“If this tragedy happened, it is not the fault of Mother Nature. It was not nature who gathered together twenty thousand buildings in this place.”

(Jean Jacques Rousseau’s letter to Voltaire after 1755 Lisbon Earthquake)
1 PREFACE

The analytical study on host nation support (hereinafter the Study) presented hereby was undertaken within the scope of a comprehensive civil protection capacity building programme (hereinafter the Programme), organized in the framework of the European Union’s Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA).

The overall objective of the Programme is to reduce the vulnerability of the Beneficiary countries\(^1\) to natural and man-made disasters at local, national and regional levels, by contributing to the development of the Beneficiaries’ civil protection capacities through thematic workshops on six well-defined subjects. The Programme also aims to bring the Beneficiaries closer to the European Civil Protection Mechanism, by making them better informed.

This Study is considered as an additional input for the workshop on host nation support, one of the thematic subjects defined by the Programme’s terms of reference (TOR). It “shall investigate the level of preparedness of beneficiaries for receiving international assistance during emergencies according to the HNS requirements {…}.”\(^2\)

The terminology used, the interpretations, findings and conclusions expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

The Study has the following structure:

- Chapter 1: Preface
- Chapter 2: Abbreviations and acronyms
- Chapter 3: Glossary of terms
- Chapter 4: Executive summary
- Chapter 5: Methodology
- Chapter 6: HNS in the Beneficiary countries
- Chapter 7: General conclusions

The Study has the following annexes:

- Annex I: Online questionnaire summary
- Annex II: HNS guidelines per Beneficiary country
- Annex III: Acknowledgements

\(^1\) Beneficiary countries of the Programme: Albania, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo*, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey

\(^2\) Mandate given by the Programme’s Terms of Reference
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# 2 ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFAD</td>
<td>Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>Crisis Management Centre of the fYR of Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EADRU</td>
<td>Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>European Commission (Directorate General) Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECPM</td>
<td>European Civil Protection Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency of Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EULEX</td>
<td>European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDCE</td>
<td>General Directorate for Civil Emergencies of Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNS</td>
<td>host nation support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRL</td>
<td>International Disaster Response Law (within IFRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSARAG</td>
<td>International Search and Rescue Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Instrument for Pre-Accession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFOR</td>
<td>Kosovo Force (NATO-led international peace-keeping force)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDA</td>
<td>Military and civil defence assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs of Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>Monitoring and Information Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEP</td>
<td>National Civil Emergency Plan of Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>(United Nations) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSOCC</td>
<td>On-site Operations Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Point of contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>Protection and Rescue Directorate of the fYR of Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS(s)</td>
<td>Participating State(s) of the European Civil Protection Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>Sector for Emergency Management, Ministry of Interior of Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP(s)</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedure(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIK</td>
<td>United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAR</td>
<td>Urban Search and Rescue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Different HNS related guidelines and recommendations use different terminology, depending on the context they are produced in or who their use is intended for. Also, different institutions and actors will have different meaning of the same term, based on their scope of work, or use different terms for the same meaning.

So as to avoid confusion or misunderstanding, the terminology used in this Study is clearly defined in the following table. Since these definitions might not correspond to the generally accepted interpretation of these terms, they shall solely be understood in the context of this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assisting state</td>
<td>A state offering and providing disaster relief assistance, including in-kind assistance, teams and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary countries / Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Countries, who benefit from this IPA Programme, i.e. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil protection assistance</td>
<td>Emergency aid, including intervention teams and assets (but no money), provided from one government to another one, based on a request for international assistance and irrespective of the coordination structure through which it has been offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil protection actors</td>
<td>Entities and intervention teams providing civil protection assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common situational awareness</td>
<td>A complete understanding of what has happened by all responsible actors (i.e. proper assessment and proper information management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage assessment</td>
<td>Evaluation of the situation specifically as regards the damages to facilities caused by the disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor countries / agencies</td>
<td>Countries / agencies that give aid in terms of money / direct funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible international actors</td>
<td>International (i.e. not of the host nation) actors providing relief assistance who are eligible to receive the facilities rendered by the host nation or transit country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host nation</td>
<td>The state that receives international disaster relief assistance, including foreign intervention teams and in-kind assistance / material to cope with the consequences of a disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host nation support</td>
<td>Provision of facilities rendered by the host nation or transit country to remove as much as possible any foreseeable obstacle to international disaster relief assistance so as to ensure that disaster response operations proceed smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNS Team / Cell</td>
<td>A team, established by the host nation, that is to serve as a direct link in between the host nation and the incoming foreign disaster relief assistance teams / consignments, with the purpose of facilitating adequate host nation support during the operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian actors</td>
<td>Non-profit entities providing humanitarian aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian aid</td>
<td>Emergency relief assistance, including materials and support teams, provided directly to the (services of) the affected population with the help of funding from donor countries and donor agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind assistance</td>
<td>Donations that are done in goods and services rather than money or direct funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>European Civil Protection Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Evaluation of the situation after the disaster to gauge the needs of the population affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating States</td>
<td>States participating in the European Civil Protection Mechanism (i.e. EU Member States, plus Iceland, Lichtenstein, Norway as well as Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit country</td>
<td>A state through which territory an assisting state transports its disaster relief assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

When a call goes out for help after a disaster, the attention is rightly focused on the needs of the affected population and on the efforts the international relief community is making to provide assistance. Not many consider, however, how critical the preparations to receive such emergency assistance can be to the overall success of the operation.

Lessons learned from recent emergencies have shown that the effectiveness of relief operations can be enhanced not only by strengthening the response capabilities, but also by getting prepared for receiving foreign assistance. Host nation support, the concept already firmly established in the military, has only recently been gaining ground in the disaster relief context. Guidelines have been elaborated in several different fora to address the issue, which aim to help governments consider and eventually remove all foreseeable obstacles with the potential to hinder smooth relief operations on their territories.

The most recent initiative, the EU Host Nation Support Guidelines adopted in January 2012, whilst built on existing international recommendations and practices, specifically target the facilitation of assistance operations under the European Civil Protection Mechanism and thus improving solidarity amongst the Participating States. Third countries that are likely to request and receive assistance in case of need under this framework are also encouraged to take these non-binding guidelines into account.

Therefore, HNS has become one of the key subjects of the Programme, by being integrated both in the training curricula, in the planning of the exercises and in the workshop programme. This Study, as part of the overall awareness raising objective of the Programme, aims to depict the status quo within the Beneficiary countries, on which progress can be built, if necessary, to improve cooperation in future disaster relief operations.

To analyze the actual situation of the implementation of the HNS system in general in the Beneficiary countries, a careful approach has been chosen, having taken into account the scope of the work as well as both practical and political considerations. Information has been gathered from the countries themselves in different formats and from various open sources. It was also agreed that the Study should be as descriptive as possible, with the aim that it will serve as the main working document for the HNS workshops to draw general and individual (i.e. per country) conclusions and recommendations from.

The general findings of the Study are:

1. The level of preparedness in between the Beneficiary countries may vary just as much as it may vary in between the Participating States of the Mechanism and between the Beneficiary countries and the Participating States. Therefore, the general assumption that “civil protection and related administrative capacities (of the Beneficiaries) are on
average of much lower standard than those of the EU countries”³ is far from being proven.

2. Though differing standards and different levels of preparedness certainly exist to some extent, they may be attributed to the recent historical background of the region as well as to the different organizational and decision making structures of the Beneficiary countries.

3. While HNS as a system or concept has not been institutionalised in many Beneficiary countries, rules and practices pertaining to the same affect do exist and are considered, despite that most Beneficiaries have not obtained their own lessons learned from real emergencies in this respect.

