such relationships or planning mechanisms exist, it may not always be possible to conduct them on a formal basis” (p. 4). For this reason, shaping an effective relationship between these two groups is a vital component for minimizing the extent of a crisis and stabilizing the situation. In order to reach the right level of agreement and coordination in the civil-military relationship NATO emphasizes the importance of establishing common goals at an early stage, “consistent with political guidance, which military commanders must integrate into the planning for the execution of their operations” (p. 5). Particularly important herein is the notion of transparency, allowing the creation of trust and mutual understanding.

The Oslo Guidelines

Besides the CIMIC Policy, the Oslo Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA) in Disaster Relief serve as a major guide for NATO disaster relief

operations. The official author of the Oslo Guidelines is the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), and the guidelines have been written over a period of two years, involving numerous states and organizations, including NATO. The first version of the Guidelines was published in 1994 and has undergone several alternations ever since, the last one being in 2007 (OCHA, 2007, “Oslo Guidelines”, p. 1). The principle aim of the Oslo Guidelines is to “establish the basic framework for formalizing and improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the use of foreign military and civil defense assets in international disaster relief operations” (OCHA, 2007, “Oslo Guidelines”, p. 4). Moreover, the Guidelines are based upon the core humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality and neutrality. Member states are not obliged to follow the Guidelines, which makes it a non-binding document that solely seeks to establish a framework and therefore serves as a foundation for enhanced coordination of military and civilian assistance.

The Guidelines define humanitarian assistance as “aid to an affected population that seeks, as its primary purpose, to save lives and alleviate suffering of a crisis-affected population”. Additionally, international disaster relief assistance (IDRA) is described as “material, personnel and services provided by the international community to an Affected State to meet the needs of those affected by a disaster” (OCHA, 2007, “Oslo Guidelines”, p. 3). Next, the document classifies different types of humanitarian assistance: direct and indirect assistance, and infrastructure support. Correspondingly, MCDA efforts should focus on the two latter types of humanitarian assistance, in which the population is not directly exposed to relief activities by the military and the main focus is to transport goods or personnel and to provide general services to restore or improve infrastructural services. Accordingly, direct assistance activities are left to humanitarian organizations, such as handing out food supplies to affected populations. However, sometimes it does happen that military forces get involved in direct humanitarian assistance. When this is the case, it is very important that there remains a clear distinction between the regular roles of military and humanitarian actors.

Regarding the identification and security of foreign personnel, the Guidelines emphasize the principle that “foreign military and civil defence personnel deploying on disaster relief missions will do so unarmed and in national uniforms” (OCHA, 2007, “Oslo Guidelines”, p. 8). Correspondingly, in the model agreement that covers the status of MCDA and likewise serves as a draft agreement between the UN, the receiving states, and the assisting states, it is written that, “members of the MCDA operation shall be

permitted to wear the national military or civil defence uniforms of their State". However, it also underlines that "the affected state will determine as part of this agreement if members of the MCDA operation may carry arms for their own protection, while performing official duties" (OCHA, 2007, "Oslo Guidelines" "Annex 1", p. 6). Hence, although foreign military personnel could be allowed to carry arms during the relief operation, it is desired that they do not, but the affected states have the possibility to take specific decisions resulting from particular security environments. The Oslo Guidelines underline the distinction between United Nations Military and Civil Defence Assets (UN MCDA) and "other deployed forces" (OCHA, 2007, "Oslo Guidelines", p. 3). Respectively, NATO would fall under the latter group. Whereas the UN MCDA are controlled by UN humanitarian agencies, the resources of other deployed forces fall under the command of the corresponding entity.

The NATO CIMIC policy and the Oslo Guidelines are predominantly based on common grounds. For instance, just as NATO, the UN stresses the importance of a quick and effective response, given that an immediate response in the first stage of crisis situation is usually crucial for the success of the operation. Second, both entities promote a harmonious relation between civilian and humanitarian actors, based on dialogue and cooperation. Finally, military and civil defense assets should only be deployed as a last resort when no other civilian alternative is available, and when militaries can provide unique capabilities. In other words, dependency on military assets should be avoided at all costs. Most questions are raised over the latter principle. Wiharta et al. (2008) found that the last resort concept is interpreted differently among all actors, resulting in an uneven application of the Guidelines:

"There is considerable disagreement among governments and humanitarian actors about how much weight to give these 'unique' characteristics when balancing them against issues such as cost burdens, the risk of militarizing the relief effort and how the presence of foreign troops affects civilian humanitarian actors' safety and freedom to operate"
(p. xi)

Another reason why the last resort concept is a difficult one is because in the initial stage of the disaster response there is hardly time to assess whether there truly are no other civilian options left.

Another critique on the Guidelines is that it does not address the coordination with the military of the affected state, although this is often a crucial matter. Likewise, Metcalfe et al. (2012) identify a "tendency of foreign militaries and the international humanitarian

community to lose sight of the central role of the national military in crisis response” (p. 17).

Importantly, the Oslo Guidelines solely apply to the delivery of humanitarian assistance in emergency situations in times of peace and fully respect the sovereignty of the state that receives disaster assistance. Hence, it does not have any regard to the use of foreign MCDA in armed conflict situations. There is a different document for the use of MCDA for the so-called “complex emergencies”: the UN Civil-Military Guidelines for Complex Emergencies, which provides a foundation for relief operations focused on the reconstruction and rehabilitation of a (post-) conflict society. The definition of a complex emergency is as follows: “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 and which requires an international response that goes beyond the mandate or capacity of any single agency and/or the ongoing UN country program” (UN, 2003, “Guidelines on the use of military and civil defense assets to support United Nations humanitarian activities in complex emergencies”, p. 3). Whereas humanitarian agencies usually make the request for disaster assistance in the case of a complex emergency, disaster relief operations in peacetime are carried out when the affected state files an official request for international humanitarian assistance following a technological, environmental or natural disaster.

Both guidelines are currently the principle frameworks concerning the deployment of military assets in disaster relief operations.

A controversial matter

Among others, natural disasters have been happening more frequently over the last decades, and when they strike, they are they are generally more destructive (Leaning and Guha-Sapir, 2013, “Natural disasters, armed conflict, and public health”). This has invoked a substantial increase in the presence of foreign military assets in disaster responses. This growing availability on the side of military actors to engage in disaster response probably has to do with several factors. First, the media attention and the subsequent public pressure that often comes along with major disasters work as a strong incentive to decide to engage in disaster relief operations. Second, these types of operations are excellent training opportunities for military forces and contribute to the staff morale. The employment of military forces in complex disasters and crises broadens their field of expertise and ascertains their role in the changing security

environment. Finally, the phenomenon of armed forces taking on humanitarian assistance tasks is also in line with the more comprehensive approaches to international security. Whereas before disaster relief operations were mainly focused on providing logistics and technical support to the affected state, the military's role in providing humanitarian aid during these types of operations is growing. The involvement of the military has thus become inevitable and "the question for humanitarian organizations is no longer whether to engage with the military, but rather how and when to do so" (Hoffman and Hudson, 2009, p. 31).

It is exactly the military involvement in humanitarian assistance that has caused much controversy, and questions have been raised whether it is appropriate for foreign military forces to be involved in humanitarian aid. However, according to Wheeler and Harmer (2006), "military engagement in the response to natural disasters is perhaps the least contentious aspect of the relationship between the military and the humanitarian worlds" (p. 7). Nonetheless, the trend of utilizing foreign military assets in disaster response becoming the norm has been subject to much criticism, especially because experiences have demonstrated that a smooth civil-military coordination appears to be an issue that seems hard to achieve. Tensions especially arise in complex situations because of differences in approaches to security among humanitarians and military actors; notwithstanding that they generally have the same objectives regarding the outcomes of the disaster response. Madiwale and Virk (2011) explain that military actors usually operate according to the principles of deterrence and physical security, often involving fortified compounds and the presence of arms. Humanitarian actors, conversely, focus on security based on acceptance among all stakeholders, while usually opposing the presence of arms (p. 1086).

Factors for effective civil-military coordination

A research by Wiharta et al. (2008) for the Stockholm International Research Peace Institute (SIPRI) that focuses on civil-military coordination identifies several areas that determine whether the deployment of foreign military assets will be effective or not: timeliness, appropriateness, efficiency, absorptive capacity, and coordination (pp. 33-42).

The concept of timeliness concentrates on whether the military assets arrive on time and also become operational at the right moment. "The ideal scenario would be a minimal delay between the signing of any status of force agreement, dispatch and operation"(Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 34). It goes without saying that this is particularly

hard to achieve in reality, considering the complex conditions and the large amount of involved actors. Natural disasters require an immediate response, as the initial phase right after the disaster has struck is usually crucial, especially when it concerns earthquakes. When military assets arrive too late, it loses its unique capability. A particularly important aspect for the military to be able to arrive on time is the initial needs assessment, which evaluates the impact and the seriousness of the disaster. A correct initial needs assessment is thus crucial for the establishment of a good perception of the seriousness of the disaster and the urgency of assistance by the international community. For instance, “in the case of the Indian Ocean Tsunami, the scale and severity of the disaster were immediately clear and prompted rapid response from the international community with all of its available resources” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 33). In some situations, however, the initial needs assessment does not appropriately sketch the true graveness of the situation, which can cause foreign military assets to arrive too late. Further, civilian actors hardly include military actors in their needs assessments, as well as the other way around. As a result, coordination is already troubled in the first phase of the disaster response. Wiharta et al. (2008), therefore, strongly recommends for civilian and military actors to conduct joint needs assessments (p. 41). Another factor that can hinder the rapid deployment of military assets is the bureaucratic processes. It is important whether there are procedures and mechanisms in place between the military and civilian actors, and if these do exist, that they function effectively.

Second, appropriateness reflects whether the deployed military assets meet the humanitarian needs or not. It is important to assess whether the right assets are being used for the right situation and in the right place. If not, this can decrease efficiency and reverse the achieved progress of a quick arrival of the military assets.

Efficiency is the third area, which stands for the efficient and optimal use of the deployed assets. In some cases there are external factors that go beyond the military’s control that might thwart the efficiency, such as mandates.

Fourth, “the capacity of the affected country to effectively utilize and coordinate foreign military assets during a disaster relief operation is an important factor for successful civil-military coordination” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 39). It further matters whether the affected state concerns a strong or weak state, and whether the state has a (functioning) disaster management structure.

Finally, a smooth coordination between different actors is a deterrent for a successful operation. Disaster relief operations comprise a very high total number of involved actors and military troops are usually outnumbered by civil humanitarian contingents.

The fact that all civilian and military actors work according to different cultural backgrounds, orders, and guidelines can make the effective coordination even harder. In addition, the relationship between foreign military actors and the national military of the affected country is crucial as well (military-military coordination). Nonetheless, the research revealed that the affected governments generally found it more complicated to coordinate with humanitarian actors than with foreign militaries (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 42).

An evaluation of the criticism

Despite a growing acceptance within the humanitarian community, most critical sounds on the increased presence of military actors have come from this group. For instance, Hoffman and Hudson (2009, p. 31), writing on behalf of the British Red Cross, refer that “humanitarian organizations have a responsibility to engage more strategically with the military in order to limit the risks inherent in their involvement”. Further, they argue that potential benefits should be maximized. When looking closely at these sentences, the negative attitude towards the military involvement is evident, especially because of their statement referring to the risks inherent in the involvement of the military, and that these should be limited. It almost implies that the Red Cross in fact does not accept military involvement, and that they just have to make the best of a bad situation. Nevertheless, they do acknowledge the importance of dialogue between the two actors.

The argument used the most against military engagement in disaster response is that the involvement of the military in humanitarian aid jeopardizes humanitarian space and that it is contrary to principles upon which the humanitarian community is based. However, “humanitarian principle dictates that all available resources – including military assets – should be used to minimize the human cost of a natural disaster” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. ix). In addition, the UN Oslo Guidelines and the UN Civil-Military Guidelines for Complex Emergencies both emphasize that humanitarian actors and military actors should act in accordance with the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, independence and distinction. As a rule, militaries use these guidelines when being deployed in natural disaster responses.

Further, critics claim that military engagement is not only inappropriate, but also inefficient and inadequate. Putting it mildly, these claims seem unfounded. The deployment of military assets in disaster relief operations has many advantages. First of all, military assets are “typically on permanent standby, available in large numbers, ready to deploy at a moment’s notice, and thus able to reach the scene of a disaster

quickly” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 32). A speedy arrival of military assets in the surge phase is a decisive constituent for the rest of the disaster relief operation. Military helicopters, for instance, can be of great importance during the first phase of a relief operation for reaching affected populations and transporting essential relief goods. However, it is often the presence of military forces after the initial phase of the relief operation that raises questions. A further advantage of military assets in disaster response is the fact that military forces possess useful capabilities that other organizations do not have. Madiwale and Virk (2011) identify several crucial military contributions: the excellent capacity for search and rescue activities, the expertise and resources for logistics and infrastructure support, highly trained manpower, and the ability to provide security to relief workers (p. 1086). What is more, “military assets bring with them a high degree of self-sufficiency and do not strain local resources. Further, they can operate under extreme conditions for protracted and intense periods, including day and night operations” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p.39).

A third frequently heard argument opposing the increased prominence of military actors is that they are “driven by political imperatives rather than humanitarian need” (Hoffman and Hudson, 2009, p. 30). Considering the fact that military forces are sent by their state, some might question whether the forces genuinely operate according to the principles of independence, neutrality and impartiality, or whether their actions are directed by political principles. Yet, military engagement in disaster response is perceived as relatively politically uncomplicated (Wheeler and Harmer, 2006, p. 7).

Apart from these political motives, some critics also argue that military forces mostly engage in disaster relief operations to improve its image and generate goodwill. From a certain perspective, this argument might be valid. In fact, however, NATO needed to position itself in a changed security environment, and it did so by taking on a wider range of tasks, among which also, but not only, disaster response operations. These new activities can indeed lead to a change in the perception of NATO by the general public, and perhaps to more sympathy. However, NATO’s main intention by taking on disaster relief activities was not to brush up its global image; this would solely be an unintended but probably welcomed side effect.

Chapter 3 - NATO's involvement in disaster assistance

Although NATO is mainly known as a collective defense organization with the purpose of preserving the territorial integrity of its members, the fact is that the North Atlantic Alliance is not only involved in the protection of populations against the effects of war, but also uses its capabilities to protect populations against the effects of natural disasters, such as floods and earthquakes. These, and other activities conducted by NATO that do not fall under the Article 5 (mutual defense) umbrella are labeled as “Non-Article 5” and grouped under the concept of crisis response operations. “Non-Article 5 crisis response operations (NA5CRO) can be described as multifunctional operations that encompass those political, military, and civil activities, initiated and executed in accordance with international law, including international humanitarian law, contributing to conflict prevention and resolution and crisis management, or serve humanitarian purposes, in the pursuit of declared Alliance objectives” (NATO, 2010a, “Allied joint doctrine for non-article 5 crisis response operations”, p. xi). Disaster response operations in its purity do not result from the collective defense principle, and thus fall under NA5CRO. NATO has the capability to deploy military forces in NA5CRO situations: “In many cases, the main support from the military will be to provide a secure environment where the humanitarian actors can perform their functions” (NATO, 2010a, “Allied joint doctrine for non-article 5 crisis response operations”, p. 3). As a result, Schrogl et al. (2009) accurately point out, “distinctions between war and relief, between domestic and foreign deployments, are breaking down” (p.262).