4. Some areas of HNS, such as risk assessment and border crossing procedures are observed to be in place. It could, however, prove beneficial, if some further modalities to integrate international aid into the national coordination system could still be considered.

5. To better understand the importance of HNS and to develop a more solid HNS system in the region, field exercises targeting the issue of host nation support would be of great added value.

6. Present legislative and administrative procedures could well delay any significant short-term progress in HNS, even if there is enough political will to invest in it.

³ Programme’s Terms of Reference, point 1.4
5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Underlying assumptions

During the individual interviews some Beneficiaries made reservations regarding the intended purpose of the Study, namely that it “shall investigate the level of preparedness of beneficiaries for receiving international assistance during emergencies according to the HNS requirements and identify potential measures for improvement.” It is believed that this derives from the false general assumption that their “civil protection [...] capacities are [...] of much lower standard than those of the EU countries”.

It was argued that the Programme’s main objective to contribute to the development of the Beneficiaries’ capacities should not imply any scrutiny procedure, which would create the feeling that those referred standards not yet institutionalised at EU level should be already complied with by the Beneficiary countries or that the main purpose of the Study is to prove the above false assumption.

It was also noted, that though the EU had already launched the long process towards the adoption of the EU Host Nation Support Guidelines, these guidelines were not yet available when the Study concept was instigated in May 2011. Therefore, it was agreed that an assessment against these yet unknown guidelines specifically designed for operations under the European Civil Protection Mechanism, which most of the Beneficiaries are not participants in, would have resulted in the creation of double standards by a Programme not offering concrete immediate benefits, such as offers for accession to the Mechanism, for example.

All this said and taken into account, the issue had to be addressed in a sensitive manner and a politically correct approach had to be chosen, as presented below.

The contribution of the Beneficiaries to the Study has been voluntary. In a declaration, each country agreed to share the data they provided and also any eventual finding with the European Commission, with the other Beneficiary countries and with the Participating States.

5.2 Limitations

Since both the whole Programme and the EU Host Nation Guidelines focus on civil protection assistance operations, with special attention to the European Civil Protection Mechanism, HNS in relation to receiving humanitarian aid will not be covered by this Study.
Similarly, the Study concentrates on the phase of preparedness and first response activities and shall not touch early warning, risk reduction, prevention, long-term recovery and development-related assistance.

Though the different international guidelines and recommendations include the responsibilities of assisting states and organisations as well, it was understood that the main purpose of the Study is to describe the capacities of the Beneficiaries as host nations and transit countries.

Media handling and other public communication forms are not covered in this Study. Equally, preparation for interventions including assistance of military nature is not considered either. Relation to third parties, mainly engaged in humanitarian aid, such as NGOs and volunteers will not feature in this project.

The Study does not intend to evaluate the preparedness of the individual Beneficiary countries, nor does it aim to offer recommendations to them individually. It has been agreed that this shall rather be the main objective of the HNS workshops, where Beneficiaries shall be provided the opportunity to draw conclusions for them, based on their individual structure and needs as well as on the general recommendations.

5.3 What guidelines?

As various compilations of HNS-related guidelines and recommendations are in existence, it had to be decided first which set of them should be taken into consideration as baseline data for this Study. Mainly those major compilations were researched that have been deemed relevant and / or applicable for this work, such as for e.g. those covering subject matters relevant for civil protection assistance interventions, or are “products” of international organizations that the Beneficiaries are party to, or those already in practice in the Beneficiaries, etc. Therefore the followings have been considered:

- Council Conclusions on HNS 15874/10 and Work of the EU Commission expert sub-working group on HNS guidelines (status as of May 2011)
- IFRC Guidelines for the domestic facilitation and regulation of international disaster relief and initial recovery assistance (IDRL Guidelines)
- NATO Checklist and Non-Binding Guidelines for the Request, Reception and Provision of International Assistance in the Event of a CBN Incident or Natural Disaster
- INSARAG Guidelines (Sector D2, “Affected country responsibilities”)
- Oslo Guidelines (Art. 51-57)
Some sector-specific recommendations relevant to HNS were also studied, such as the Tampere Convention, the Istanbul convention on temporary admission and the 2006 Kyoto Convention on customs procedures.

Having examined these documents also in light of the scope of our work, it was concluded that none of the “general” ones could be used alone as baseline data, but a special set of “guidelines” were elaborated for the purposes of the Study. This consideration was also substantiated by the following considerations:

- The EU HNS guidelines were still under preparation. Also, most of the Beneficiary countries are not participants to the EUCPM, of which operations these guidelines focus on, and so they could not necessarily be aware of the ongoing works in this field at the EU level. Therefore it was questioned how relevant the available EU drafts could have been for the Study.

- The IDRL guidelines address a much wider spectrum of international disaster relief than civil protection assistance interventions cover. Also, they tend to approach the question rather from a legal than practical point of view.

- The INSARAG guidelines target operations of USAR teams only (though it is acknowledged, that these guidelines could easily be adapted to civil protection assistance interventions, too)

- The NATO Checklist misses some key-points

- The Oslo guidelines address the use of MCDA in disaster relief; the particularity of the involvement of such assets is highlighted in these guidelines

The following table summarizes the selected HNS-related issues that have been taken into account for this Study, also detailing in which other existing guidelines they appear, fully or partially, in the same or similar meaning. The table, and later on the country presentations will follow the heading structure of the lately adopted EU HNS Guidelines for easier reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMERGENCY PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Legal framework in place to deal with incoming assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Institutional and administrative framework in place to deal with incoming assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Decision making system in place with clearly identified responsibilities of key authorities, also in relation to incoming assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Study</td>
<td>EU HNS Guidelines</td>
<td>IDRL Guidelines</td>
<td>INSARAG Guidelines</td>
<td>Nato Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Needs assessment methodology in place to quickly assess situation and needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Information management system in place to share information with international actors (incl. maintenance of a national POC)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Ensure relevant training of personnel dealing with incoming international assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Prepare country profile to be handed over to incoming international teams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>All-sector risk assessment in place, incl. a gap (i.e. risks v. resources) analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Ensure accurate and timely situation and needs assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Use template for request for international assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Coordination structure in place to deal with incoming international assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>HNS Team / cell in place to assist incoming international teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Identify border crossing / entry points in advance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Waive visa requirements or grant visas for entry, exit and transit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Waive customs duties, taxes, tariffs for donated goods and equipment (incl. vehicles) of incoming teams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Waive or reduce inspection and administrative / documentation requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Prepare arrangements for in-country transport, incl. waive tariffs, taxes, tolls and other fees in relation to transport</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Reduce barriers to the import / export, transit and use of ICT equipment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Reduce barriers to the import / export, transit and use of medication and medical equipment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Reduce barriers to the import / export, transit and use of search dogs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Reduce barriers to the import / export, transit and use of hazardous material necessary for relief operations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Permit re-exportation of equipment (incl. search dogs, vehicles) and unused goods, even if donated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Ensure appropriate security and safety of international relief personnel, their equipment and relief consignments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.12 Plan for a Base of Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.13 Provide administrative support (office, admin. personnel, translation, equipment, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.14 Provide subsistence commodities (food, water, lodging, electricity, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.15 Provide medical support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 LEGAL AND FINANCIAL ISSUES

#### 4.1 Recognize professional qualifications and certificates of international relief personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 Recognize the legal status of personnel of assisting international actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3 Grant work permits where necessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4 Consider issues of liability for damage caused by relief personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5 Reduce barriers to the import / export and transit of funds and currencies necessary for the operations of international relief actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.6 Consider procedures to facilitate the reimbursement of the incoming assistance for in case of need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.7 Grant VAT-free / duty free status for disaster relief operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>EU HNS Guidelines</th>
<th>IDRL Guidelines</th>
<th>INSARAG Guidelines</th>
<th>NATO Checklist</th>
<th>Oslo Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.4 The three-step approach

In order to get the best possible overview of the state of play of HNS in the Beneficiaries, the following three-step approach was introduced:

First, a questionnaire was disseminated to each competent authority of the Beneficiary countries through a password protected area of the Programme’s website. This quantitative survey could also serve as a tool for raising awareness of the HNS issues, while it has provided the Programme with a basic overview of the HNS-related measures already implemented or considered. At this stage each question included in the questionnaire was general (i.e. not country-specific, but same for all countries) and direct, with only a few possible response options, to avoid requesting long, theoretic answers.

Next, based on the answers received for the questionnaire, a personalised interview was elaborated for each Beneficiary. These qualitative interview questions, more in depth, were specifically tailored for the system of each country. General follow-up questions to the questionnaire answers were combined with and confirmed by case-specific questions, based on a fictitious disaster scenario built up for this purpose. The Beneficiaries were presented all
questions well before the interview so that they could make all necessary preparations. Later
they were also asked to review the interview report.

Finally, the Study itself reflects both the findings from the previous two stages and information
gathered from open sources, such as legal acts and other strategic papers provided by the
Beneficiaries or documents researched on the internet.
6 HNS IN THE BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES

6.1 Albania
(Facts are endorsed as valid on 02 April 2012)

While it cannot be said that host nation support is conceptualized in Albania, a HNS framework does exist. Many HNS-related issues have been considered and legal provisions as well as institutional structures are also in place. The system could be tested during some recent emergencies\(^4\) where the Mechanism was activated. No lessons learned activity has focused, however, specifically on host nation support, which could have verified the existing procedures. On the other hand, Albania has reported\(^5\) that they did not experience major problems during past operations.

In the self-assessment exercise included in the online-questionnaire\(^6\) Albania has rated its HNS-related preparedness an average 4 points out of 5, which rating is supported by the fact that most laws and coordination structures proved necessary are being in place. This can facilitate quick decision making and quick operations; language barriers, however, in the Operational Directory for Civil Emergency Management and Control might result in some shortcomings while they deal with international actors.

Albania has an extensive knowledge of HNS-related works. Also, they have signed up or pledged to the most important ones, or, alternatively, they have introduced provisions pertaining to the same affect.

---

\(^4\) Flooding in January 2010 (Austria, France, Greece, and Slovenia assisted with teams and in-kind assistance, Italy transported sandbags from the WFP warehouse in Brindisi, an European Civil Protection Team with an associated UNDAC member were also dispatched). Flooding in December 2010 (Austria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Slovenia and Turkey delivered in-kind assistance and teams). Severe weather conditions in February 2012 (Luxembourg assisted with one helicopter to distribute medical and food supplies).

\(^5\) See Annex I, point 3.3 of the Questionnaire summary table

\(^6\) See Annex I, point 3.2 of the Questionnaire summary table

6.1.1 Emergency planning

Albania’s civil emergency planning and disaster management system is based on Law No. 8756 of 26 March 2001 on the Civil Emergency Services, detailing the roles and responsibilities of the different bodies (i.e. central and local level institutions, military and police forces, rescue services, etc.) involved in the permanent and temporary structures of the system, while it also gives the mandate for further regulations of different areas in secondary legislation\(^7\).
Most HNS-related provisions are stipulated in the *National Civil Emergency Plan of Albania* (NCEP), adopted by Council of Ministers Decree no. 835 of 03 December 2004, which covers the responsibilities of all sectors and all levels, in all phases, within the organization of the national structure of management of civil emergencies. Chapter 6 of the NCEP, dealing with the modalities of the Response phase considers the following areas related to HNS, though without providing practical details in some cases:

- coordination, including national and international response
- needs and damage assessment
- emergency telecommunications and transport
- emergency customs, immigration and border controls

Some sector-specific laws also have provisions affecting host nation support, such as for e.g., the laws for electronic communication, on state border control, on taxation, for the veterinary services, and on narcotics and psychotropic substances. Additionally, Albania has signed bilateral agreements\(^8\) on mutual disaster relief assistance, which cover most of the HNS issues.

The *Council of Ministers*, the *Inter-ministerial Committee for Emergency Situations* (IMC), the *Ministry of the Interior* and the *General Directorate for Civil Emergencies* (GDCE), key actors of emergency management, ensure that decisions are made, the activities of the different services are coordinated and the administrative structure necessary for the operations is functioning properly. The National Operations Centre, within GDCE, the information hub to collect, analyse and proceed all data on emergencies, serves also as the focal point for international cooperation.

According to 6.11 of the NCEP, some **standard needs assessment tools** are institutionalised and annexed to the NCEP:

- First Notification Report to be prepared by the Prefect
- First Disaster Information Report, to be prepared by the Joint Assessment Team
- Disaster Situation Report to OCHA

Also, Rapid Needs Assessment Reports are presented according to the Civil Emergency Manuals by the Joint Assessment Team\(^9\), if they are called in.

---

\(^7\) Such as, for e.g., *Decision No. 655. of 18 December 2002 on the establishment and functioning of the national structure on civil emergency planning and response* or *Decision No. 664 of 18 December 2002 on the criteria and procedures of proclamation of the civil emergency situation*.

\(^8\) Bilateral agreements in force are with Austria, Croatia, Greece and Italy, while agreements with Bosnia and Herzegovina, the fYR of Macedonia, Montenegro and Turkey are under preparation.

\(^9\) The Joint Assessment Team is established by the GDCE and composed of experts provided by the relevant ministries and institutions, such as for e.g. Ministries of Defense, Health, Agriculture and Food, Environment, Territory Regulation, Energy, the Albanian Red Cross, and the affected local bodies. The Team is lead by a specialist from the most appropriate institution according to the nature of the disaster. Assessment of damages in the infrastructure and buildings is also done by the Joint Assessment Team, which is then supported by experts of technical institutions.
6.1.2 Emergency Management

Situation and needs assessment is first and foremost the responsibility of the affected commune and it is done against locally available resources. In case of a large-scale disaster the Inter-ministerial Committee decide on the dispatching of a Joint Assessment Team.

In case state of emergency is declared by the Council of Ministers, the Council of Ministers, with the Prime Minister assuming the lead role, will decide on a request for international assistance. They are always advised by the Inter-ministerial Committee, which prepares the request and which is supported by the GDCE and the Head of Operations, determining the requirements of the international assistance, as well as by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs implementing the procedures. If no state of emergency is declared, the Ministry of Interior or the GDCE can directly contact international partners, especially bilateral ones, for any assistance request. In any case, the contact is always made through the GDCE with the use of nationally developed forms, annexed to the NCEP.

It is difficult to determine what those emergencies are that would certainly result in a wider request for international assistance. Also, no preference is set regarding to whom the request is primarily addressed; it is always decided on a case-by-case basis, mainly based on the wish for the most effective response. Previous cases show, however, that under the current system the decision on requesting international assistance is obtained fairly quickly within the national structures.

The NCEP discusses also the coordination structure in case of a larger scale emergency, where international assistance is most probable. In this case, the overall coordination of national and international response teams is the responsibility of the Inter Ministerial Committee (IMC), with the direct support and advise of the Head of Operations and the GDCE, as well as that of the UNDAC Team (or similar), if deployed in the country. An OSOCC or and OSOCC-like structure is most likely to be established, but the actual coordination framework for international assistance is decided on a case by case basis. Once the international team are appointed to its base of operations, it will work under the authority of the respective incident commander. To further facilitate coordination and their work, incoming international teams are, as general practice, assigned a liaison officer by the GDCE.