§3.1 The evolution of NATO disaster relief operations

Complex disasters can surpass the capacity of a single nation or other entities to deal with the crisis. Moreover, besides the disaster itself, there are usually other factors that make a humanitarian emergency even more complex, such as economic, social or political instability in the affected region. When analyzing NATO's historical record of disaster relief activities, the humanitarian nature of the operations varies. As mentioned before, the North Sea Floods of 1953 were the reason for NATO to develop a policy for disaster assistance in peacetime. NATO's assistance in this specific operation was of great humanitarian value. However, not all NATO responses were of direct humanitarian nature. For instance, in response to the 1966 Arno floods in Italy, NATO's assistance was mainly technical, wherefore the Alliance did not directly engage in direct humanitarian assistance. Importantly, already from the beginning NATO stressed that it does not profile itself as a humanitarian organization:

“NATO is not a humanitarian organization, NATO is an organization for peace, security and stability. However, in the view of NATO, it was entirely in line with the purposes of peace, security and stability to use all possible resources to bring relief to victims of disaster, and to do so in cooperation with the World Community, including NATO’s cooperation partners in Central and Eastern Europe.” (NATO, 2001b, p. 13)

Toward enhanced cooperation

From its first disaster operation in 1953 until 1995, NATO conducted various disaster operations following natural disasters, such as ones in Turkey, Italy, and Armenia and Kyrgyzstan. However, it could be stated that NATO’s disaster assistance before 1995 was rather conditioned. Originally, NATO would only provide direct disaster assistance to countries located within the NATO area. When it would concern a non-NATO member or even a NATO partner, the Alliance would only provide disaster assistance if requested by a relevant IO. In other words, before 1995, when the government of a non-NATO country or a NATO partner would request NATO for disaster assistance after it had been struck by a natural disaster, NATO would not provide disaster assistance, unless requested by a relevant IO or if the request was made on behalf of a NATO member. Floods in Moldavia in 1994 highlighted this bottleneck, which initiated the review of the NATO policy for disaster assistance (NATO, 2001b, p. 15). Subsequent to this alteration of the disaster assistance policy, governments of NACC and PfP members were allowed to request direct assistance. Consequently, the area of NATO’s disaster assistance activities greatly expanded. Afterwards, on the initiative of Russia, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) established the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) and the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit (EADRU) in 1998, which enhanced cooperation even further in the field of disaster relief.

The 1998 Albanian refugee crisis as a decisive event

The 1998 Albanian refugee crisis marked another relevant change, as it caused the Alliance to become involved in a disaster relief operation in a so-called complex emergency situation, as defined previously. Importantly, this specific relief operation was in response to a man-made disaster. As a result of the Kosovo crisis, Albania was confronted with a massive refugee crisis, and civil organizations alone were underprepared and therefore not able to adequately cope with this critical situation. For this reason, NATO agreed to launch Operation Allied Harbor in 1999, which allowed military contributions to the relief efforts. “NATO troops constructed refugee camps,

participated in the administration of aid, provided logistics help and improved transport infrastructure in Albania and the FYROM” (Seybolt, 2007, p. 123). It was the first time that NATO provided immediate humanitarian relief in a complex emergency situation, namely in a (post-) conflict zone.

Seybolt makes an interesting observation, however, by arguing that this specific humanitarian effort by NATO was an incidental one (p. 123). When the Kosovo war finally came to an end, “Serbian actions had generated approximately 863000 refugees and 590000 IDPs – 90 per cent of the population. Almost all the refugees fled west to Albania or east to the FYROM” (p. 124). Humanitarian organizations were unable to provide an adequate response to the massive refugee flows because they had not anticipated to such a large number of refugees. Consequently, NATO received requests from both Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) for humanitarian assistance. The main reason for this request was the simple fact that NATO already had humanitarian intervention forces present in the regions anyways, which allowed a quick response. “For political, military and humanitarian reasons, NATO willingly took on the humanitarian challenge” (Seybolt, 2007, p. 124). NATO military forces intensely engaged in humanitarian activities in Albania. The situation in FYROM was different from the situation in Albania, however. Whereas the FYROM Government did not allow humanitarian organizations into the country to prepare a humanitarian response, “the NATO troops, in contrast, were welcomed, partly because of the political aspirations of the FYROM Government with regard to future membership of both NATO and the European Union” (Seybolt, 2007, p. 124). Hence, NATO forces were simply the only ones that were allowed to conduct humanitarian aid activities, because the FYROM Government was keeping out humanitarian organizations.

This incidental humanitarian effort by NATO has greatly shaped all succeeding NATO disaster assistance activities. After the requests for assistance following the Kosovo refugee crisis, NATO suddenly got engaged in a disaster assistance operation (humanitarian assistance), besides the already existing peacekeeping operation (humanitarian intervention). Therefore, it had to quickly adapt to a new wide range of actors involved and develop its humanitarian assistance capabilities. Military groups were no longer the main actors in the conflict, but also civil entities. It is for NATO’s sudden engagement in these disaster assistance efforts that the operation did not run flawless, but due to NATO’s rapid response many lives have been saved, despite some difficulties with coordination and assistance. Ever since NATO’s disaster relief operation in response to the massive refugee crisis caused by the Kosovo War, EADRCC “has responded to more than 60 requests for assistance, mainly states stricken by natural

disasters” (NATO, 2015, “The Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre”, para. 6).

Recent operations

From 2005 onwards, there has been a considerable increase in disaster response operations. In this year, NATO responded to two natural disasters in the US and Pakistan, probably the two largest and most high-profile NATO involvements in humanitarian operations. These operations clearly demonstrated the added value of certain military capabilities in disaster relief efforts when the affected states and humanitarian organizations are incapable to come up with an adequate response.

On 4 September 2005, the US requested NATO assistance, following the disastrous consequences of Hurricane Katrina. The US was in need of financial and medical assistance, food supplies, and equipment. Correspondingly, the EADRCC sent the list of requirements to the EAPC and coordinated the disaster response. Only five days following the request, a NATO transport operation was approved, allowing aid supplies from Europe to the US. In addition, “two civil aviation experts reinforced the EADRCC as of Friday, 9 September to provide advice and coordinate aviation transport matters with donating nations” (EADRCC, “EADRCC Final Report (Nº 15) Hurricane Katrina – USA”, 2005, p. 1). On 2 October 2005 the NATO disaster relief operation was completed, as the US did not have further requests to NATO for assistance. According to the EADRCC Final Report on the Hurricane Katrina operation, in total 39 NATO member and partner countries have offered assistance to the US, of which 23 directly communicated their offered assistance to the EADRCC, 12 have offered their assistance through the EU Community Civil Protection Mechanism, and 4 did not report their offers of assistance. (EADRCC, 2005, “EADRCC Final Report (Nº 15) Hurricane Katrina – USA”, p. 1). It was the first time NATO carried out a disaster relief operation in the US.

In the same year, a powerful earthquake struck the India-Pakistan border, causing particular destruction in the Kashmir region. The Kashmir region is located between India and Pakistan and characterized by decade long conflict. Subsequent to the disastrous earthquake, “health care services and structures in all of Pakistan faced considerable difficulty in coping with thousands of traumatized people seeking cure and care” (Rietjens and Bollen, 2008, p. 81). Despite relief efforts from the international relief community, the Pakistani government urgently requested NATO for disaster assistance on 8 October 2005. Subsequently, NATO approved this request and initiated the two-stage disaster relief operation two days later. The NATO relief mission included airlifts and the deployment of engineers and medical personnel. In total, 42 NATO

members and partners provided assistance to Pakistan and the disaster relief operation lasted three months. NATO's relief operation in the Kashmir region will be briefly discussed in chapter 5 by means of a case study.

Up to the present day, NATO has been involved in 44 disaster relief efforts and enhanced its dimension of disaster assistance, and at the same time reaffirmed its global role in the international security arena after the disaster assistance operations following Hurricane Katrina and the Kashmir earthquake. Most ones were carried out following natural disasters such as floods, snowfalls, and forest fires. There are only a few humanitarian crises listed that were caused by man-made disasters. If this happens to be the case, however, all operations are focused on providing disaster relief assistance for refugees and/or internal displaced persons (IDP) (NATO, 2015, "Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) – Operations"). For instance, NATO has received requests through the EADRCC from Turkey (2012 and 2014) and Jordan (2014) because the countries were unable to individually deal with the massive flows of Syrian refugees. Moreover, EADRCC received an urgent relief assistance request from Iraq on 19 August 2014, as the country faced massive populations of IDP's after ISIL took control of the city Mosul. Since then, the situation only worsened and the country is being taunted by among others food shortages, a lack of clean water, power cuts, and a shortage of fuel (EADRCC, 2014, "EADRCC urgent relief assistance request Iraq – IDP crisis", p. 2).

§3.2 Types of disaster assistance

There is a great variation in the type of disaster relief support offered by the assisting nations. Moreover, the number of allied and partner nations that provide assistance differs greatly, depending on the stricken country in question and the scale of the disaster. Besides the scale of the disaster, Wiharta et al. (2008) identified several other factors upon which the contribution of countries depends: geographic proximity, country's policies, national interests, relations with the affected country, and media coverage and public pressure (p. x).

To illustrate, the EADRCC received an urgent request for assistance from Bosnia and Herzegovina on 22 August 2013 (EADRCC, 2013, "EADRCC urgent disaster assistance request forest fires in Bosnia and Herzegovina"). The type of disaster was identified as "large scale wind fires" (p.1). The fires had already started approximately one month prior to request for assistance, but at the time of the request the situation was getting to dangerous levels given the circumstances. The terrain was unreachable due to the scale

of the fires and the landmines and unexploded ordnance caused the situation to be even riskier. In the meantime, fires were spreading rapidly and started to reach inhabited areas, while damaging infrastructures. After assessing the situation, EADRCC identified the following requirements for disaster assistance: fire-fighting aircrafts, helicopters with fire-fighting capabilities, and aviation gasoline. According to the final situation report by EADRCC (2013), four countries provided disaster assistance in total: Turkey, Croatia, Slovenia, and Ukraine (EADRCC, "Situation report no. 2 (final) forest fires in Bosnia and Herzegovina", p. 2). Where Turkey and Croatia contributed to the disaster relief efforts by providing helicopters and fire-fighting airplanes, Slovenia's and Ukraine's offers were rejected as the situation was already under control as such that further international assistance was no longer necessary. The coordinated response, thus, in this case was a rather small-scaled one, with relatively few countries involved and a limited list of requirements. In addition, although the operation had the aim to protect the civilian population, NATO itself did not directly engage in humanitarian assistance.

On the contrary, NATO's most recent disaster response was bigger and more humanitarian in nature. The disaster assistance request was made on 5 February 2015 by Albania, because heavy snowfall and floods had affected the country (EADRCC, 2015, "EADRCC urgent assistance request Albania snowfall and floods"). Unlike the previous case, Albania filed the request already a few days later after the heavy snowfall and rainfalls. The situation was getting particularly alarming because the weather conditions were expected to get worse, which required an immediate response. Moreover, there were over 600 displaced families, there was a troubling lack of resources, and a food and water shortage was likely to occur in the short term. The situation of the displaced families was particularly concerning because of insufficient space and very poor living conditions. The EADRCC divided the disaster assistance requirements into three main categories: food and family items, such as flour, soap, and rice; manufactured goods, such as water suction pumps, blankets, tents, and rainproof suits' and equipment and vehicles, such as snow and earth moving vehicles, bridge construction, scuba gear, and uniforms. The assistance provided by Allied and partner nations was much more far-reaching than the previously illustrated operation. In total, 14 nations offered assistance, ranging from money donations up to assistance covering more than one category of disaster assistance. For instance, the United Arab Emirates donated 400.000 USD, Qatar offered 9 tons of food, Belgium offered blankets and tents, and Austria provided power generators (EADRCC, 2015, EADRCC situation report no. 6 (final) Albania snowfall and floods, pp. 2-4).

Hence, these two examples illustrate that each disaster assistance response is different in regard to the type of assistance and the involved parties, depending on the nature and the extent of the disaster. Also, the level of humanitarian involvement of NATO can differ greatly. Besides, it is important to stress the importance of the involvement of IOs in disaster assistance operations, as the EADRCC also coordinates their responses. For instance, the Canadian Red Cross and the Netherlands Red Cross were involved in the international disaster assistance in Albania.

To summarize, NATO's successful history of disaster relief operations goes back a long way, which means that it is an experienced actor in disaster assistance. The organization's dimension of disaster assistance has evolved over the years, causing it to be capable of dealing with crises of different kinds, ranging from relatively large-scaled ones with a low level of humanitarian engagement to greatly destructive ones that require a high level of humanitarian assistance.

Chapter 4 - NATO's organizational structure

NATO disaster assistance operations cannot be conducted properly without an effective cooperation and functioning of both the civilian and military structure. NATO's headquarters is located in Brussels, Belgium and correspondingly serves as the physical heart of the organization where all political decisions are taken and administrative tasks are performed. It is the place where the North Atlantic Council (NAC) seats as the highest authority of the Alliance, embodying the decisions of the Allied nations, as laid down in Article 9 of the North Atlantic Treaty: "The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty" (NATO, 1949, "The North Atlantic Treaty", para. 9). Meetings of the NAC can be at different levels, such as meetings between heads of states or at ministerial level, but it has a permanent structure, composed of ambassadors or permanent representatives from all member nations and all decisions are taken by consensus. Moreover, national delegates have a supporting function by representing their countries on different NATO committees, which are a vital part of the decision-making process within the Alliance.

The Military Committee (MC), which is the highest military authority, is also seated at the NATO headquarters. Under the political authority of the NAC, the MC has the responsibility to provide it with military recommendations and advice, to execute the decisions of the Council at the military level, and to lead the military commands of NATO. It is composed by the member nations' Chiefs of Staff and also functions on a continuous basis with permanent Military Representatives appointed by each nation. Both of these bodies, and in fact all NATO bodies, decide by consensus. For a detailed description of NATO's military structure please refer to appendix 3.

§4.1 Civilian structure

As NATO nowadays deals with a wide range of issues there is an extensive structure of committees. One of the committees, specifically important for this dissertation, is the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC). The SCEPC is made up of civil experts and therefore advises on NATO missions and operations that require support for national authorities following civil emergencies and the use of civil resources during NATO military operations. Evidently, the SCEPC is also the main advisory body concerning disaster assistance operations as it is concerned with civilian protection and the use of civil resources.

Besides the NATO Committees, the International Staff (IS) is also an important component dedicated to support the NAC's decision-making process, as it aims to foster a harmonious decision-making process by conducting work prior to and following decisions by the NATO committees. Just as there are various committees designed for different topics, the IS is divided into different divisions. Specifically important for NATO disaster assistance is the Operations division, which duty is to ensure NATO's operational capability in crisis management and peacekeeping operations, just as in civil emergency planning and training. The Operations division has several tasks that are important to NATO disaster assistance. First, it provides the "development of the arrangements for the use of civil resources in support of Alliance defence and for the protection of civil populations" (NATO, 2001a, p. 226). Second, the Operations division provides staff support to both the SCEPC and CEP boards. Third, it supervises the EADRCC. Finally, the Operations division comprises the NATO Situation Centre (SITCEN), which serves as a linking mechanism between NATO's civilian and military structure. It does so by gathering as much crisis management information as possible in order to optimize the situational awareness and therefore allow the Alliance to give the best response to a certain crises.

§4.2 Military structure

There are two elements that mark the military peculiarity of NATO. First, it has a permanent and integrated Command Structure, made up of military and civilian elements of all the different nations, responsible to direct the NATO operations in time of peace and war. Second, The NATO Force Structure (NFS) constitutes all the forces or other capabilities provided by the member nations, in line with a certain type of readiness and availability.

Since the integrated military structure comprises elements from all member countries, a high level of cohesion is indispensable for accomplishing the effective functioning. Therefore, solidarity and cohesion are key concepts within the military structure. NATO's military capabilities can be used for Article 5 operations, which are conducted to safeguard the territorial integrity of the member countries, while simultaneously guaranteeing their political independence. NATO's forces nowadays, however, are predominantly used in NA5CRO, covering a wide range of missions, including disaster assistance operations.

Over the years, both NATO's Military Command and Force Structure have undergone transformations along with changes in NATO's defense posture, mainly through the assumptions of new tasks and activities. While preserving the importance of the

traditional role of the Alliance, NATO's crisis management capabilities have been enhanced through reforms in military structure. Interestingly, Young (1997) remarks that NATO's military transformation to rapidly formed task forces designed for specific short-term emergencies was a huge change, given the fact that up until then, NATO's strength was the robust and static military structure, designed to conduct lengthy and broad territorial defense missions. Accordingly, he compares NATO's military transformation with "organizing and training a professional football team among players accustomed to playing infrequently and with little practice as a team" (p. 30). As a consequence of the transformation of the NFS, which among others included a reduction in the number of forces, there has been an increase in effectiveness and cohesion. Additionally, the present NATO military forces are characterized by their flexibility and multinationality.

In other words, NATO has maintained its conventional role of ensuring the concept of collective defense, while anticipating to the new security environment through the assumption of new roles and tasks. Garnett (2003), Chief of Staff of SHAPE in 2003, explains NATO's transformation as follows: "There was a clear need to transform, not just in terms of military capability and responsiveness, but also in terms of political decision-making in order to deploy forces" ("NATO Response Force", p. 20).

There are two elements of the military structure that should be clarified for the purpose of this dissertation: the concept of Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) and the NATO Response Force (NRF). Both were deployed during the Pakistan relief operation, which is used for this dissertation's case study and therefore serve as a possible measure of the of the Alliance's effectiveness. The concepts will be briefly discussed in the sections below.

The Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept

When analyzing the NATO publications, it could be concluded that the CJTF is in fact a concept that, anticipating the probability of NATO to work in crisis management operations with Allies, partners, or just concerned nations, was conceived to allow the coordinated integration of all in a common effort. The concept, therefore, aims to bring different origins and capabilities together: "Through the permanent establishment of deployable multinational joint task forces, NATO hopes to develop a unique hybrid capability within its force structure that combines the best characteristics of both Alliance and coalition forces" (Jones, 1999, "NATO's combined joint task force concept –

a viable tiger or a paper dragon?”, p. 14). It represents all the concepts of NATO’s transformed military capabilities: effectiveness, cohesion, flexibility, and multinationality. Literally, CJTF means the participation of military forces of two or more nations during NATO missions.

The overall process of the creation was a lengthy one: the idea of a combined joint task force was first coined in 1993 by the US, whereupon NATO endorsed the concept in 1994. Then, the concept was completed in 1996 and finally fully implemented in 1997. The concept was designed to meet the requirements of the new 1991 Strategic Concept and therefore anticipates to the new security environment in which threats have become more diverse and unpredictable. As a result, it is crucial for NATO to have flexible forces at its disposal that can be rapidly deployed in case of a crisis. NATO (2001a) describes the CJTF as “easily deployable, multinational, multiservice and military formations tailored to specific kinds of military tasks” (p. 254). Specific types of military tasks include humanitarian relief, peacekeeping, and peace enforcement.

The CJTF has several important features. First of all, the concept would become the cornerstone of NATO’s new force structure because deploying CJTFs will become the primary modus operandi of standing Alliance in peacetime (Young, 1997, p. 30). Second, it gives the force structure the flexibility to provide an effective response in NATO beyond the NATO area. Admiral Gehman (1999), former Supreme Allied Commander, observes that “the new security environment increases the likelihood that NATO military forces will be required to conduct operations around the periphery of NATO’s defended territory” (“Transforming NATO’s defense capabilities for the 21st century”, para. 16). Third, it allows the inclusion of PfP partner countries in NATO crisis response operations. When this is the case, non-NATO partner countries can augment NATO nucleus staff while agreeing to operate in compliance with NATO arrangements and procedures. CJTF, therefore, is an important factor for increased cooperation between NATO member countries and PfP partner countries. Finally, the CJTF has a wide range of responsibilities including intelligence, the command and control of forces, and liaison with relevant actors. Depending on the operational environment, however, logistics might also be the responsibility of the CJTF, although commonly this is a national primary responsibility. Jones (1999) observes that, “in out-of-area missions, NATO’s present luxury of interior lines, fixed bases, established infrastructure and host nation support will be potentially replaced by long lines of communications, dilapidated infrastructure, and meagre host nation support, especially in areas hit by humanitarian disaster” (pp. 18-19). As a consequence, CJTF needs to adopt logistics-related tasks in some cases.

The NATO Response Force

A vital element of the transformation of the NATO Force Structure was the introduction of the NATO Response Force (NRF). Unlike the CJTF, the NRF is not a concept but a force designed to operate in high intensity conflicts, also occurring outside the NATO area, and is especially vital in disaster relief operations, as the forces are characterized by their high state of readiness and flexibility. It is for this reason that the NRF has been first used during disaster relief efforts both following Hurricane Katrina in the US and the earthquake in Pakistan. The NRF is not to mistake with the CJTF concept; whereas the CJTF is more an attitude or concept, the NRF is an actual force. Moreover, the CJTF does not have self-sustaining ability and relies on parent headquarters, the NRF is a trained force, ready to be employed, and has the capability to be self-sustaining up to 30 days. After a certain period of time, under full availability for operations, the NRF is replaced by another package.

The first prototype of the force was introduced in 2003, approximately one year after the MC endorsed the NRF concept at the Prague Summit. "For the first time in its history, NATO would be able to field an integrated joint and combined force under a single commander; a force trained and certified together and, if necessary, ready to go into combat together" (Garnett, 2003, "NATO Response Force", p. 21). In fact, the idea for the creation of a NATO Response Force came from the Americans, who were concerned with the fact that NATO was not adequately prepared to respond to the new challenges, especially after 9/11. However, the Americans and the EU Allies had different interests in the creation of the NRF. Where the Americans perceived the NRF as a "good vehicle for showing off US leadership" (Krugler, 2007, p. 6), the Europeans were more concerned with enhancing NATO's relevance and the possibility of access to the US's expertise. The approval for the creation of the NRF is rather unique in the sense that among the three major European powers France, usually opposing US leadership, was in favor of the proposal. Bialos and Koehl (2005) wrote a rather critical paper on the role of the NRF with regard to the US-EU relations in particular. Interestingly, they state that the creation of the NRF was a means to revitalize the relationship between the European allies and the US, which has been characterized by tensions ever since the end of the Cold War. These tensions have been mainly based on geopolitical, technology transfer, and economic matters. The relations between the US and the EU have been characterized by conflicting views vis-à-vis security matters, aggravated by the conviction of the European allies that the US is unwilling to share technology (Bialos and Koehl, 2005, p.4). Krugler even argues that, "to an important degree, the NRF's future

will depend upon U.S. willingness to expedite the technology transfer process for the Europeans” (2007, p. 14). Hence, the NRF was perceived as an opportunity to bridge the gap between the US and the EU and create a common ground. Still, the NRF currently is mainly a European force, although the US has showed an increased involvement in the past few years, for example in the development of the VJTF concept. Moreover, the NRF is an important linkage between NATO and the European Union’s Rapid Reaction Forces.

The NRF it is a very high readiness force, tailored for different types of missions. The NRF package currently consists “of some 20,000 troops, supporting a brigade-sized land element, a combined naval task force, and an air element capable of undertaking some 200 combat missions each day” (Garnett, 2003, “NATO Response Force”, p.21). The first and second force package solely involved NATO nations, NRF three and four included invited countries and integrated the use of the NRF force for disaster relief operations, and finally NRF five and six also included the partner nations. The NRF has the capability of being rapidly deployed under a wide variety of circumstances. Therefore, the variety of tasks consists of immediate collective defense operations, crisis management and peace support missions, and disaster assistance efforts and the protection of infrastructure. However, the NRF is mainly designed for the latter types of missions, as the force is tailored for the 21st century approach, not the traditional approach of fixed collective defense. Its forces comprise both forces from NATO’s military structure and forces from other nations. An important element of the NRF is the Deployed Joint Task Force (DJTF), which contributes to the process of a rapid response by its expected capacity to deploy within five days.

The overall command of the NRF lays with SACEUR, the commander of the Allied Command Operations (ACO), who carries the principle responsibility of the standards and procedures, and the exercises and trainings of the force. The role of the SACT, the commander of the Allied Command Transformation (ACT), one the other hand, is to develop the NRF doctrine and improve the capabilities for NRF’s continuous adaptation to changes in the security environment. Garnett (2003) remarks that “ACT will 'supply' ACO, as its 'customer', with all aspects of military transformation, with the necessary development of doctrine, policy, training and education, manpower, logistics, and material capabilities, resulting in the cultural transformation of the Alliance” (“NATO Response Force”, p. 23). Please consult appendix 3 for a detailed description of the concepts and command structure.

The operational command of the NATO Response Force is assigned to a Joint Force Command (JFC) each year on basis of rotation. Currently, JFC Naples is the lead headquarters. The rotation system determines the constitution and organization of the NRF. The process is as follows. In the first stage, all nations choose which types of force elements they will contribute to the NRF. Second, trainings will be held in the form of joint exercises. Then, the force is operational for one year and therefore ready to be deployed. A high level of flexibility and multinationality, just as training and exercises, between all components of the NRF, such as headquarters and forces, is crucial for the required level of interoperability. Up to 2012, the rotation period amounted six months instead of one year, and Bialos and Koehl (2005), raised questions regarding this six-month rotation system. First, they stated that it creates a high degree of turbulence. Second, they argued that it would be hard to reach unity, as “the NRF will barely have developed cohesion and a sense of unit identity before it must disband and the process must begin anew” (p. 14). Last, the authors claimed that the six-month rotation system influences the member nations in their contributions to the NRF. Many countries chose the easy way by sending equipment and material such as aircrafts, whereas only few countries contributed ground forces, as this is the hardest unit to reach interoperability due to differences in for example language and equipment. According to Krugler (2007), “the lack of ground forces was a problem that continued affecting follow-on NRFs during 2003–2006” (p. 8). Although these critiques are based on the six-month rotation system, future operations will have to show whether the extension to one year will address these challenges.

Besides these factors that hinder effective interoperability, the issue of funding is another matter that recurs when reading on the NRF. The NRF is not funded through NATO’s common account, coming down to the fact that participating countries have to bear the costs of their own contributions. This suggests that countries that make a large contribution of force elements to NRF are automatically faced with a high financial burden, which makes participation more difficult for nations with a limited defense budget.

The most recent development, concerning the NRF has been the creation of a Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF) in 2014. It has been implemented as a part of the NRF’s new structure, spurred by the rise of recent security challenges such as the Russian aggression against neighboring Ukraine and the growing threat posed by ISIL. The boosting factor of this force is that it can already be deployed when there are warning signs for the outbreak of a potential crisis. Thus, this force can be sent to a

potential crisis area to prevent escalation. Just as the NRF, the VJTF comprises components of national armies and also has the capability to rapidly deploy within several days.

In short, NATO has an excellent civilian and military structure for disaster assistance, designed for missions that need a high level of readiness and flexibility. Specifically important is NATO's military transformation, in which the CJTF concept and the NRF are vital components.

Chapter 5 - Case Study: Pakistan earthquake relief operation

§5.1 The Earthquake

On 8 October 2005 a powerful earthquake struck the Indian-Pakistani border, causing damage in India, Pakistan and Afghanistan. The earthquake caused a particularly high level of destruction to the Kashmir region (see Figure 1). The damage in the Pakistan-controlled Kashmir area was overwhelming. In total, the earthquake caused 80.000 casualties and left 70.000 wounded and 2.5 million homeless. Numerous people were forced to sleep outdoors under harsh conditions. Moreover, an estimated number of 2.3 million people barely had access to basic needs, or not at all. What made the situation particularly acute was the fact that the region where the earthquake struck hardest was very mountainous, therefore the affected population was spread out over remote areas that were extremely hard to reach, aggravated by the degradation and destruction of the infrastructure. Besides, winter was coming and the worsening weather conditions were another cause for concern. Thus, the destruction of the earthquake was widespread as such that it asked for an immediate response.



Figure 1 – Area struck by earthquake
Source: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4321490.stm

Context in which the earthquake occurred

It is important to first discuss the historical background of Pakistan, and in particular the Kashmir region, in order to create the bigger picture that allows us to understand in which political and socio-economic context the crisis occurred. In 1947 Britain prepared to end nearly a century of rule over the Indian subcontinent and its millions of people. Generally, Hindus were concentrated in central and southern India, and Muslims in

Bengal and the northwest. A British commission divided the territory in majority-Muslim Pakistan and majority-Hindu India. In the chaos that followed partition, 15 million people fled across the new borders and thousands died in riots. One of the border regions that saw the worst of it is the Kashmir region. In the years following, the region has been subject to a struggle for territory between India and Pakistan, leading to three wars in total. In addition, what makes the Kashmir conflict particularly dangerous is the fact that militant groups are largely present in the areas and that both countries, apart from having strong armies, also have successfully tested and presumably deployed nuclear weapons. For more detailed information on the historical context of Pakistan and the Kashmir region, please refer to appendix 4.

At the time when the earthquake hit the region, it is important to keep several factors in mind that required a careful approach of the relief workers. First of all, about two years before the earthquake hit, India and Pakistan were relatively on peaceful terms, as they agreed on a ceasefire along the Line Of Control (LOC), which divides the region into the Pakistan-controlled part and the India-controlled part. Nonetheless, tensions in the area have always continued to simmer. Importantly, “the Line of Control (LOC) ran right through the Bagh district, which was the center of the emergency aid operation”. The relief personnel, therefore, had to be careful not to cross to the wrong side of the line. Moreover, “the NATO operation in Pakistan was a sensitive issue due to the involvement of both the Alliance and Pakistan in the war in neighboring Afghanistan” (NIMH, 2011, p. 1). Pakistan’s role in the “War on Terror”, however, is a controversial one given the fact that it has also provided safe haven to both radical Islamist groups and the Afghan Taliban. Respectively, extremist groups were largely present in several parts of the country, which had to be taken into account by the foreign military and humanitarian personnel. Further, foreign military personnel were perceived negatively among the Pakistani population, exacerbated by the presence of strong anti-American (and thus anti-Western) sentiments. Last, the affected region was one characterized by widespread poverty, political instability, corruption, and most of the population in rural areas was living under very poor conditions.