As for communication, English is considered as the main communication language in case of operations including assistance from abroad, if no other common language is identified. The liaison officers assigned to the team shall in all case master the working language chosen.
6.1.3 Logistics and transport

The general rule that urgent disaster relief assistance shall be processed with priority through the state borders is confirmed in various legal documents, such as the NCEP, the Law on Safety Controls and Supervision of the State Borders and the ratified NATO MoU on the facilitation of vital cross-border transport. In line with these rules visa and customs requirements are waived for incoming international teams, provided that the nature and the content of the consignment is properly marked and documented. As the assigned liaison officer is always provided as of border crossing to the international teams / relief items to facilitate border crossing, the likelihood of any malpractice to violate the rules is absolutely minimal.

Regarding the entry of search dogs, in the apparent absence of special provisions for emergency situations in this respect, the Law on veterinary services applies. It stipulates that animals crossing the state borders shall be documented by appropriate veterinary certificates, including list of vaccinations, and the animals will be subject to a veterinary control at the border crossing point.

To import drugs or narcotics, even in small quantities such as part of the equipment of a SAR team, a licence from the General Directorate for Pharmaceutics within the Ministry of Health needs to be obtained. In a large-scale emergency an expeditious clearance procedure can be established for such items, provided that the medical substances are clearly marked in the offer for assistance. Additionally, at all border crossing check-points a representative of the medical inspectorate is present, who can also facilitate the entry in case no clearance has been requested in advance.

As foreseen in the Tampere Convention, which is ratified by Albania, ICT equipment can be used without limitation. The Ministry of Innovation, Information Technology and Communication have the overall coordination role of emergency telecommunication, while additional support is provided by the Electronic and Postal Communication Authority (AKEP). The Law on Electronic Communication in the Republic of Albania foresees that some frequencies can be used without prior authorization in case of emergencies. Additionally, AKEP waive any taxes on the use of frequencies.

The DGCE is responsible for passing on all relevant information to the immigration, customs and border control authorities on the incoming relief assistance, which is normally done on the NATO templates (see EADRU SOPs) expected from international teams. Additionally, customs procedures also stipulate the necessary content information for border crossing with materials / equipment, and therefore, if this is presented, the use of the above mentioned forms is not necessary.

While equipment owned by the international teams can, in line with the Istanbul Convention, freely be re-exported, provided it is properly documented also at exit, Albania’s current
customs regulations do not allow, not even partially, the re-exportation of unused goods that were agreed to be donated and therefore have been exempt from customs duties.

Albania, being a host nation, assumes the responsibility for providing adequate security and safety measures for the international relief personnel, their equipment and for the relief shipments. Disaster sites are always secured by the police and access is granted only for those authorized. To facilitate speedy in-country transport, escort can be provided on request by the GDCE.

Albania does not expect incoming international teams to be self-sufficient. However, the decision on any logistical support bearing financial consequences is to be made by the Inter-ministerial Committee and / or the GDCE and therefore any request to this end has to be included in the assisting state’s offer in advance. Any other support needed will have to be covered by own expenses on site. In any case, logistical support, whether to be paid for or not, is provided from within the same structure as that for national intervention teams, and it is coordinated by the Head of Coordination at national level. If necessary, resources of the private sector (mainly transport means) can also be made available, based on pre-arranged contracts or on legislation14.

6.1.4 Legal and financial issues

Professional qualifications, licences and certificates of foreign disaster relief personnel to perform services are generally recognized with no additional certification procedure, unless serious doubt arises about their competencies.

Albania does not have a list of eligible international actors, though the NCEP specifically names, even if not in a set-up list, some international actors: donor countries and agencies, INSARAG accredited international SAR teams, UNDAC and the UN. On the other hand, this “list” does not seem to be exhaustive as assistance from other actors (i.e. the European Civil Protection Mechanism) has already been accepted on various previous occasions15. Additionally, the NCEP also discusses how to deal with unsolicited and / or unwanted assistance. As a general rule, all offers are considered in light of the actual needs, irrespective of the source. Some formalities, however, are expected to be respected; i.e. using official / diplomatic channels for the offer.

---

10 Law No. 9861
11 Law No. 9805 of 17 September 2007
12 Law No. 10465 of 29 September 2011
13 Law No. 9918 of 19 May 2008
14 See Council of Ministers’ Decision No. 654 of 18 December 2002 on the fees for temporary use of private vehicles by state authorities in emergency situation

16 See Council of Ministers’ Decision No. 654 of 18 December 2002 on the fees for temporary use of private vehicles by state authorities in emergency situation
The status of personnel of bilateral partners is clarified in the bilateral agreements. In the absence of specific regulations of this issue for in case of emergency response, corresponding legislation (e.g. on liability, etc.) applicable to own nationals, or otherwise relevant, will apply for the personnel of other actors.

See also Annex I, point 6.1 of the Questionnaire summary table

6.2 Bosnia and Herzegovina
(Facts are endorsed as valid on 19 June 2012)

According to the Dayton Agreement signed in December 1995, Bosnia and Herzegovina’s constitutional set-up and public administration system is largely characterized by decentralization, with powers transferred from the central government to the two autonomous entities, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Srpska, each having its own constitution, and to the Brčko District, governed under local government (hereinafter the “Entities” in this section).

This organisational structure is also reflected in the organisation of the civil protection / emergency management sector; the powers are shared between the state and the Entities, as defined in the Framework law on protection and rescue as well as the Law on ministries and other administrative bodies of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Consequently, competencies are also shared regarding host nation support.
As for the scope of this chapter, it must be noted that the Study will only discuss the HNS issues falling under the competence of the central government, mainly because it is the level responsible for strategic planning, internal coordination and international cooperation in the framework of protection and rescue. Those HNS areas that fall under the responsibility of the Entities will be clearly marked, without detailed discussion, in the absence of further research.

Bosnia and Herzegovina’s host nation support framework is defined by various legal measures already in place. The system could be tested in the second half of 2010 when the “Joint Response – Sarajevo 2010” exercise was organized and soon followed by devastating floods, triggering a request for international assistance. Additionally, between 28 May and 07 June 2012 Bosnia and Herzegovina hosted a big international table-top and field exercise, where HNS was one of the core issues to be exercised. Though HNS was not in the centre of lessons learnt activities, Bosnia and Herzegovina did draw conclusions from the past operations, experiencing problems with internal decision making, cooperation across sectors, common situational awareness, integration of international actors in the coordination structures, and with the quality of incoming assistance and the provision of logistical support.

In the self-assessment exercise included in the online-questionnaire Bosnia and Herzegovina has rated its HNS-related preparedness an average 3 points out of 5, which rating is supported by the following experiences and opinions:

- The current legislation is believed to cover all HNS areas, but it still needs to be exercised so that all stakeholders are properly prepared.
- The autonomous Entities having their own civil protection and rescue structures will be handed over the incoming international assistance, without any further intervention or supervision of the central / state level. (The Entities are obliged only to report to the Ministry of Security of BIH on the distributed assistance so that the legality of procedures can by reviewed by the Customs Authority audit.)
- Lines of communication vis-à-vis international actors as defined in the corresponding legislation regarding the distribution of competencies between the different ministries shall be better maintained (ref. 2010 Floods when the Turkish assistance was offered and provided through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs despite the Ministry of Security having the competence)
- The administrative procedures regarding customs clearance have proved to be cumbersome and need to be simplified.
- Storage facilities / cargo depots are just being established.
- Most administrative procedures are free of charge; fees are covered by the competent state authorities.
In general Bosnia and Herzegovina has a fairly good knowledge of HNS-related works. Also, they have signed up or pledged to some of the most important ones.