§5.2 The NATO Response

NATO can be involved in a disaster relief operation through the EADRCC by just coordinating the supply of relief efforts, which is usually the case. However, in some cases, NATO can also decide to deploy military assets from the command and force structures. In the case of Pakistan, both options were used.

First relief efforts were conducted by the national and international humanitarian organizations. The Pakistani military also provided an immediate response by coordinating the relief efforts and deploying troops. Notwithstanding these first efforts, the Pakistani authorities and humanitarian organizations were incapable of coping with the immense number of traumatized people. Moreover, the rugged terrain, extreme weather conditions, and the destroyed infrastructure greatly obstructed their attempts to provide relief efforts. Accordingly, the EADRCC received an urgent request for assistance from the Pakistani authorities on 10 October, two days following the earthquake. Subsequent to the request for assistance the Alliance agreed to provide a disaster response, which comprised two phases. It was clear from the start that NATO's involvement in the disaster response would be of great humanitarian nature.

Timeline NATO Pakistan Earthquake Relief Operation	
8 October	Earthquake hit Pakistan
10 October	Request for assistance by Pakistani authorities
11 October	NAC approves airlift
21 October	Approval deployment ground forces
24 October	Deployment DJTF HQ Deployment air component
29 October	Deployment land component
6 November	First NATO helicopters
9 November	NATO Hospital (NMH) starts activities
10 November	First engineering support
1 February	End of the mission

Figure 2 – Timeline

STAGE 1: NATO'S AIR BRIDGES

One day after the request was received, the NAC decided that NATO's role would be coordinating the transportation of the aid supplies that were offered by EAPC countries, which would be the responsibility of the EADRCC. Hence, the first phase of NATO's involvement was an airlift operation, consisting of two air bridges that allowed the delivery of more than 2500 tons of aid supplies in total. The first air bridge was launched from Germany on 13 October, and served to deliver donated relief supplies from NATO and partner countries, and the second one was opened from Turkey, and

delivered aid supplies from UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Donations included for example tents, blankets and mattresses, water purification tablets, medical equipment and supplies, and medical and relief personnel.

STAGE 2: DEPLOYMENT OF MILITARY ASSETS ON THE GROUND

Following an additional request from the Pakistani authorities, NATO initiated a second stage of the disaster relief operation, in which specialist units from the NRF were deployed on the ground. Importantly, this disaster relief operation led by the Alliance was NATO's first major relief operation outside the Euro-Atlantic territory and the NRF's first major deployment. Although the NRF was first deployed in response to Hurricane Katrina, the Pakistan earthquake operation was the NRF's first major involvement in a humanitarian mission.

Decision-making process

Interestingly, the decision-making process of the NRF's deployment became clear during a personal interview with Portuguese Colonel [Col] Lemos Pires (April 7, 2015) from the Joint Command Lisbon (JCL), whose responsibility was to help the supervision of the NATO rescue operation. He clarified that given the dimensions of the earthquake the sense of possible utility of the Joint Headquarters and of the NRF (under its supervision) was shared by all, and only a few contacts led to the commander's determination to start the initial planning for a possible operation. Importantly, at the time of the Pakistan earthquake, there were three Joint Commands: Joint Force Command (JFC) Brunssum, JFC Naples, and Joint Command Lisbon. It was Joint Command Lisbon that would command NRF five and six from the period of July 2005 until June 2006, meaning that Lisbon's Operational Commander was in charge of the NRF's deployment in Pakistan.

Operation objectives

Upon deployment the NRF had to keep in mind the strategic mission, the operational mission, and the anticipated end state. The strategic mission was, as defined by SHAPE, to help the victims of the earthquake in accordance with the necessities requested by Pakistan. The JC Lisbon headquarters was responsible for directing the operation, which was to maintain an air bridge, repair the roads, establish air transport within Pakistan (helicopters), and guarantee medical and engineering support. Important to note is that humanitarian assistance was not part of the operational mission. The end state represents the desired outcome of the mission, which was to stabilize and protect the population that survived in the affected area in order to help them prepare for the

coming winter. Accordingly, “each soldier should know why he is there; he must always know what the end state is. Everything NATO did was in accordance with the end state” (Col Lemos Pires, April 7, 2015).

Deployment

Accordingly, the second phase of the NATO deployment consisted of elements drawn from JCL and from the NRF units, with extended aviation support. JCL deployed a command component to Pakistan, belonging to the Headquarters and maintained ready to be used in any place: the Deployed Joint Task Force Headquarters (DJTF HQ). The NRF participation was mostly at the level of medical and engineering units. The overall operation took on the name “NATO Disaster Relief Team” (NDRT).

The first NRF element on the ground was the deployed headquarters (DJTF HQ). Col Lemos Pires explained the DJTF concept as a “taking a slice of the fixed headquarters and applying it outside” (Col Lemos Pires, April 7, 2015). Ultimately, having a headquarters in the affected area allows the smoother coordination of the relief efforts. The DJTF HQ was sent on 24 October and was located in Arga, which is about 20 kilometers southwest of Bagh. The Pakistani authorities decided that the Bagh region would be the zone of relief efforts for NATO’s deployed forces. In the case of Pakistan, only land and air components were deployed– the maritime component was not used.

Second, the most crucial NRF assets were without a doubt the specialist units for medical and engineering support, given the alarming public health risk and the heavily damaged infrastructures. “The local health infrastructure was badly damaged by the earthquake: 796 health facilities were destroyed and a further 119 were rendered unsafe” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 115). Consequently, the enormous amount of earthquake victims that were in desperate need of medical support was unable to receive the medical assistance they so urgently needed. NATO’s main contribution to health care relief in the Bagh district consisted of the Dutch Military Emergency Hospital (MNH), which was deployed one month following the earthquake. The role of the Netherlands was an important one, as “it provided the structure within which the international field hospital could be set up, including its full crew and a platoon-sized detachment of force protection” (NIMH, 2010, p. 2). In total there were two field hospitals, which mainly performed basic healthcare tasks because when they finally became operational, the need for acute medical aid was no longer needed. In addition, the Dutch medical unit came up with the idea of introducing mobile medical units, which

proved to be very valuable because it enabled the provision of medical assistance and the delivery of aid supplies to remote areas. Moreover, the mobile units played an essential role in providing vaccinations to the inhabitants of the affected areas. Two mobile units were deployed every day, and “each team consisted of a doctor, two medics, two nurses, two interpreters and force protection and they had three off-road vehicles at their disposal” (NIMH, 2010, p. 3). However, sometimes the units would also use horses and mules to move around. Later, the MNH also had an airmobile team at its disposal after Luxembourg offered a trauma helicopter. In total, NATO’s medical teams performed 8.000 consults, 2.300 vaccinations, and 9.700 medical treatments (Col Lemos Pires, April 7, 2015).

The engineering team was the second specialized unit and was led by the Spanish. The tasks of the engineers can roughly be divided into three groups: the construction of buildings, restoring the road infrastructure, and performing water treatments. The engineers were responsible for the construction of medical centers, as most of the existing local health centers had been destroyed, as mentioned previously. In addition, a total of 60 shelters were built, which provided shelter to the numerous people who had become homeless following the earthquake. Interestingly, NATO was mainly prepared to build shelters upon arrival to the affected area, which it also did, but on the first day of the operation President Musharraf requested the construction of schools for a very specific reason. As Col Lemos Pires stated (April 7, 2015), the first NGOs to arrive to the scene were not the international humanitarian organizations such as the Red Cross, but instead the Taliban’s NGOs were the first ones to provide humanitarian aid. Considering that the majority of the victims were orphans, these children were in great danger of being taken advantage of, especially by terrorist networks. Upon their arrival in affected area, they started building Islamic religious schools (Madrasa’s) immediately. Consequently, in order to avoid children from being recruited to the Taliban’s madrasa’s, the government of Pakistan asked NATO to build schools – especially girls’ schools – because girls were more vulnerable. Restoring road infrastructure was another important duty assigned to the engineers. Their tasks mainly consisted of repairing the roads and the walls alongside the roads and clearing the roads from snow, ice and rubble. The earthquake had left most of the roads in the area impassable. Because of these bad conditions of the roads it took really long for NATO troops to reach their destinations, yet the factual distances were not really far. Besides, it sometimes occurred that troops were denied access to certain routes. It is for this reasons that repairing and clearing the roads was an essential activity in order to smoothen the movement of NATO troops and supplies. Water treatments were a third important field

of activity for the engineers, as the shortage of (clean) drinking water became a serious public health concern, just as the poor sanitation conditions. The Lithuanians had the leading role in this area, as they sent a water purification team through NATO. Besides distributing drinking water, the engineers “updated a permanent spring water distribution and storage system to serve up to 8,400 persons a day” (NATO, 2010c, “Pakistan earthquake relief operation”, para. 3).

Last, besides the initial airlift operation in the first phase, NATO extended air support through maintaining the air bridge for the continuation of the deliverance of relief supplies. Moreover, the deployment of helicopters allowed aid workers to reach remote areas and to move displaced and injured people. In order to sustain this extent of aviation operations, additional airbases were established throughout the affected area. The establishment of a fuel farm by the French played a crucial role herein, as it enabled the refueling for military and civilian helicopters. Thus, the French fuel farm in Abbottabad, “acted as a ‘force multiplier’, extending the range of aviation operations significantly and permitting longer and more frequent sorties to the more remote areas” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 114-115).

Altogether NATO deployed roughly 12.000 soldiers from 17 different NATO countries through the NRF. In addition to the NATO forces, military forces from the US and Australia also contributed military troops. The whole NATO disaster relief operation in Pakistan, which lasted for a period of about three months, was conducted in close cooperation with the Pakistani authorities and the UN.

§5.3 The UN cluster approach

A unique aspect about this disaster response in specific is the incorporation of the new UN cluster approach. This new approach was commissioned in August 2005, which means that only two months after its approval it was first used during the international disaster response in Pakistan. In addition, there was no international approval for this approach yet, so it was basically a pilot experiment. The objective of the UN cluster approach was, “to improve accountability, predictability, and reliability by identifying organizational leaders for areas in which there was an identified gap in humanitarian response” (House of Commons: International Development Committee, 2006, p. 189). Each organization would have a different “mission” according to their cluster. Hence, NATO forces had to operate according to this new approach to humanitarian response, as envisioned by the UN. Eventually, nine clusters were created, divided according to

three main areas (see figure 3): relief and assistance, service provision, and crosscutting concerns. Within the area of relief and assistance there were the clusters of food and nutrition, water and sanitation, health, and emergency shelter. Service provision included the clusters logistics and IT and telecommunications. Crosscutting concerns encompassed and early recovery and reconstruction, camp management, and protection. Later, the cluster education was added.



Figure 3 – The UN Cluster Approach

ActionAid International (2007) has evaluated the functioning of the UN cluster approach. Relevant to mention is that this evaluation is from a NGO perspective. Although the report acknowledges that the UN cluster approach has great potential, it claims that a lot of problems need to be resolved before it can fully realize its objective of filling up the gap in international humanitarian response. First, there was no clear understanding of what the UN cluster approach exactly was among all involved actors. When the approach was used in Pakistan, it was not fully developed yet. “As a result, those implementing the approach did not have Terms of Reference, appropriate support or training” (p. 4). Second, the UN clearly failed to include local organizations, groups, and other structures, by not giving them the opportunity to contribute to the decision-making processes. To illustrate, the report (2007) points out that local organizations described the cluster meetings as “meetings of an elite group of foreigners” (p. 4). A major factor herein was that the meetings were solely held in English, without the presence of translators. Third, some clusters got distracted by all the procedures, numerous meetings, compartmentalization, and consequently lost sight of the objective. As a result, there were strong differences in performance per cluster. For instance,

“those oriented towards ground-level work, such as logistics, food and shelter, were more successful” (ActionAid International, 2007, p. 4). Last, there proved to be points of improvement in the areas of coordination, monitoring, and evaluation.

It seems, however, that NATO experienced fewer difficulties with the cluster approach than for example the NGOs and IOs. An explanation could be that the NATO forces worked closely together with both the UN and Pakistani government. International NGOs, however, already had general coordination problems with the Pakistani authorities, and perhaps the UN cluster approach only exposed these tensions even more because of the exclusion of local structures.

§5.4 An evaluation

It cannot be denied that NATO’s role was a very important one, and that it made a substantial positive difference to the overall response. However, the involvement of the Alliance was also a topic of controversy, questioning why military assets should be used in disaster operations, and what exactly NATO’s added value is. In this paragraph NATO’s response will be evaluated by identifying which factors hampered the disaster response (A), but also by discussing the successes of the operation and NATO’s added value in specific (B). What makes this a particularly interesting case study is that it only has happened a few times that NATO has deployed military capabilities during a humanitarian operation, but never as high profile as during the Pakistan earthquake response.

A) Obstructing factors

When closely assessing the Pakistan disaster response, several factors can be identified that hampered the overall disaster response. In this section these hampering factors will be discussed by dividing them into three areas from which the problem originated: NATO, Pakistan, and civil-military coordination. In other words, each of these three areas represents the “source” of the problem.

Obstructing factors originating from within NATO

Throughout the disaster response several problems can be identified that arose from within NATO’s structure. Important to note, however, is that many aspects about this specific disaster response were new for NATO as well, such as the fact that it the NRF’s first major deployment. Therefore, the identified problems should rather be seen as points of interest that give way to improvement.

Lack of a NATO policy for complex humanitarian operations

In 2005, NATO had not yet developed a doctrine specifically for humanitarian missions like these. It was only in 2008 that a policy document was adopted for this matter. This lack of an encompassing NATO policy therefore meant that the deployed forces had little guidance from the strategic level. As Col Lemos Pires puts it: “They just said: do what the Pakistani’s ask you” (7 April, 2015). It goes without saying that his open guidance led to confusion and misunderstandings.

The complexity of the situation furthermore caused a lot of doubt within the NAC whether to get involved in the operation or not. Not all NATO members agreed with a disaster response mission of such clear humanitarian nature outside of the traditional area (Wiharta et al., 2008, pp. 112-113). This unease was reinforced by the fact that Pakistan in specific was a sensitive matter, as NATO’s involvement could be associated with the Alliance’s participation in the “War on Terror” and with the understanding that NATO wanted to remain in the area, even after the disaster response would be concluded. Eventually, after a rather time-consuming process, the NAC approved the mission, but in order to invalidate any suspicions about NATO’s involvement, the NAC set out several principles for the mission (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 113).

NATO’s mission would:

- Only last for the prefixed period of three months;
- Solely include emergency relief and recovery efforts and not involve any reconstruction activities;
- Be executed in accordance with the principles as set out by the Pakistani authorities;
- Not serve as a model for future missions alike.

The available NRF Package

During the Cold War, NATO’s structure was basically designed to dissuade or to defend the Allied territory against a massive full-scale invasion. After the fall of the Berlin Wall and particularly after the September 11 Attacks reality came to check and the concept was developed, making forces designed to be ready and responsive (first-in first-out concept). The NATO Response Forces are primarily designed to fight, not to conduct humanitarian assistance activities, although it could be part of its mission. Thus, the NRF force package that NATO had prepared at the time was not fully prepared for complex humanitarian emergencies. This focus on combat is striking however, given the fact that natural disasters are much more likely to happen than for example high-intensity conflicts. As the assets that the NRF had available were not quite what they needed,

additional forces needed to be generated in order to fit the requirements. These additional forces needed to be prepared as well, which was a demanding process. Col Lemos Pires (7 April, 2015) summarizes the situation as follows: “We had to generate additional forces. The NRF has a package prepared for war, so in a situation like this, capability needs to be added on top of the package. What we needed for an earthquake like this, was not yet in the package, so additional forces needed to be generated”.

In addition, the Dutch Military Emergency Hospital (MNH) “had to take the coordination of the build-up and the assistance into its own hands” because the NATO Disaster Response Team (NDRT) took too long to start up (NIMH, 2010, p. 3). Because of these delays, the MNH only performed basic medical treatments instead of first aid, because there was no longer a need for direct emergency aid by the time the hospital had been set up. Also, foreign colleagues had to be introduced to Dutch working habits and procedures.

Moreover, it occurred that when Pakistani authorities assigned tasks to NATO response forces, they were unable to carry out these tasks adequately, even though it did fall within their field of expertise and capabilities.

Absence of a lead nation

During the personal interview, Col Lemos Pires pointed out that having a lead nation during the operation would have been desirable. The fact is that in general, the NATO deployment comprises separate units from different nations, and that all these forces show their national flag on their uniforms. Likewise, some sort of competition arises between the different nations, as each nation wants to show that they are the best and tend to plan things for themselves. However, in a humanitarian mission like this, it can cause complications. Therefore, Col Lemos Pires claimed that a change in mentality was necessary: no transfer of authority (TOA) before Joint Operation Area (JOA). In other words, cohesion among the different national forces had to be established before a transfer of authority could take place. After all, the primary objective of the mission was to help the earthquake victims and assist the Pakistani authorities in preparing for winter. So the NATO forces had to completely set aside their “national pride” in order to establish a strong sense of cohesion among the troops.

Political limitations (decision-making processes)

In missions like these, time is the enemy and therefore speed of movement is crucial. Yet, politicians take time to make decisions, but as soon as the decision is agreed upon they want action fast. As discussed before, NATO could not do anything while the NAC

was deciding on whether to deploy forces on Pakistani soil. Eventually, it took almost two weeks before the NAC approved the deployment of the NATO response forces, and three weeks before the forces arrived to the affected area (see figure 2). Thus, the period in between the approval and the deployment still lasted one week. Especially in a situation in which speed of movement is crucial, the fact that the forces were only deployed three weeks following the request proves that much time was lost in the decision-making process. In spite of this, the air bridge was established really quickly, only three days after the earthquake and one day after the request for assistance.

Further, the exchange of diplomatic letters also caused some delays. The exchange of diplomatic letters is a mandatory custom when forces are deployed on foreign soil. For instance, it had to be decided whether NATO forces would be allowed to carry arms. It was eventually decided that it would not be allowed, which in turn caused much opposition among members, some even claiming that they would refuse to go if they would not be allowed to carry arms.

Besides delaying factors from within, NATO also had to deal with political limitations from the outside, upon which they had no influence. For instance, Iran did not allow NATO forces to fly over. As a consequence, NATO's air transport had to fly around Iran, which took more time, required more planning, and cost more fuel.

Thin line between relief and rehabilitation work

From the start, the clear objective of the NATO mission was that the forces would solely help the survivors of the earthquake and to help preventing a second death wave. It was stressed that NATO would not participate in any type of development work. However, this was easier said than done. Experiences have shown that NATO soldiers were easily drawn into rehabilitation or development work not related to the earthquake, caused by for example the poor position of women and children, mainly because of their excitement in the heat of the moment, but also because they had the capacity to do so. The line between relief and rehabilitation work, therefore, has shown to be really thin.

NATO standards vs. local standards

All relief efforts by NATO happened according to EU standards. Up to today, there are no NATO standards yet, because its involvement in humanitarian aid is still subject to discussion within the Alliance. Wiharta et al. (2008) found that the "standard of rehabilitation work carried out by NATO seems to have been higher than the usual minimum standards for humanitarian aid" (p. 117). This became particularly evident in the area of medical assistance: the health care standards during the response were

better than before the earthquake even happened. As a result, the Kashmiris became used to these conditions, and it would occur earthquake victims with minor injuries would refuse to go to medical centers with lower standards. Moreover, Kashmiris used the NATO medical centers also for minor injuries that were not earthquake-related. These high standards of medical care made the handover to civilian actors upon the withdrawal of the NATO troops more difficult.

Supply-driven approach

Although many assets were ones that the Pakistani authorities specifically requested, there were also military assets sent to the affected areas that did not quite fit the need. These unsolicited offers made the coordination of military assets somewhat more difficult, especially in the first phase of the operation.

Obstructing factors originating from within Pakistan

NATO's deployment was hampered by several problems that had to do with Pakistan itself, such as its political, cultural, and socio-economic factors.

Disputed area

On top of the disaster, the affected area was a very complicated one. At the time of the earthquake President Musharraf, who was both President and Chief of Army, ruled Pakistan. Although the country did have some democratic aspects, it was still largely subject to an authoritarian regime. The mission was a sensitive issue, mainly because Pakistan was also an US-ally in the war in Afghanistan. The Kashmir region in specific is a troubled one, characterized by three territorial wars with India, the presence of the Taliban and other militant groups, and the fact that both India and Pakistan had their nuclear weapons stored in the region. That is, the NATO forces were deployed in a very complex situation and a very sensitive area, and this had to be kept in mind throughout the whole operation.

Opposition to NATO forces

At the start of the mission, the level of acceptance toward NATO's involvement was extremely low among the Kashmiri population, politicians, officials, and policymakers in Pakistan (Col Lemos Pires, April 7, 2015). Generally there was a very negative perception towards foreign military forces. For instance, Pakistani's did not make a difference between Dutch or Portuguese forces. To them, the NATO forces were all Americans. The role of the Pakistani was considerable in influencing the opinion on

western soldiers among the population. “They were told that we were cannibals, pedophiles, would sell their children, and so on” (Col Lemos Pires, April 7, 2015). Col Lemos Pires shared one of his experiences that perfectly illustrates the Pakistani’s negative attitude toward foreign military forces, resulting from the bad publicity: “The first time we went on the road in Pakistan, all children were running away, because they were afraid of us”. Hence, NATO had a lot of people against them at the beginning of the operation, which undoubtedly hampered their relief efforts. It also meant that NATO had to prove itself in order to win their trust.

Cultural boundaries

Throughout the deployment, NATO forces encountered several cultural barriers that delayed the disaster response. This section will illustrate three situations in which NATO’s activities were hampered because of cultural reasons. First, it took significantly longer than usual to reconstruct the collapsed girl’s schools and clear the area. “Usually it takes 4 days to clear the area, this time it took 24 days” (Col Lemos Pires, 7 April, 2015). The reason for this was as follows: each time the aid workers would find a corpse, they could not touch it until someone would arrive that was capable of carrying out a *ghusl*, that is a Muslim ceremony that needs to be performed before the body can be buried.

Moreover, transporting and constructing the NMH took longer than expected because of the Eid holidays, which is a Muslim celebration linked to the Ramadan and lasts for three days. Because of this three-day-holiday “there were considerable delays and the ground at the camp in Bagh had not yet been leveled” (NIMH, 2010, p. 3). In addition, it also took them some time to establish good connections with the Pakistani military forces.

What is more, Pakistan’s high level of gender inequality led to some problems as well. Female workers often perceived difficulties in providing relief efforts due to Pakistan’s poor position of women. The NMH moreover experienced is that Pakistani females would often refuse to seek medical help when there would be no female doctors. Unfortunately, the hospital did not have any female doctors at its disposal. This is where Portugal stepped in and sent female doctors to the campsite. Of course, this is again a process that took time.

Absence of central authority for managing disasters

Pakistan did not have a central authority to manage disasters. “The only national disaster contingency plans were related to the maintenance of the emergency relief cell

(ERC), a warehouse facility that stockpiled emergency supplies” (Wiharta, 2008, p. 108). Besides, the few arrangements that were in place for natural disasters were solely focused on floods, not earthquakes. There was also an entity for security crises, but was also insignificant for the disaster response.

Unjust initial assessment

The Pakistani authorities took really long to rightly assess the graveness of the situation. The initial assessments did not reflect the reality: they made the situation seem less severe than it was in reality. As a consequence, some of the relief supplies that were sent in the first stage of the disaster response were inappropriate (Centre of Excellence, “Pakistan Earthquake: A Review of the Civil-Military Dimensions of the International Response”2006, p. 6). As a consequence, an inadequate information sharing arose between relief organizations, NATO forces and the Pakistani military, as the situation reports of the Pakistani military were the main source of information for both the humanitarian organizations and the foreign military forces.

Obstructing factors caused by civil-military coordination

Given the strong coordinating role of the Pakistani army, the extensive presence of foreign military forces, and the sheer number of humanitarian organizations, the overall disaster response had a strong civil-military dimension. The involvement of all these different actors and the complex nature of the disaster, of course, gave rise to difficulties.

Reluctance among humanitarian actors

It seems that humanitarian actors were often reluctant to work closely together with foreign military forces, afraid it would influence how other humanitarian workers would perceive them (loss of image), and therefore with the possibility of hampering their future humanitarian activities in other countries. Striking is, that the hesitancy to civil-military coordination mainly came from humanitarian actors and not so much from military actors. In general, the military forces seemed willing to cooperate with humanitarian actors, while humanitarian workers were more reluctant to work with military forces. This is logical, however, as NATO is a rather new actor in this area, and humanitarian actors might feel that they are intruding in “their” field. Humanitarians also often believe that military involvement damages the humanitarian principles. (Metcalf et al., 2012, pp. 5-6).

In addition, humanitarian and military actors did not fully understand each other's limitations and capabilities, due to a lack of civil-military education or training, experience, and/or biases from previous experiences (Center of Excellence, 2006, "Pakistan earthquake: a review of the civil-military dimensions of the international response" p. 3-4). Consequently, it took too much time before a smooth communication was established between the civilian and military actors that were present in the affected area. For instance, when the NATO forces had just arrived, it was not clear to many humanitarian organizations what the capabilities of NATO were, and what their exact involvement was going to be.

Last, besides the hesitant attitude among humanitarian actors to closely cooperate with the foreign military forces, Metcalfe et al. (2002) found that humanitarians were not too eager to coordinate with the Pakistani military either, although after a period of time it was acknowledged that it was necessary for an effective response (p. 17). Nevertheless, the Pakistani army perhaps granted the foreign military forces more freedom than it did to humanitarian organizations given its authoritarian structure.

Lack of common guidelines and structures

Although the Oslo Guidelines are supposed to serve as the major framework during civil-military coordination in complex emergencies, the Center of Excellence (2006) reports that both civil and military actors were not very much aware of the content of the Oslo Guidelines ("Pakistan Earthquake: A Review of the Civil-Military Dimensions of the International Response", p. 4), which basically invalidates the whole purpose of the Guidelines.

The report also finds that there was no standardized data collection and reporting, such as incompatible communication systems between different actors. To illustrate, whereas most actors used email as a means of communication, Pakistan was heavily dependent on communication by fax (p. 7). Also, it was hard to establish a clear, joint understanding of the needs, as groups and organizations were conducting assessments independently from each other. Moreover, there was a lack of coordinated communication between emergency services, worsened by insufficient resources. Therefore, it was hard to form a clear overview of what medical supplies were both required and available because there was no central dispatch.

Last, it took time for military actors and humanitarian actors to establish a good coordination. For instance, the NMH lost some time at the start of their deployment as coordination had to be shaped with NGOs, both local and international.

Insignificant role of OCHA-CMCS

Surprisingly, “the OCHA civil-military coordination section (CMCS) was not a key player in the channeling of assets” (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 112). Its activities had little influence on the overall disaster response, as they just conducted some information gathering and deployed a small number of personnel on the ground. Therefore, the overall significance of the group was very limited, although they claim to be “the focal point in the UN system for humanitarian civil-military coordination” (OCHA, n.d., “Humanitarian civil-military coordination (UN-CMCoord)”, para. 3).

B) What went well?

Although the operation did not run perfectly, the overall disaster response achieved considerable successes, and the operation surely would not have been as successful without NATO’s involvement.

NATO’s added value

Without a doubt, NATO’s contributions have proven to be crucial to the overall success of the disaster response and probably the outcome would have been a lot different without its involvement. NATO’s added value is dependent on several factors.

Perfect timing

Although this is a factor that goes beyond NATO’s power, it is important to mention that the mission would not have been possible if it had occurred recently. The earthquake happened in 2005. That is, before the unrest started in 2006. At that time, the Taliban accepted the presence of NATO, as there was a common understanding between the Taliban and Pakistan that the Western people should be protected. Now, NATO forces would probably not be deployed because it would be too dangerous.

Diplomatic interest

Most likely NATO’s involvement was also of diplomatic interest. Participating in this specific relief operation was a good opportunity for the Alliance to promote itself in a positive way given its security interest in the region, but most of all to reassure its prominent role in crisis management. Although others use it as a criticism, here it is perceived as a positive aspect.

Structure

NATO has an excellent structure for these types of operations, as it has the capacity to coordinate, liaise, and facilitate the availability of assets. NATO works 24/7, all days of the year, and it can deploy its assets at a short notice. It further has the ability to concentrate power. Besides, an important factor is that NATO has the ability to secure themselves, whereas humanitarian workers can encounter risky situations, as they often do not have the capacity to ensure their own security. Another important component of NATO's structure is the reach back concept, meaning that the deployed assets can rely on teams working from the bases in the original countries, such as ACO Belgium and JCL Lisbon. For instance, intelligence staff from the headquarters supported NATO in order to guarantee the security of the NATO response forces. All the preparation work is also done back in the original countries.

Unique capabilities

NATO's involvement simply resulted from necessity. The Pakistani authorities, IOs, and NGOs were overwhelmed by the destruction caused by the disaster. Pakistan was in desperate need of international relief support, and thus requested NATO for disaster assistance. Importantly, Pakistan was solely concerned with receiving the assistance they needed; it was unimportant to them whether the relief support came from NATO or civilian actors. However, military forces can be of great value during disaster relief efforts because of their unique capabilities. Moreover, the question of deploying military assets is one that is carefully considered: they are only deployed when there is no other option left (last resort). Important to mention is, however, that sometimes NATO is really the only option for affected states, because other entities do not possess the assets that are needed.