16 A civilian-military drill of response to a terrorist attack, organized by the Ministry of Security in cooperation with the Ministry of Defence, the OSCE Mission and the NATO HQ in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in September 2010.

17 Flooding in December 2010; the Mechanism was also activated (Austria, Slovenia and Turkey provided assistance).

18 “Shared Resilience – 2012” Exercise, a civil-military exercise, based on the Oslo guidelines. Several Beneficiary countries (Croatia, Montenegro, the FYR of Macedonia, Serbia) and the USA participated, while other Beneficiaries sent evaluators or observers.

19 See Annex I, point 3.3 of the Questionnaire summary table

20 See Annex I, point 3.2 of the Questionnaire summary table

6.2.1 Emergency planning

Bosnia Herzegovina’s protection and rescue system is built on the Framework Law of 15 May 2008 on protection and rescue of people and property from natural or other disasters in Bosnia and Herzegovina (hereinafter the “Framework Law” in this section), addressing also some HNS-related aspects, such as:

- When and how to request international assistance
- The responsibility regarding international cooperation
- Distribution of responsibilities between state and entity levels
- Authorization to adopt secondary legislation regarding international relief assistance

The country’s HNS concept is further framed by other legislative acts, such as the Guidance on border crossing for receiving international assistance, the SOPs for receiving and sending international assistance (SOPs) and several bilateral agreements on mutual disaster relief.

The Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Security, mainly via its Protection and Rescue Sector (hereinafter the “Sector” in this section) and the civil protection authorities of the Entities are the core institutions of the decision making and administrative structure to ensure the proper functioning of the protection and rescue system. The Operational and Communication Centre of Bosnia and Herzegovina – 112, within the Sector, is designated to be the national focal point to issue the requests / offers for international assistance. Additionally, BIH has developed a network of POCs among competent authorities in charge of reception of international assistance to better facilitate border crossing, entry visas, customs procedures, police support, coordination, etc.

There are no legal provisions in place on needs assessment methodology. On the other hand, however, the Methodology on Risk Assessment gives guidelines to all Entities on how to document the risks existing in their territory. Additionally, a state-level risk assessment
document has been recently adopted. Gap analysis (i.e. risks v. resources available) is usually done at entity-level.

Bilateral agreements in force are with Croatia, the fYR of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia.

In the Republic of Srpska the Republic Civil Protection Administration of the Ministry of Interior, in the Federation of BiH the Federal Civil Protection Administration, in Brčko District the Public Safety Department.

6.2.2 Emergency Management

Situation and needs assessment lies within the competence of the affected Entity and is generally done by their civil protection / rescue organisation. When they exhaust their available capacities and capabilities to cope with the consequences they report their needs to the state level, which can activate the armed forces or the international partners, if necessary.

Once in case of a disaster state of emergency is declared by the Council of Ministers, the Council of Ministers, advised by the Coordinating Body for Protection and Rescue and the Ministry of Security, will decide on a request for international assistance. The contact then is always made through the Sector, via the Operational and Communication Centre of Bosnia and Herzegovina – 112 with the use of forms similar to the NATO (EADRU) forms, being part of the SOPs.

In case of a larger scale emergency that goes beyond the response capacity of the affected Entity and where international assistance is most probable the strategic coordination will be ensured by the Ministry of Security via the Sector. This practically means maintaining contacts with international partners, ensuring that the accepted offers match the reported needs and that the incoming assistance reaches its destination. To this end, a liaison officer, a staff member of the Sector will facilitate border crossing and custom clearance procedures. Also, the Sector is currently considering the establishment of special units, composed of experts of relevant bodies (i.e. customs, taxation, immigration, etc.) to assist incoming international teams and consignments. Operational coordination, on the other hand, including the integration of the international forces into the on-site operation, remains with the Entity in question, and is performed in line with their own legal framework.

As for communication, English is considered as the main communication language in case of operations including assistance from abroad, if no other common language is identified. This issue could, however, certainly cause problems. Once the international teams are handed over to the affected Entity being the responsible for the operations, it is not possible that the liaison officer provided by the Sector joins the international team, due to the independence of the Entity in question.
6.2.3 Logistics and transport

Border crossing for relief personnel being citizens of EU Member States, bilateral partners and NATO EAPC countries is not considered to be an issue as they enjoy visa-free-entry status in general. Should intervention team members of any other assisting country need entry visa, it will be facilitated by the Sector in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on a case-by-case basis. Disaster relief goods and equipment are all exempt from customs duties, taxes and any similar fees. On the other hand, however, some customs procedures need to be followed, which can, admittedly, be cumbersome for the moment, as experiences also proved. Reception at the border crossing point chosen by the sending nation entails only a brief inspection of the assistance and equipment items announced in advance. Should further inspections be necessary that cannot be done on spot, the border crossing or customs authorities will refer the consignment to another border crossing point. Customs procedures proper are, however, completed at regional taxation checkpoints, where all consignments with no exception are obliged to proceed first before heading towards the final destination. To facilitate procedures, the assigned liaison officer is at the disposal of the team as of the border crossing, which also decreases the likelihood of any malpractice or violation of rules by the relevant authorities.

Regarding the entry of search dogs, most bilateral agreements contain provisions on the necessary documentation required for expeditious entry. No information has been received, on the other hand, concerning the clearance procedure for dogs of other teams.

To import drugs or narcotic as part of the equipment of a SAR team proper documentation is necessary.

As foreseen in the Tampere Convention, which is ratified by Bosnia and Herzegovina, no significant restrictions are imposed on the use of ICT equipment. Should any restriction apply for any reason (for e.g. restriction on photography around infrastructure or military facilities, etc.), it will be properly indicated.

Incoming assistance is expected to be documented on templates similar to the NATO (EADRU) forms, which contain all obligatory information necessary for border crossing with equipment, vehicles, animals, etc. Bilateral agreements also stipulate compulsory list of content.

In line with the Istanbul Convention equipment of international relief teams and unused goods can freely be re-exported. The SOPs cover how donations are to be handled; the unused goods shall be retained by the Taxation Authority BiH in its warehouse until the administrative procedures for the eventual re-exportation are finalized.

Bosnia and Herzegovina expects the international relief teams to take care for the personal safety of individual team members (such as for e.g. adequate safety equipment, own medication, etc.), while all other security measures will be provided by the host nation, as planned on a case-by-case basis by the police directorate. The state-level police, within the
Ministry of Security are also responsible for providing escort to the affected area. Once on site, the police forces of the independent Entity are to ensure safety of the team, except for cases when for e.g. the base of operations is provided within a military compound.

Bosnia and Herzegovina expects incoming international teams to be self-sufficient for a period of more than 7 days. After this period elapses, certain logistical support can be provided (such as for e.g. office support, healthcare, transportation, electricity) by the host nation. As a general rule, according to the SOPs, the provision of logistical support remains with the Sector (i.e. state-level), however, no modalities have been yet implemented, also due to the sharing of responsibilities between state- and entity-level and its consequences on the practicalities.

6.2.4 Legal and financial issues

No report has been received whether Bosnia and Herzegovina has considered yet the recognition of professional qualifications, licences and certificates of foreign disaster relief personnel to perform services. It can be assumed that personnel of bilateral partners and of relief actors with international reputation (i.e. for e.g. INSARAG-certified USAR teams) are given the credit to work in their profession during the operations without any administrative formalities.

Bosnia and Herzegovina has not seen the need so far to consider the issue of setting up an official list of eligible international actors. Offers in reply to a request for international assistance is believed to be assessed in light of the reported needs only, but some procedures regarding host nation support may vary depending on the source of the offer (for e.g. offer from a private company shall come through the official channels to be considered).

The status of personnel of bilateral partners is clarified in the bilateral agreements. The status of personnel (incl. liability) of other assisting actors has not yet been considered.
6.3 Croatia

(Facts are endorsed as valid on 22 March 2012)

The HNS system, including legal provisions and institutional structures, is well established in Croatia. Though – luckily – it has not been tested by real emergencies, various exercises\textsuperscript{25} have been organized recently that allowed gathering lessons learned in relation to HNS and fine-tuning of the system.

In the self-assessment exercise included in the online-questionnaire\textsuperscript{26} Croatia has rated its HNS-related preparedness an average 4 points out of 5, which can be substantiated by the following facts:

- There is a solid legal framework in place, verified regularly by different types of exercises and trainings
- SOPs for internal communication and structure are adopted
- Administrative and operational capacity are adjusted to needs
- The self-sufficiency requirements for assisting states are taken into account when logistical support is arranged
- Arrangements with private companies involved are still to be developed (e.g. airports / highway authorities, to waive tolls or fees, to establish 24/7 contact points, etc.)

Croatia has an extensive knowledge of HNS-related works. Also, they have signed up or pledged to the most important ones\textsuperscript{27}, or, alternatively, they have introduced provisions pertaining to the same affect.

Furthermore, Croatia plans to further enhance its HNS system, taking into account the new EU HNS guidelines. The following measures are envisaged:

- Identification of entry points
- Development of TOR for HNS related positions
- Verification of the system in place as regards the different types of assistance and assistance coming from outside the EU and from bilateral partners

\textsuperscript{25} Following the “Taming the dragon – Dalmatia 2002” and IDASSA 2007 exercises in the framework of NATO, including at each exercise approx. 600 international personnel, the Protection and Rescue Act of 2004 gave the mandate for a special decree specifically on HNS (Decree on crossing national border while sending / receiving international assistance in emergency situations), adopted in 2006. National exercise “HALO 2008” tested the “SOP for coordination between national authorities while sending/receiving international assistance in case of emergency situations” in case of Croatia being a transit state and a state sending international assistance. During the IPA Programme Lot 2 Exercise “SI QUAKE 2011”, HR facilitated some other participating states’ teams’ transit to the exercise site in Slovenia.

\textsuperscript{26} See Annex I, point 3.2 of the Questionnaire summary table

\textsuperscript{27} See Annex I, point 4 of the Questionnaire summary table
6.3.1 Emergency planning

Croatia’s HNS system is framed by a set of legal documents and practices based on international guidelines. Eleven bilateral agreements have been signed on mutual disaster relief assistance, covering all the HNS related aspects. The Protection and Rescue Act, in force since December 2004, defines the protection and rescue system, including, amongst others, the tasks of the command and coordination bodies, the activities of the operational communication centre – 112 and provisions for international cooperation.

The Protection and Rescue Act gives mandate for the special Decree on crossing national border while sending / receiving international assistance in emergency situations (hereinafter the Decree in this section), a piece of secondary legislation detailing coordination, communication and border crossing rules in case of disaster relief assistance. The SOPs for coordination between national authorities while sending / receiving international assistance in emergency situations (hereinafter the SOPs in this section) further stipulates the responsibilities of all participants, the communication and coordination lines in between them as well as the specific procedures for sending, receiving and “processing” transiting international assistance. The coordination structure in case international teams are also present in the operations is covered by these SOPs, too.

The decision making, coordination and administrative structure is based on the following key players: the Government, the National Protection and Rescue Headquarter (National HQ, i.e. the LEMA), composed of appointed members from government institutions as well as several NGOs, and the National Protection and Rescue Directorate (NPRD). All major communication goes through the National 112 Centre within the NPRD, which also serves as the POC for international actors.

No standardized needs assessment methodology is in place, but established working procedures exist. Assessment always takes into account the relevant hazard mapping / risk assessment documents, which also include the response capacity available. Additionally, disaster damage assessment is institutionalized, mainly for reimbursement purposes.

28 Bilateral agreements signed with Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, and Hungary, the FYR of Macedonia, Montenegro, Poland, Russia, Slovakia and Slovenia. Agreements under preparation are with Bulgaria, Jordan and Serbia.

29 The Ministry of Finance is responsible for damage assessment. The purpose is to grant symbolical financial assistance to the affected populations, which has to be justified by reconstruction works. The declaration of a state of emergency is a prerequisite.

6.3.2 Emergency management

Situation and needs assessment in case of a disaster is performed by various actors from local level up in the protection and rescue system, with the national authority, the NPRD always monitoring how the situation evolves from the beginning.
The Prime Minister gives the final word on behalf of the whole Government regarding the request for international assistance. He/she has the right to make the decision alone, but he is usually advised by the NPRD General Director and the National HQ. It is difficult to predict how quickly a decision can be made as there has been no need to request for assistance recently. It also depends on the type of emergency; in case of quick-onset disaster in an urban area decision is made quickly, while for slow-onset disasters constant monitoring allows for being better prepared, also in terms of preparing a request for assistance. Additionally, Croatia has a preference for bilateral assistance, but all decisions depend on the actual needs.

For the moment NATO forms (see EADRU SOPs) are used as templates for requesting international assistance. On the other hand, the content is much more important; the information to be included in a request is set by the above mentioned Decree. As the EU guidelines are adopted, both forms will be used, depending on the communication channel.

Art. 14-15 of the Decree defines the general framework on how to integrate international assistance into the national coordination structure. The incoming international assistance is usually coordinated by the International Cooperation Department of NPRD or by an OSOCC-type coordination body formed from national resources (i.e. the National HQ). The National 112 Centre serves as communication hub also for international teams. The establishment of an OSOCC (in its proper sense, i.e. established by international actors) is considered only as an exceptional practice, i.e. only in case of a really big disaster. In this case, a liaison officer from the National HQ will work within the OSOCC to facilitate both coordination and communication. Once the international team is assigned the task by the National HQ, they will work under the command of the respective incident / on-site commander. Additionally, as a general practice, all incoming international teams could be assigned a liaison officer to facilitate both communication and coordination.

As for communication, English is considered as the main communication language in case of operations including assistance from abroad, unless other common language is identified. The on-site commander under whose direction the international teams are assigned should know English, otherwise a translator is provided. During exercises it has been tested to engage language students for the role of translators, which practice shall yet be tested during real interventions, too.

6.3.3 Logistics and transport

According to Art. 3. of the Decree, urgent disaster relief assistance shall be given a priority while crossing the state borders. Visas, if necessary, can be issued expeditiously, exceptionally even at border crossing points. Customs duties and related fees are waived for the relief items.
and for the equipment of international intervention teams, provided that all items are well documented. As entry is always facilitated by a representative of NPRD (or of its local office), the likelihood of any misconduct or violation of these rules are practically non-existent.

The Decree contains provisions regarding the necessary **documentation** for search **dogs** and emergency medication, which must be presented at the border crossing point. **Drugs** containing narcotics can be imported only in quantities required for emergency medical assistance. Though Croatia is not party to the Tampere Convention, emergency **ICT equipment**, provided that it is properly documented, can be imported and used without limitation. The only exception is the use of own radio frequencies as they may interfere with the frequencies of national authorities. Therefore, to facilitate radio communication, Croatia has spared free frequencies for international disaster relief teams, which can be distributed in case of need.