Change of opinion

A very important achievement for NATO was, that, considering the strong opposition at the start of the operation, it managed to establish a positive image in the course of time. According to Col Lemos Pires (7 April, 2015), when the end of the operation was near, many asked the NATO forces to stay in the area, such as Pakistani politicians and the Kashmiris. This perfectly demonstrates the importance of NATO's involvement. The change of opinion has been a very valuable development, both for NATO and Pakistan, for their future relations.

Cooperation

Throughout the operation, NATO showed its great ability to cooperate with the different actors involved and spread a sense of cohesion. To illustrate, during the interview, Col Lemos Pires clarified that when he spoke about “we” he did not refer just to NATO, but to all the entities that were there to help (7 April, 2015). Although NATO’s role was vital, it was not a leading one: it provided the military assets that were needed, coordinated the relief supplies, maintained the communication with the different actors involved, and most importantly helped out wherever they were needed. The cooperation between the NATO military forces and the Pakistani army went particularly well, which was crucial because in situations like these, unlike normal military situations, the interaction with the local authorities is vital. Accordingly, Col Lemos Pires repeatedly emphasized that the Pakistanis were of great help throughout the operation (7 April, 2015).

The numbers

Above all, NATO’s added value becomes clear when looking at the numbers of the operation:

- 3.100 tons of aid delivered in total through the air bridges and helicopters:
 - Air bridges:
 - 160 flights in total
 - 18.000 tents
 - 500.000 mattresses and sleeping bags
 - 17.000 stoves
 - Medical supplies and food
 - Helicopters
 - 792 flights in total
 - Replenished with 1736 m³
 - Transportation of 6321 displaced, sick, and injured people
- 59 kilometers of roads have been repaired
- 4 kilometers of roads have been cleared from snow, ice, and rubble
- 41.500m³ rubble has been removed
- 30.000 litres of fresh water supplies per day
- 220 trucks full of rubble from the collapsed girls schools
- 113 schools and medical centres have been built
- 60 shelters have been created, of which 51 on a altitude higher than 1.500 meters

In total, an estimated 40.000 Pakistanis directly benefited from NATO aid and 100.000 indirectly.

Pakistan's added value

NATO's important role would not have been possible without the efforts of the Pakistani authorities. Despite the fact that there was no national structure for natural disaster management in place at the time of the earthquake, the role of the Pakistani army was very effective. The authorities showed strong leadership and flexibility.

First, the Pakistani authorities launched Operation Lifeline right after the earthquake struck, which allowed the deployment of 60.000 military forces in total. These military forces conducted significant relief efforts in the initial phase of the disaster response.

Second, the Federal Relief Commission (FRC) was created on 10 October in order to fill the vacuum that had arisen due to the absence of an existing disaster management structure. The FRC was led by the Pakistani army and was designed to streamline the overall disaster response. An important component of the FRC was the Strategic Oversight Group (SOG), which "purpose it was to ensure that the various groups represented (the FRC, foreign militaries, the UN and key donors) understood priorities and acted in a coordinated manner (Wiharta et al., 2008, p. 111). Moreover, it was the FRC who was in favor of the implementation of the UN cluster approach. In general, The FRC proved to be a very effective link throughout the disaster response.

Third, Pakistan demonstrated its willingness to change after the earthquake. Accordingly, in order to improve responses for any future disasters two structures for disaster management were created: the National Disaster Management Authority and the Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority.

Good experiences from civil-military coordination

From a NATO perspective the overall civil-military coordination went well, although not perfect, mainly in the area of logistics and engineering. NATO showed great willingness to cooperate with civilian actors in order to achieve the best possible results.

§5.5 Conclusion

In order to analyze overall success of the NATO disaster operation, it is interesting to evaluate whether the operation was conducted in accordance with the principles set out by the NAC.

- *The mission would only last for the prefixed period of three months: **yes***

The first NATO forces arrived on Pakistani soil on 24 October 2005 (DJTF) and the mission was officially concluded on 1 February 2006. This means that in total, the mission lasted for 100 days, which is 3 months and 8 days. This means that, although the mission slightly exceeded the timeframe, the mission was in accordance with this principle.

- *The mission would solely include emergency relief and recovery efforts and forces would not involve any reconstruction activities: **no***

This is a tricky matter. The line between relief work and development work has proven to be very thin and easily to cross. As a consequence, some NATO soldiers did find themselves getting involved in activities that were not part of the mission. Nonetheless, it did not seem to have affected the operation in a negative way in any sense.

- *The mission would be executed in accordance with the principles as set out by the Pakistani authorities: **yes***

The effective coordination between the Pakistani army and NATO forces proved to have been a smoothing factor in the overall response. The Pakistani army was very willing to cooperate and adapt in order to achieve the most effective response.

- *The mission would not serve as a model for future missions alike: **partially***

The mission has proven to be a very successful humanitarian operation for NATO, especially given the circumstances (disputed area, strong civil-military component, first major deployment NRF). Although the principle states that the mission would not serve as a model for future missions alike, it should. As the Center of Excellence (2010) comments: “The Pakistan earthquake serves as an example of how, in the face of a disaster, despair, and overwhelming need over a large area, communities, nations, and organizations can come together for the common good” (“Pakistan Earthquake: A Review of the Civil-Military Dimensions of the International Response”, p. 12).

To conclude, NATO’s involvement in the earthquake response was an interesting one, as besides serving as a mechanism for the supply of relief donations from EAPC members through the EADRCC, NATO also deployed military forces on the ground. The deployment of the NATO Response Force is what makes the mission a controversial one, as NATO soldiers became directly involved in humanitarian assistance; a field in which not everyone agrees that NATO should be involved in.

However, NATO proved during the disaster response that it can be of great help during these types of missions. Even though NATO was faced with many external but also internal challenges, NATO managed to stand firm and achieve impressive results. In the end, NATO realized the objective of the mission, which was to help the survivors of the earthquake and assist the Pakistani authorities in preparing for winter.

Conclusion

The dissertation sought to research the appropriateness of NATO disaster relief operations. Although definitely not perfect and still prone to many developments, NATO's involvement in disaster assistance is certainly appropriate. NATO disaster relief operations can be justified on two grounds. First, they are fully in accordance with NATO's fundamental principles and purpose. Second, it is evident that NATO's capabilities can be of great added value and therefore can make significant contributions to the overall disaster response.

An analysis of the 1949 founding Treaty and the strategic concepts that emanated from it, reaffirms that disaster relief operations are fully in consonance with the Alliance's fundamental principles, that is, to promote stability, preserve security, and safeguard the existence of the peoples in the Euro-Atlantic area, while respecting the UN Charter's principles. What is more, the gradual development of NATO's humanitarian role, and the fact that NATO has always been committed to civil protection, support this statement.

In accordance with the liberal institutional point of view, NATO proved to be a dynamic and reactive organization, continuously evolving apace with the changing security environment, while staying faithful to the principles of the 1949 founding Treaty.

The Alliance succeeded to maintain its important position by adopting a broad and comprehensive approach, tailored to the contemporary security environment. The focus would be more on complex multidimensional risks, where crisis management and the promotion of international security through cooperation and dialogue became vital functions of the Alliance. Natural disasters were identified as increasing threats to common peace and stability, causing NATO to become a more active and prominent actor in disaster assistance, in line with changes in the notion of civil protection. Disaster assistance therefore fits perfectly in NATO's evolved role, as it aims to protect civilian populations from the consequences of disasters, while at the same time greatly emphasizing the importance of cooperation.

NATO's involvement in disaster assistance is further appropriate because its added value to disaster relief is evident through its positive contributions.

First, the Alliance is an experienced actor in the field of disaster assistance, already having dealt with a wide range of disasters given its extensive track of disaster relief operations. It therefore possesses significant expertise in the field.

Second, NATO only gets involved out of necessity when the affected state and the first aid organizations are overwhelmed. It is always the host nation that holds the primary authority during disaster relief operations, therefore NATO does not have a commanding role in any way: it only helps out where needed, wherefore its role is exclusively complementary.

Third, NATO's civilian structure, but most of all its military transformation to rapid, flexible, and multinational forces in particular are important factors for NATO's usefulness, with the NATO Response Force and the CJTF concept as crucial elements. Besides being in accordance with humanitarian principles, NATO's military involvement is effective and adequate because its military assets are unique, rapidly deployable, suitable for extreme conditions, self-sufficient, and enjoy protection, therefore significantly contributing to the overall response. In addition, NATO's involvement kills two birds with one stone, as not only the affected state benefits, but also NATO itself.

Fourth, besides conducting actual disaster relief operations, NATO has a broad range of elements for disaster assistance at its disposal, by also being committed to the phases prior to and following the disasters through information sharing and training and exercises. Therefore, the disaster capabilities of both NATO and the host nation improve through cooperation and dialogue. Moreover, its involvement does not only increase cooperation between NATO members and partners, but also fosters the relations between NATO and international organizations and host nations.

All NATO's meaningful contributions, as mentioned above, became clear during the Pakistan earthquake response. The case study therefore reaffirmed that NATO functions as a crucial actor, essentially making diverse and meaningful contributions to the objective of disaster assistance, which is to save lives and alleviate human suffering, while conducting its activities in line with the requests from the host nation. It is therefore hard to argue why NATO should not be involved in disaster relief operations. After all, its added value is evident through its highly integrated structure, unique capabilities that it can offer in times of crises, and its ability to establish good cooperation with all involved actors.

This of course does not change the fact that NATO has to keep evolving and learning from its previous experiences because each situation is unique and there will always be areas for improvement. However, this does not only apply to just NATO, but to all involved actors, among which humanitarian actors and the host nations. After all, the success of a disaster relief operation will be determined by the joint effort of all involved

actors, whether they are civilian or military. In the end, all that matters is that the affected state receives the assistance it so urgently needs, irrespectively of from which type of actor the assistance comes from. So where NATO has the capability and opportunity to make a positive contribution to a disaster response, which it definitely has, it should.

Recommendations

Following this dissertation, some points of recommendations could be presented.

- ***Foster cooperation and dialogue between civilian and military actors***

Noticeable gains could be made in the area of civil-military coordination. However, this is not just NATO's responsibility, but it must be a two-way process. Common grounds should be established between both actors, which could be realized through training and education. Accordingly, biases toward the other group can be diminished and both actors will have a better understanding of each other's working methods and procedures. An important factor herein could be to establish a better understanding of the existing policies, frameworks, and guidelines on disaster assistance, such as the Oslo Guidelines and the UN Cluster Approach. Moreover, militaries should involve civilian actors in their working methods and preparation, just as the other way around, in order to become more comfortable with working with one another and create common goals already at an early stage. Eventually, important is to make both actors, but especially civilian actors, feel more comfortable with working closely with one another.

- ***Improve decision-making processes***

The Pakistan case study showed that some time was lost in the deployment of NATO forces because of slow decision-making processes, therefore stimulating speedier decision-making processes within NATO to deploy forces on the ground would be beneficial. Also, clearer guidelines and standards for humanitarian assistance could be created in order to establish a clearer line between relief and rehabilitation work, just as to avoid that the standards of the NATO relief efforts are too high in comparison to the local standards

- ***Increased cooperation with potential host nations***

Although NATO is already involved in activities that aim to promote nations to become better prepared for potential disasters, there would be an opportunity for NATO to play an even greater role in this field through increased cooperation, for instance by helping nations in developing disaster management structures. Moreover, establishing good connections with potential host nations at an early stage would be desirable, in order to have a better cultural awareness and get accustomed to the national and local

structures. This will eventually contribute to the disaster response, as cultural barriers seem to be an important delaying factor. It should be acknowledged however that it is impossible for NATO to establish good relationships with every single nation, and that it cannot be foreseen which nation will be the next one to be struck by a disaster.

- ***Image building***

Although NATO's tasks, activities and attitude have adapted to the contemporary environment, it seems that its image has not. NATO is still largely perceived as a static and robust actor; therefore its image still lingers in the old NATO times. It seems that the general public is not really aware of NATO's exact activities and therefore automatically makes the link to well known operations, such as the ones in Libya and Kosovo, which at the same time are more controversial and therefore misrepresent the organization. Therefore, it would be important for NATO to focus more on creating a positive image among the general public through the effective use of public relations.

List of references

ActionAid International (2007). *The Evolving UN Cluster Approach in the Aftermath of the Pakistan Earthquake: an NGO perspective*. Bangalore: Books for Change

Allied Command Operations.(n.d.). *Military Command Structure*. Retrieved April 14, 2015, from the ACO Web site:

http://www.aco.nato.int/military_command_structure.aspx

Bercovitch, J. and Jackson, R. (2009). *Conflict resolution in the Twenty-first Century. Principles, Methods, and Approaches*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press

Bialos, J.P., and Koehl, S.L. (2005, September). *The NATO Response Force. Facilitating Coalition Warfare through Technology Transfer and Information Sharing*. Washington: National Defense University, Center for Technology and National Security Policy

Byman, D., Lesser, I., Pirnie, B., Benard, C. and Waxman, M. [Byman et al.] (2000). *Strengthening the Partnership. Improving Military Coordination with Relief Agencies and Allies in Humanitarian Operations*. Santa Monica: RAND

Carpenter, T. G. (2001). *NATO Enters the 21st Century*. London: Frank Cass

Center of Excellence (2006, April). *Pakistan Earthquake: A Review of the Civil-Military Dimensions of the International Response*. Retrieved May 2, 2015, from the APAN Web site:

<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:Ehtg5Y7fZjcl:https://wss.apan.org/432/Files/Resources/References/Lessons%2520Learned/Pakistan%2520Earthquake.doc+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=pt>

Chatterjee, A. (2010) *International Relations Today. Concepts and Applications*. New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley

Coppola, D., P. (2015). *Introduction to International Disaster Management*. Oxford: Elsevier

David, C. and Lévesque, J. (1999). *The Future of NATO. Enlargement, Russia, and European Security*. Quebec: The Centre for Security and Foreign Policy Studies

Davies, N. (1997). *Europe: A History*. London: Pimlico

EADRCC (2002, July 24). *Enhanced Practical Cooperation in the Field of International Disaster Relief*. Retrieved March 26, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

<http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/fact.htm>

EADRCC (2005, October 3). *EADRCC Final Report (Nº 15) Hurricane Katrina – USA*. Retrieved March 10, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

<http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/2005/katrina/051003a-15.pdf>

EADRCC (2006, August 16). *Seminar on Lessons Learned from operations and exercises conducted by the EADRCC*. Retrieved May 1, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

<http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/2004/seminars/040526a.htm>

EADRCC (2012). *Extract from the Exercise Instructions for Observers – Exercise Georgia – 2012*. Retrieved March 28, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/2012/09-georgia/docs/extract_exercise_instructions_for_observers_georgia_2012.pdf

EADRCC (2013, August 22). *EADRCC Urgent Disaster Assistance Request Forest Fires in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

<http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/2013/08-bih-fires/docs/ops-eadrcc-2013-0098.pdf>

EADRCC (2013, August 28). *EADRCC Situation Report No. 2 (final) Forest Fires in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Retrieved March 22, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

<http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/2013/08-bih-fires/docs/ops-eadrcc-2013-0105.pdf>