Regarding the documentation necessary for the entry of relief personnel and the imported items, for the moment the NATO templates (see. EADRU SOPs) are used. It is, however, agreed with the border crossing authorities that the content is more important than the format and therefore all documents are accepted that contain the obligatory basic information identifying the entering personnel, animals and goods.

Goods, even if donated but not used can be re-exported without special procedures or charges, provided that documentation proves their nature. Actually, customs procedures are simpler in case of **re-exportation** than if the donation remains in the country.

Croatia considers that the proper **security and safety** of relief personnel, their equipment and relief consignments is the responsibility of the host nation. In case of security constraints, security advice is provided by the representative of the police in the National HQ. **Escort** to speed up in-country transport is always provided, either by the police or NRPD, to / from the highways. In case of transiting assistance, escort is available only on request.

Regarding the **logistical support** to be provided by the host nation, Croatia requests that the recommendations regarding self-sufficiency, as strongly advocated at different fora, are properly taken into account by the assisting state. They expect that all incoming international teams are self-sufficient for 3-7 days. In general, technical / ICT support, administrative / office support, healthcare, interpretation, electricity and other non-food items can be provided free of charge, while lodging, water, food and fuel shall be paid for.

The operational cell of the National HQ is responsible for dealing with international teams, both in terms of operations and logistics-related requests. Should an OSOCC eventually be established, it shall deal with the request via the liaison officer assigned to it.

To provide logistical services for national intervention teams, standard procedures are in place, whose application may be extended to international teams, too, if feasible. Under these terms, private companies are not obliged to provide services free of charge, not even in case of state
of emergency; their services are always paid for. Invoices are to be settled on spot, either by credit cards, if the electronic payment system is functioning, or by cash; local currency and euro are both accepted.

6.3.4 Legal and financial issues

Professional qualifications, licences and certificates of foreign disaster relief personnel to perform services are generally recognized with no additional certification procedure. Medical personnel can provide basic healthcare, especially if they are part of a certified USAR team.

Croatia does not have an established list of eligible international actors. As a general rule, anyone can enter Croatia with valid documents; no restrictions apply in case of a major emergency, but eased border crossing procedure apply only for those invited. Also, access to the disaster area is tried to be limited to those invited only. The actual HNS concept does not envisage the provision of assistance from NGOs and private companies, unless they are offered and accepted through official channels.32

The status of personnel of bilateral partners is clarified in the bilateral agreements. It is, however, not considered for the personnel of other international relief actors. This also applies for issues concerning the liability for damage caused by relief personnel.

31 See details included in Annex I, point 7.6 of the Questionnaire summary table
32 See also Annex I, point 6.1 of the Questionnaire summary table
6.4 Kosovo*

*(Facts are endorsed as valid on 17 May 2012)*

Kosovo’s administrative system is largely determined by a very complex political and constitutional set-up, which is rooted in the country’s recent history and which must be at the forefront of any attempt to understand its emergency management organisation as well, including the HNS-related arrangements.

First and foremost it must be noted, that, despite all recent political development, the UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) no. 1244/99 (hereinafter the “Resolution” in this section), which placed Kosovo under transitional UN administration and authorised a NATO-lead peacekeeping force, the Kosovo Force (KFOR), is still in force. The United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) was tasked, amongst others, to perform basic civilian administrative functions and coordinate humanitarian and disaster relief of all international agencies.

Following the declaration of independence in February 2008, Kosovo enacted a new Constitution in June 2008, which grants Kosovo authority over civil emergency response within its territory. Consequently, primary legislation has been adopted and institutions have been set up also in this field of public administration, which already frame a certain structure of emergency management, even if still incipient.

Last, but not least, the situation is further complicated by the presence and “supervision” of numerous international actors that may well have a role in response, should a major disaster occur. The UNMIK still monitors the police, justice and civil administration enforcement, once its “responsibility”, which have been handed over to the institutions of Kosovo, assisted in these fields now by the EU’s EULEX mission, including police and civilian resources to advice on strengthening the rule of law. The NATO-led KFOR provide an international security presence in Kosovo; its mandate initially included also the support to be provided to the international humanitarian effort in case of need, coordinated by the UNMIK.

Kosovo admittedly has no host nation support framework in place; it has not yet been considered as a concept. On the other hand, some legislation and basic structure do already exist, which may provide for HNS-related arrangements in case of an emergency operation involving incoming international actors. The existing system, however, has not yet been tested; no major civil protection exercise has been yet organised, mainly for financial reasons. Therefore, Kosovo could not rate its HNS-related preparedness in the self-assessment exercise included in the online-questionnaire.

In general Kosovo has to further study the available HNS-related works before any progress can be made in this field. Furthermore, the political environment will have to change before they
are able to fully sign up or pledge officially to any international platform with relation to host nation support.

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

32 It has also consequence on Kosovo’s status; while Kosovo is provided autonomy within Serbia (which legally succeeded the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia), Serbia’s territorial integrity was affirmed by the Resolution.

33 See Annex I, point 3.2 of the Questionnaire summary table

6.4.1 Emergency planning

Kosovo’s core legal act pertaining to emergency management is the Law for protection against natural and other disasters\(^35\) revised in October 2011, which establishes the institutional framework and specifies the mandates and responsibilities of both the central and local level government bodies in disaster preparedness and response. The Law on the establishment of the Kosovo Security Council\(^36\) of June 2008 describes the role of the Kosovo Security Council in case of a declared state of emergency.

The Integrated Emergency Management System (IEMS), strongly influenced by the United States and adopted in May 2010, serves as a guidance to all actors at all levels of government, to nongovernmental organizations and also to the private sector to conduct a well-integrated and effective emergency management and incident response operation. It is complemented by the National Response Plan (hereinafter NRP in this section), adopted in December 2010, which provides and further clarifies the structure and mechanisms for emergency operations.

While the bilateral agreements on mutual disaster relief\(^37\) in place may cover HNS-related provisions, none of the above mentioned pieces of legislation considers real involvement of international actors in Kosovo’s emergency management system. According to point 6.4 of the NRP International plans may exist to support the NRP, but no information could be gathered on their exact nature and whether they have already been adopted or not.

The institutional and administrative structure of national emergency management is based on the following key players: the Government, the Kosovo Security Council, and the Emergency Management Agency (EMA) under the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA). Communication is ensured via the network of Emergency Operations Centres – 112 of the EMA and the Situation Centre of the Office of the Prime Minister. These are responsible for providing situational updates, based on the inputs from all relevant stakeholders, and for the coordination of the Kosovo-wide operational response activities.

There are no legal provisions in place on needs assessment methodology. On the other hand, however, damage assessment is stipulated in Art. 90 of the Law for Protection against Disasters, most probably for financial / recovery related purposes. Special committees are responsible for damage assessment, comprising of experts, representative of public
administrations, local communities, public services and insurance companies. Methodologies for damage assessment are adopted by the Government, on the proposal of MIA on a case-by-case basis.

[35] Nr. 2006/02/L-68
[36] Nr. 2008/03-L050
[37] Bilateral agreements in force are with Albania and the fYR of Macedonia

6.4.2 Emergency Management

The Emergency Response Team’s Advanced element (ERT-A), under development, is tasked with situation and needs assessment. They are deployed in the early phase of the incident; partly to work directly with the affected municipalities to gather as much information on the effects of the incidents and as quickly as possible, and, also, to identify the eventual need for extra resources to be drawn either from the neighbouring regions or the central level.