EADRCC (2013, November 13). *Georgia to host NATO/EAPC Disaster Response Exercise*. Retrieved March 27, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

<http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/2012/09-georgia/index.html>

EADRCC (2014, August 19). *EADRCC Urgent Relief Assistance Request Iraq – IDP crisis*. Retrieved March 19, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2014_08-iraq/20150302_140819-iraq-idp-request.pdf

EADRCC (2015, February 5). *EADRCC Urgent Assistance Request Albania Snowfall and Floods*. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2015_01-albania/20150302_150205-albania-floods-request.pdf

EADRCC (2015, March 6). *EADRCC Situation Report no. 6 (final) Albania Snowfall and Floods*. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2015_01-albania/20150318_150205-albania-floods-06.pdf

Garnett, I. (2003). NATO Response Force. *The RUSI Journal*. 148:6, 20-25. Retrieved April 17, 2015, from the Tandfonline Web site:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03071840308446941>

Gehman, H. W. (1999, March 17). *Transforming NATO's Defense Capabilities for the 21st Century*. Retrieved April 15, 2015, from the FAS Web site:

http://fas.org/man/nato/offdocs/us_99/99031703_ppo.htm

Haque, C. E. (2005) *Mitigation of Natural Hazards and Disasters. International Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer

Hassan, R. (2011). *Life as a Weapon: The Global Rise of Suicide Bombings*. Oxon: Routledge

Herd, G. P. and Kriendler, J. (2013). *Understanding NATO in the 21st Century. Alliance Strategies, Security and Global Governance*. New York: Routledge

Hoffman, C. and Hudson, L. (2009). Military responses to natural disaster: last resort or inevitable trend? *Humanitarian Exchange*, 4, 29-31

Hough, P. (2013). *Understanding Global Security*. Oxon: Routledge

House of Commons: International Development Committee (2006). *Humanitarian Response to Natural Disasters*. Norwich: TSO

Jones, P. L. (1999). *Combined Joint Task Force Concept. A Viable Tiger or a Paper Dragon?*

Retrieved April 16, 2015, from the DTIC Web site:

<http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a370298.pdf>

Keohane, R. O. (2012). Twenty Years of Institutional Liberalism. *International*

Relations, vol. 26, no. 2, 125-138. Retrieved June 19, 2015, from the Sage Web site:

<http://ire.sagepub.com/content/26/2/125.full.pdf>

Kerigan-Kyro, D. (2014). *NATO and Critical Infrastructure Resilience – Planning for the Unknown*. Amsterdam: IOS Press

Kissinger, H. (2001). *Does America need a foreign policy? Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century*. New York: Simon & Schuster

Krugler, R. (2007). *The NATO Response Force 2002–200. Innovation by the Atlantic Alliance*. Washington: National Defense University, Center for Technology and National Security Policy

Leaning, J. and Guha-Sapir, D. (2013, November 7). Natural Disasters, Armed Conflict, and Public Health. *The New England Journal of Medicine [NEJM]*. Retrieved June 17, 2015, from the NEJM Web site:

http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMra1109877?query=featured_home&

Lieutenant Colonel [Lt Col] Mario Lemos Pires (2015, April 7). Personal Interview.

Little, R and Smith, M. (2006). *Perspectives on World Politics*. London: Routledge

Lowe, K. (2012). *Savage Continent: Europe in the Aftermath of World War II*. New York: Picador

Madiwale, A. and Virk, K. (2011, December). Civil-military relations in natural disasters: a case study of the 2010 Pakistan floods. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 93, 884, 1085-1105

Metcalf, V., Haysom, S. and Gordon, S. [Metcalf et al.] (2012, May). *Trends and challenges in humanitarian civil-military coordination. A Review of the Literature*.

(Humanitarian Policy Group [HPG] Working Paper). London: Overseas Development Institute

Morrison, J. (1995). *NATO Expansion and Alternative Future Security Alignments*. Washington: Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS)

NATO (1949, April 4). *The North Atlantic Treaty*. Retrieved July 10, 2015, from the NATO Web site: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm

NATO (1965). *Facts about the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*. Paris: the Service

NATO (1989). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Facts and Figures*. Brussels: RP – Public Diplomacy Division (PDD)

NATO (1990, July 5-6). *Declaration on a transformed North Atlantic Alliance*. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_23693.htm

NATO (1991, November 7-8). *The Alliance's New Strategic Concept*. Retrieved June 15, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_23847.htm

NATO (1998). *EAPC Policy on Enhanced Practical Cooperation in the Field of International Disaster Relief*. Retrieved March 20, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/eadrcc/sop/sop_eadrcc/eadrcc_sop_annex01.pdf

NATO (1999, April 24). *The Alliance's Strategic Concept*. Retrieved March 2, 2015, from the NATO Web site: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_27433.htm

NATO (2001a). *Handbook*. Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press

NATO (2001b). *NATO's Role in Disaster Assistance*. Brussels: EADRCC

NATO (2006). *NATO's Role in Civil Emergency Planning*. Brussels: NATO Public Diplomacy Division

NATO (2008, May). Modalities for the Advisory Support Team. Retrieved March 23, 2015, from the NATO Web site: <http://www.nato.int/docu/cep/cep-cbrn-ast-e.pdf>

NATO (2010, October 27). *Pakistan Earthquake Relief Operation*. Retrieved June 1, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/cps/nl/natohq/topics_50070.htm?selectedLocale=ru

NATO (2010a). *Allied Joint Doctrine for Non-Article 5 Crisis Response Operations*.

NATO/PfP unclassified. Retrieved 22 April, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:rS76slPn3qYJ:www.kam.lt/download/14142/ajp-3.4%28a%29%2520rd1.pdf+%&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=pt>

NATO (2010b, November). *Strategic Concept*. Retrieved April 3, 2015, from the NATO web site:

http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/20120214_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf

NATO (2010c, October 27). *Pakistan earthquake relief operation*. Retrieved April 20, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50070.htm

NATO (2014), October. Public Affairs Handbook. *Allied Command Operations and Allied Command Transformation*. Brussels: NATO Office of Information and Press

NATO (2015, February 10). *The Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre*.

Retrieved March 11, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_52057.htm

NATO (2015, January 29). *Crisis Management*. Retrieved February 16, 2015, from NATO web site: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49192.htm

NATO (2015, March 4). *Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) – Operations*. Retrieved March 23, 2015, from the NATO Web site:

http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_117901.htm

NATO (2015, May 11). *NATO Response Force*. Retrieved March 21, 2015, from the NATO Web site: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49755.htm#

NATO (n.d.). *A Short History of NATO*. Retrieved February 15, 2015, from NATO Web site: <http://www.nato.int/history/nato-history.html>

Netherlands Institute for Military History [NIMH] (2010). *NATO Disaster Relief team Pakistan*. The Hague: Ministry of Defense

OCHA (n.d.). *Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination (UN-CMCoord)*. Retrieved May 21, 2015, from the OCHA Web site: <http://www.unocha.org/what-we-do/coordination-tools/UN-CMCoord/overview>

OCHA (2007, November). *Oslo Guidelines. Guidelines on The Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets In Disaster Relief*. Retrieved March 10, 2015, from the UNOCHA Web site: [https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Oslo%20Guidelines%20ENGLISH%20November%202007\).pdf](https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Oslo%20Guidelines%20ENGLISH%20November%202007).pdf)

Policy Coordination Group (2001, July 9). *NATO Military Policy on Civil-Military Co-operation (Cimic)*. NATO/EAPC/PFP Unclassified Document. Retrieved from the NATO Web site: http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:hu708qGzY8sJ:www.arrc.nato.int/resources/28/CIMIC/key_references/policy.doc+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=pt

Rietjens, S. J. H. and Bollen, M. T. I. B. (ed). (2008). *Managing Civil-Military Cooperation. a 24/7 Joint Effort for Stability*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited

Rosenberg, J. (n.d.). *Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech*. Retrieved July 11, 2015, from the About Web site: <http://history1900s.about.com/od/churchillwinston/a/Iron-Curtain.htm>

Schrogl, K., Mathieu, C., Lukaszczyk, A. [Schrogl et al.] (2009). *Threats, Risks and Sustainability - Answers by Space*. Vienna: Springer-Verlag/Wien

Seybolt, T. B. (2007). *Humanitarian Military Intervention. The conditions for success and failure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Street, A., Parihar, G. (2007, March). The UN Cluster Approach in the Pakistan earthquake response: an NGO perspective. *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine*. Issue 37. Retrieved May 24, 2015, from the HPN Web site: <http://www.odihpn.org/humanitarian-exchange-magazine/issue-37/the-un-cluster-approach-in-the-pakistan-earthquake-response-an-ngo-perspective>

United Nations [UN] (2003, March). *Guidelines On The Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets To Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies*. Retrieved March 8, 2015, from the Refworld Web site: <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/3f13f73b4.pdf>

Weissinger-Baylon. (2002). *Global Security: Defining and Responding to the New Threats*. California: House of Printing

Wheeler, V. and Harmer, A. (2006, March). Resetting the rules of engagement. Trends and issues in humanitarian-military relations. *Humanitarian Policy Group [HPG]*. Report 21. London: Overseas Development Institute

Wiharta S., Ahmad, H., Haine, J., Löfgren, J. and Randall, T. [Wiharta et al.] (2008). *The Effectiveness of Foreign Military Assets in Natural Disaster Response* (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI]). Solna: SIPRI

Young, T. (1997). *Command in NATO after the Cold War: Alliance, national, and multinational considerations*. Pennsylvania: Strategic Studies Institute

Zorgbibe, C. (2002). *Histoire de l'OTAN*. Brussels: Complexe

Appendix 1 - Glossary of terms

Base

An area or locality containing installations which provide logistic or other support / A locality from which operations are projected or supported. (CCOE, 2015, p. 20)

Civil Emergency Planning (CEP)

To collect, analyse and share information on national planning activity to ensure the most effective use of civil resources for use during emergency situations, in accordance with Alliance objectives. It enables Allies and Partner nations to assist each other in preparing for and dealing with the consequences of crisis, disaster or conflict. (NATO, 2006, p. 1)

Civil Protection

Activities undertaken by emergency services to protect populations, properties, infrastructure and the environment from the consequences of natural and technological disasters and other emergencies (CCOE, 2015, p. 27)

Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC)

The coordination and cooperation, in support of the mission, between the NATO Commander and civil actors, including the national population and local authorities, as well as international, national and non-governmental organizations and agencies. (CCOE, 2015, p. 28)

Combined Joint Task Force CJTF

A combined joint task force is a combined (i.e. made up of forces from different nations) and joint (i.e. comprising different services: land, air, navy, marines, special forces, and others) deployable task force, tailored to the mission, and formed for the full range of the Alliance's military missions. (CCOE, 2015, p. 32)

Complex emergency

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 and which requires an international response that goes beyond the mandate or capacity of any single agency and/or the ongoing UN country program.

(UN, 2003, "The use of military and civil defense assets to support United Nations humanitarian activities in complex emergencies", p. 3).

Crisis management (CM)

The coordinated actions taken to defuse crises, prevent their escalation into an armed conflict and contain hostilities if they should result.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 49)

Deployment

The movement of forces within areas of operations.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 57)

Direct assistance

The face-to-face distribution of relief items and services.

(Wiharta et al, 2008, p. 2)

Doctrine

Fundamental principles by which the military forces guide their actions in support of objectives. It is authoritative but requires judgement in application.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 60)

End state

The political and/or military situation to be attained at the end of an operation, which indicates that the objective has been achieved.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 63)

Forces allocated to NATO

Those forces made available to NATO by a nation under the categories of: a. NATO command forces; b. NATO assigned forces; c. NATO earmarked forces; d. other forces for NATO.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 77)

Foreign military assets

Personnel, equipment and services of a military nature provided by governments with the consent of the affected state for IDRA.

(Wiharta et al, 2008, p. 2)

Host nation

A nation which, by agreement: a. receives forces and materiel of NATO or other nations operating on/from or transiting through its territory; b. allows materiel and/or NATO organizations to be located on its territory; and/or c. provides support for these purposes.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 84)

Host-Nation Support (HNS)

Host-nation support HNS Civil and military assistance rendered in peace, crisis or war by a host nation to NATO and/or other forces and NATO organizations that are located on, operating on/from, or in transit through the host nation's territory.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 86)

Humanitarian actor

Humanitarian actors are civilians, whether national or international, UN or non-UN, governmental or nongovernmental, which have a commitment to humanitarian principles and are engaged in humanitarian activities.

(UN, 2008, p. 11)

Humanitarian aid

The resources needed to directly alleviate human suffering.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 86)

Humanitarian assistance

As part of an operation, the use of available military resources to assist or complement the efforts of responsible civil actors in the operational area or specialized civil humanitarian organizations in fulfilling their primary responsibility to alleviate human suffering.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 87)

Humanitarian operation

An operation specifically mounted to alleviate human suffering in an area where the civil actors normally responsible for so doing are unable or unwilling adequately to support a population.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 87)

Indirect assistance

At least one step removed from the people affected by the disaster and involves activities such as transporting relief items or personnel.

(Wiharta et al, 2008, p. 2)

Infrastructure support

The provision of general services—such as road repair, airspace management and power generation—that facilitate relief but are not necessarily visible to or solely for the benefit of the affected population.

(Wiharta et al, 2008, p. 2)

International disaster relief assistance (IDRA)

Material, personnel and services provided by the international community to an affected state at its request, to meet the needs of the people affected by a disaster. The primary purposes of IDRA are to save lives and alleviate suffering.

(Wiharta et al, 2008, p. 2)

International organization (IO)

An entity established by a treaty or other instrument governed by international law and possessing its own international legal personality.

(CCOE, 2015, p. 98)

Interoperability

The ability to act together coherently, effectively and efficiently to achieve Allied tactical, operational and strategic objectives

(CCOE, 2015, p. 99)

Joint operations area (JOA)

A temporary area defined by the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, in which a designated joint commander

plans and executes a specific mission at the operational level of war. A joint operations area and its defining parameters, such as time, scope of the mission and geographical area, are contingency or mission-specific and are normally associated with combined joint task force operations. (CCOE, 2015, p. 105)

Military Actor

Military actors refer to official military forces, i.e., military forces of a state or regional-/inter-governmental organisation that are subject to a hierarchical chain of command, be they armed or unarmed, governmental or inter-governmental. This may include a wide spectrum of actors such as the local or national military, multi-national forces, UN peacekeeping troops, international military observers, foreign occupying forces, regional troops or other officially organized troops. (UN, 2008, p. 11)

Multinational force

A force composed of elements of two or more nations. (CCOE, 2015, p. 128)

Natural disasters

Disasters that follow natural hazards. Other types of disaster are man-made and complex. Disasters can be classified according to the speed of their onset (rapid or slow). (Wiharta et al, 2008, p. 2)

Non-governmental organization (NGO)

Any non-profit organization group or institution motivated by humanitarian or religious values, usually independent of government, the United Nations, and commercial sectors. (CCOE, 2015, p. 136)

Strategic concept

The course of action accepted as a result of the estimate of the strategic situation. It is a statement of what is to be done in broad terms sufficiently flexible to permit its use in framing the military, diplomatic, economic, psychological and other measures which stem from it. (CCOE, 2015, p. 174)

Transfer of authority TOA

Within NATO, an action by which a member nation or NATO Command gives operational command or control of designated forces to a NATO Command. (CCOE, 2015, p. 184)

Appendix 2 - Frameworks for disaster reduction

Yokohoma Strategy

From 23 until 27 May in 1994, a UN world conference on natural disaster reduction took place in Yokohoma, resulting in the adoption of the Yokohoma Strategy. The Yokohoma Strategy sets out guidelines for natural disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation. It makes an appeal to the international community to save human lives through an integrated approach for disaster management, reducing the level of destruction following a disaster. The main reason for the creation of the strategy is the recognition that natural disasters were happening more frequently and were more powerful. Accordingly, the strategy is based on the principles and the assessment of the progress on disaster reduction. The UN pinpoints that until thus far, the focus had been too much on disaster response instead of disaster prevention. It is for this reason that the main objective of the strategy is focused on measures for improving and promoting disaster prevention and preparedness. In addition, spreading awareness and education and training is an important element of the guidelines as the strategy points out the lack of attention and commitment for the matter. Moreover, the UN especially emphasizes the importance of the more vulnerable groups, such as the disadvantaged people in the least developed and developing countries. Especially these groups need help from the international community, as they are not adequately equipped for natural disasters and therefore suffer the most. Indispensable to disaster prevention, preparedness, and mitigation is the integration of participation of actors at the community and local, regional and sub regional, and international level through among others exchanging information, sharing technology, and integrating research activities. Consequently, all these factors will “contribute to the development of a global culture of prevention” (UN, 1994, p. 9)

Hyogo Framework

During the World Conference for Disaster Reduction, taking place from 18 until 22 January in 2005, the Yokohoma Strategy was upgraded through the creation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. The framework is designed to fill the gaps of the Yokohoma Strategy. According to the Hyogo framework, the attention for and commitment to the issue of disaster reduction and response has grown, but “disasters and in particular the management and reduction of risk continue to pose a global challenge” (2005, p. 1). Nowadays, disaster risks have become a global concern as they spread out more easily and are correlated with many other factors. The expected

outcome of the framework is as follows: “the substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries” (2005, p. 3). Moreover, it is written that in order to achieve this expected outcome, a full commitment and involvement of all actors is necessary. This statement, however, is a rather idealistic and vague one. What exactly do they consider as a “substantial reduction”? And is it even realistic to wish for the full commitment of all actors? Roughly, the Hyogo Framework is very similar to the Yokohoma strategy: it calls for the effective and systematic approach for disaster risk reduction. Essential herein is the effective integration of policies and programs at all levels, just as promoting education and innovation. However, where the Yokohoma Strategy does not, the Hyogo Framework does address the issue of cultural diversity in disaster reduction planning.

Sendai Framework

The most recent framework for disaster risk reduction is the 2015-2030 Sendai Framework, as adopted on the third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. Whereas compared to the Yokohoma Strategy, the Hyogo Framework did not offer many new and specific approaches; the Sendai Framework does provide a clearer vision that is more specific. The Sendai Framework has various new aspects. First, it largely focuses on tackling the underlying drivers of disaster risk. Specifically, the framework mentions climate change and poverty as the main drivers. In addition, weak institutions, urbanization, and epidemics are mentioned as drivers of disaster risk. Second, it calls for a people-centered preventive approach: “while recognizing their leading, regulatory and coordination role, Governments should engage with relevant stakeholders, including women, children and youth, persons with disabilities, poor people, migrants, indigenous peoples, volunteers, the community of practitioners and older persons in the design and implementation of policies, plans and standard” (2015, p. 5). Third, the “build back better” concept is introduced, which underscores the importance of recovering, rehabilitating, and reconstructing the area and community affected by the disaster. Nonetheless, disaster prevention and preparedness still remains important as well.

The expected outcome of the Sendai Framework remains the same as the Hyogo one, namely “the substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries” (p. 6). However, instead of a full commitment and involvement of all actors, this framework calls for a strong commitment and involvement of political leadership at all levels. Besides this increasing expediency, the Sendai Framework also introduces seven global targets, which partly takes away the previous vagueness of the Hyogo Framework. However, these targets

still are rather ambiguous, with only two targets providing specific numbers. One of them is two “Substantially reduce global disaster mortality by 2030, aiming to lower average per 100,000 global mortality between 2020-2030 compared to 2005-2015” (2015, p. 7). Then, the targets continue to be very broad, such as “substantially increase the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies by 2020 (2015, p.7).

Appendix 3 – NATO’s military structure

The military command and force structure

The military structure of NATO is one that stands out due to the high level of integration and is ultimately designed to ensure security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. NATO’s military structure comprises the Military Committee (MC), the International Military Staff (IMS), the NATO Command Structure (NCS), and the NATO Force Structure (NFS). The NATO Military Command structure is made up of the Allied Command Operations (ACO) and Allied Command Transformation (ACT). The Command Structure has a strategic role, namely commanding and controlling NATO joint operations. At the tactical level stands the NATO Force structure, which supports the NATO command Structure by offering additional command and control at the single service level. It consists of three types of forces: in-place forces, intended for collective defense operations, deployable forces, characterized by a high level of readiness, and long-term build-up forces, designed for Article 5 operations that are large in scale and require a low level of readiness.

The Military Committee (MC) is NATO’s senior military authority and its role is to provide the NAC with consensus-based advice on military matters. The Committee comprises the Chiefs of Staff¹ of the member nations. In order to guarantee the continuous functioning of the MC, each nation appoints a Military Representative as a permanent member of the Committee. The MC’s advice is in accordance with the Alliance’s objectives, whilst respecting and representing the national interests of the member countries. When shaping the advice, the MC involves to the military commanders of Allied Command Operations (ACO) and Allied Command Transformation (ACT), the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) and the Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT) in the decision-making process. Besides giving them the possibility to influence the final advice, the MC also gives guidance to the military commanders.

The Military Committee further operates in three other entities, each made up by different members. First, the 50 Military Representatives of NATO and Partner nations constitute the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Military Committee. Although it operates in a similar way, the agenda is different. Second, the NATO-Russia Military Committee under the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation comprises Military Representatives of both the Allied and Russia.

¹ Civil servants represent Iceland in the MC, as it does not have military forces.

Third, the Military Representatives of the Allied nations and Ukraine constitute the NATO-Ukraine Military Committee, functioning on the basis of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between Ukraine and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Another important element of NATO's military structure is the **International Military Staff (IMS)**, whose role is to support the MC and therefore serves as an important link. Its responsibility is to develop policies on military matters, just as the implementation of the policies. The IMS consists of military and civilian personnel that have no national interest in the advice, unlike the MC. Therefore, the IMS works purely in the best interest of the Alliance's objectives, whereas the positions within the MC are more based on national interests as it is made up of military representatives. The responsibilities of the IMS encompasses a wide variety of activities, including planning and policy, monitoring operations, trainings and exercises, liaison with partners, logistics and resources of NATO operations, intelligence support, and the consultation on communications and information systems. The advice procedure is as follows. First, the MC receives a request for advice on a military issue from the NAC. When NAC asks for advice, the matter thus far is mainly of political nature. The IMS' role, then, is to bring forward the military dimension of the issue. This happens with input from the two commanders, SACEUR and SACT. Next, the IMS presents an initial assessment to the MC, who then needs to shape it into a consensus-based advice for the NAC. It is a difficult process to reach consensus, as there needs to be dealt with 28 different national standpoints.

As mentioned previously, there are two NATO strategic commanders at the strategic level of the NATO Command Structure. The first one is the **Supreme Allied Command Transformation commander (SACT)** and is the commanding officer of the **Allied Command Transformation (ACT)**, whose role is develop NATO's military framework, doctrine, forces, and capabilities through training and exercises. More important for this thesis, is the **Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR)**, who is the commanding officer of the **Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE)**, the strategic headquarters of **Allied Command Operations (ACO)**. SHAPE leads the operational commands, supported by the tactical commands. The SACEUR's role, therefore, is to prepare, plan, and execute all NATO military operations. In NATO's Public Affairs Handbook for ACO and ACT (2014), ACO is envisioned as the "sword and shield of the Alliance" (p. 4).

The operational level commands of ACO consist of the **Joint Force Commands (JFCs)**. The role of the JFCs is to manage military operations, either from the static location or from a deployed headquarters. In case of the latter situation, the headquarters is called a **Joint Task Force Headquarters (JTF HQ)**. The JFC needs to be prepared to plan, conduct, and sustain different NATO operations, which can differ in size and type. Once deployed, a JFC only commands one operation at a time, but assets that are not being used can be deployed for other missions. Besides, JFCs need to maintain communication with partners and relevant organizations involved in the mission. Currently there are two JFCs: JFC Brunssum, located in the Netherlands, and JFC Naples, located in Italy. Before there was also a JFC in Lisbon, but it has been deactivated in 2012. The JFCs are supported by the **Single Service Commands (SSC)**, operating on the tactical level of command and therefore part of the **NATO force structure (NFS)**. Hence, the role of the SSCs is to offer their expertise to the JFCs. Presently there are three SSCs in place. The first Single Service Command is the land command, LANDCOM, which is responsible for the land forces in terms of readiness, expertise and standardization. Moreover, HQ LANDCOM has the ability to provide deployable land commands in support of a JFC. Second, the maritime command, HQ MARCOM, commands all of NATO's maritime forces and likewise has the capability to command "a small maritime joint operation or act as the maritime component in support of an operation" (NATO, n.d., "Military command structure", para. 10). Last, HQ AIRCOM, the air command, is responsible for all NATO's operations that have air components involved. Indeed, it depends on the nature of the NATO mission which ones of the SSCs provide their expertise and support. For example, some operational environments do not require a maritime component.

Appendix 4 – Context in which the earthquake occurred

Indian partition and the creation of Pakistan

Pakistan resulted from the partition of India in 1947 after the end of the British rule. For decades, British India was subjected to British rule and Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs populated the country. Hindus were in majority, and Muslims were mainly concentrated in the Northeastern and Northwestern parts of the country. Sikhs were mainly present in the Punjab region, which was India's most wealthy region in terms of history and culture. After the end of the Second World War in 1946, Britain went bankrupt and the independence movement became stronger. India's independence leaders were divided on what would happen after Britain left. On the one hand, leaders advocated a united India, in which religions would live side by side peacefully. On the other hand, the idea of a Muslim homeland became popular among the Muslims, as they did not want to live under Hindu majority. The leader of this movement, the Muslim League, was Muhammed Ali Jinnah, demanding the division of India in two: the Muslims and the Hindus and Sikhs. Negotiations on the future of the country collapsed, and Muslims started to demand direct action for Pakistan, the Muslim homeland. Tensions arose, and Hindus and Muslims started to slaughter each other. In the meantime, the idea of a united India vanished and the violence spread even more.



Figure 1 – Indian partition

Source: http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/modern/partition1947_01.shtml

As the conflict was escalating, a deal became a matter of urgency and eventually, partition was accepted. Those provinces with Muslim majority would be given to Pakistan, and those provinces with Hindu majority would be given to India. The Punjab

and Bengal regions were treated differently: they would be cut in half and divided between India and Pakistan. The major task that was left to be done was drawing the boundary, and as Britain decided to leave almost one year earlier than planned, it had to be done quickly. A date for the announcement of the boundary was planned, and tension build up even more among communities. Subsequently, ethnic cleansings of entire districts occurred, and many people were forced to flee their homes. In August 1947, the partition was official and Pakistan was born. Consequently, huge refugee movements took place, in which Muslims living in India left to Pakistan and the other way round. In only a few months time India had been divided along religious lines, although Hindus and Muslims had lived together in peace for century. The Indian part of the Punjab was cleared of nearly all its Muslims, while Pakistan was emptied of most of its Sikhs and Hindus. The border created in 1947 would become the focus for three wars and 60 years of troubles between the government of India and Pakistan.

The conflicted Kashmir region

1947: First Kashmir War

As a part of the partition in 1947, the Indian Princely states were given the choice to either join India, Pakistan, or become autonomous. The prince of Kashmir Hari Singh wanted Kashmir to become a part of India because he was a Hindu. However, the largest part of the population consisted of Muslims who wanted Kashmir to become a part of Pakistan. Ultimately, the prince decided to remain independent and therefore neither join India nor Pakistan. This decision led to much turbulence in the region, causing Pakistan to invade Kashmir. Hari Singh fled to India and requested assistance from the Indian Government, who in turn would only do so if the ruler agreed on Kashmir acceding to India. Hari Sing agrees and Indian troops are sent to the Kashmir region to block the Pakistani invasion. As a consequence, a Line Of Control (LOC) is drawn in 1948 that embodies the dividing line between the part controlled by the Pakistanis and the part controlled by the Indians.



Figure 2 – The Kashmir region
Source: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7515458.stm

1965: Second Kashmir War

After continued tensions after the first war, a second confrontation between Pakistani and Indian armies occurred in 1965. Not long after the clash the Pakistani forces attempted to seize Kashmir, without success. After the Pakistanis invasion, India turned to the UN for help in ending the conflict. As a result, the UN passed a resolution summoning an end to the conflict and a settlement of the dispute. The US and the UK, in response, halted arms sales to both Pakistan and India. This act most affected Pakistan, as it had a weaker army than the Indians. As a result, a ceasefire was accepted by both India and Pakistan. This agreement on a ceasefire, however, was not enough. In 1966, the Soviet Union acted as a third-party mediator during negotiations in Tashkent. The results of the negotiations were that both parties would remove their military forces and drop their territorial claims.

1971: Third Kashmir War

In 1971 a third war took place after East Pakistan attempts to separate, and India declared war to Pakistan after attacks by the Pakistani air forces. The Indians attacked the Pakistanis in support of East Pakistan, and Pakistan surrendered not long after. The third war eventually resulted in the creation of the independent nation of Bangladesh. In 1972, the Simla peace agreement between Pakistan and India sets the new frontline in the Kashmir region. In spite of the signing of the Simla peace agreement, the area is taunted by clashes between the violent Pakistani fundamentalists and Indian army forces.

Nuclear weapons

The Kashmir conflict is the only conflict in which both countries possess nuclear weapons. In 1998, both India and Pakistan conduct series of nuclear tests.

1999: May-Kargil conflict

In 1999, another crisis arises, known as the May-Kargil conflict. Pakistan-backed militates occupied the Indian-controlled Kargil area. An intense clash took place between the Pakistani forces and the Indian army, while the international community feared a nuclear escalation. Subsequently, the US decided to act and pressured Pakistan to withdraw its forces from the area.

Militancy in Kashmir

The Kashmir region continues to be taunted by insurgencies from militant groups. Some militants aimed for Pakistan to take control of the whole Kashmire region, but others fought for the Kashmir region as a new independent state. Besides these militant groups, another threat arose: fundamentalists from Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Arab states that came to the Kashmir region not to fight for Pakistani control of the Kashmir region or independency, but for a global jihad. Up to this day, the countries have been taunted by terrorist attacks and nuclear threats and the conflict is still unfinished business.