Once in case of a disaster state of emergency is declared by the President of Kosovo, the Kosovo Security Council, exercising executive authority and responsibility of the Government will decide on a request for international assistance. In this case the Situation Centre is responsible for facilitating the issuance of the request to other countries and/or relevant international organisations. If state of emergency is not declared, the MIA is the coordinator to deal with “incidents of national nature” (i.e. incidents with serious consequences that require a coordinated and effective response by an appropriate combination of all-level governmental, non-governmental and private sector entities), according to the NRP. It can advise the Government to request international assistance and issue the request to international partners, should a positive decision on this matter be made. For the moment, no standard form is established for this purpose.

It is difficult to predict how quickly a decision on the need for international assistance can be made with the existing structures. But compared to 2007, when during the wide-spread forest fires the administrative rules made it fairly cumbersome to issue a request quickly, the situation has definitely improved with the current simplified provisions and practices. Additionally, the following situations could potentially lead to a request for assistance: great earthquake in an urban area, CBRN incident, localized HAZMAT accident to be tackled with special equipment and technical expertise.

In the event of declared state of emergency the highest level strategic coordination will be ensured by the Kosovo Security Council, composed of the President, the Prime Minister and the ministers of the Government, plus, in advisory capacity, the Director of the Kosovo Intelligence Agency, the President’s and the Prime Minister’s Senior Security Advisors, the
General Director of the Kosovo Police, the Commander of the Kosovo Security Force and the General Director of EMA.

Operational coordination is the task of the Inter-Institutional Group for Incident Management (IGIM), activated by MIA. This is a multi-institutional coordinating entity at the central office that assists the strategic managements. The IGIM’s composition is decided on a case-by-case basis, based on the nature, the severity and the complexity of the incident. Additionally, a Joint Field Centre (JFC) is established to coordinate governmental, non-governmental and private sector operations and mechanism. It has a flexible structure to be adapted to the nature of the incident, but in all cases it incorporates the following functions: management, operations, planning, logistics and finance/administration.

Though the existing structures provide plenty of possibilities regarding the involvement of incoming (i.e. not yet present in the country) international relief actors into the coordination arrangement, this issue has not yet been looked into. The set-up of an OSOCC has not yet been considered either; this, however, can be reasoned with the United Nations Kosovo Team, involving 14 UN agencies, funds and programmes, being still in place to provide support to the country. It is assumed that this would take up the lead in coordination should additional international support be requested.

As for communication, English is considered as the main communication language in case of operations including assistance from abroad, if no other common language is identified. Should the need arise, translators can most probably be provided, without any major difficulty.

6.4.3 Logistics and transport

According to the UN Resolution Kosovo is not yet permitted to establish visa restrictions. Relief personnel arriving by air or on road from neighbouring countries, except for Serbia, can freely enter Kosovo, with valid travel documents. Disaster relief goods and equipment are all exempt from customs duties, taxes and any similar fees. In theory, an assigned liaison officer is at the disposal of the incoming team as of the border crossing to facilitate procedures, which also decreases the likelihood of any malpractice or violation of rules by the relevant authorities.
Regarding the entry of search **dogs**, no other documentation than the internationally accepted vaccination certificates are requested for border crossing.

**To import drugs** or narcotic as part of the equipment of a SAR team proper documentation is necessary. In case of regular medication no extra border crossing / customs formalities are followed. If special medicines are transported, the advice of the health institute will have to be requested before entry can be authorized.

No information has been obtained on any restriction regarding the use of **ICT equipment** by international teams.

Incoming assistance is not yet expected to be documented on **templates**, as no form has yet been institutionalised. On the other hand, the use of already existing forms can be adopted into practice without any further need to change the existing legislation.

Contrary to the answer received in the online questionnaire, it was confirmed during the interview that the equipment of international relief teams and unused goods can freely be **re-exported**.

It is not clear who would be responsible for the **security** of incoming international relief teams in Kosovo, mainly for the reason of no relevant experience. Escort is by default provided for VIPs for security reasons, and most probably it could also be provided for relief consignments as well, if requested.

Kosovo has not yet considered whether international relief teams shall be self-sufficient or not, mainly for no experience in this field. In theory certain **logistical support** could be provided in case of need (such as water, food, fuel, transportation, office / administrative support, etc.). The logistical cell of the JFC could take the request and forward it to the EMA.

### 6.4.4 Legal and financial issues

While the recognition of **professional qualifications, licences and certificates** is in general subject to an additional certification procedure, most probably this rule does not apply to aid providers arriving for short-term operations. International driving licences are accepted without any limitation and so is the case with foreign national driving licences if the holder of it does not stay longer than 3 months.

Kosovo has not yet experienced any need to consider the issue of setting up an official list of **eligible international actors**. For the moment, the following practice can be considered valid: internationally certified / recognised teams can enter in case of a “general” (i.e. not addressed to specific partners) request for international assistance.
The **status of personnel** of international relief actors is not specified by legislation. On the other hand, once operating in the country, they are considered as all Kosovar citizens, especially as regards liability for their actions, both professional and private.

39 Still to be confirmed
40 See also Annex I, point 6.1 of the Questionnaire summary table
6.5 The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

(This section was reviewed by PRD on 11 June 2012)

Based on the findings of the research resulting in this Study, it can be concluded that the disaster management system of the fYR of Macedonia is largely characterized by a certain dualism\(^{41}\), which mainly manifests in legislation and in the partition of responsibilities, but sometimes also in the use of terminology. Though the basic laws provide an overarching regulatory foundation, they also seem to set contradictions and overlapping mandates amongst institutions, which has the potential to hinder effective response in practice. Consequently, the arrangements pertaining to host nation support are not clear-cut either.

This unique dual system could best be perceived by the following characteristics:

1. The implied distinction in between “emergency situations”\(^{42}\) and “crisis situations” has a great influence on the applicable legislation and the task distribution amongst the two main responsible organisations. Whilst the definition of a “crisis situation” is included in the Law on Crisis Management, any other situation of “endangerment” by natural or other disasters can be considered as “simple” emergency situation. The major difference is presumed to lie in the level of seriousness of the incident in question (i.e. as stated in Art. 3. of the Law on Crisis Management a “crisis situation shall mean a situation caused by risks and dangers that can jeopardise the goods, the health and lives of the people and animals and the security of Republic, for the [...] handling of which the use of a larger scope of resources is necessary”) as well as in the fact that a crisis situation has always to be declared by the Government.

\(^{41}\) PRD does not agree that the described dualism characterizes the disaster management system in the fYR of Macedonia. They argue, that their protection and rescue system is organized as a “unique system for detection and prevention of the occurrence and removal of consequences of the natural and other disasters, providing assistance in peace, state of emergency and in wartime. The protection and rescue represents linked planning process, programming, organizing, leading, coordinating, implementing, financing and monitoring of timely and effective prevention as well as preparation, action and removal of reasons and consequences caused by natural and other disasters.”

\(^{42}\) The “emergency situation” described hereby shall not be understood as the “state of emergency” set by Art. 125-126. of the Constitution of the fYR of Macedonia, which stipulates “A state of emergency exists when major natural disaster or epidemics take place. A state of emergency on the territory of the Republic of Macedonia or on part thereof is determined by the Assembly [...] During a state of war or emergency, the Government, in accordance with the Constitution and law, issues decrees with the force of law.” The Law on Protection and Rescue defines “natural disasters” (i.e. “events caused by uncontrolled effects of natural forces that endanger lives, ... etc.”) and “other disasters” (i.e. “events that come as a result of certain oversight and errors in the execution of daily economic and other activities”).

2. The dualism is also reflected in the disaster management legislation. The Law of Protection and Rescue of 2004 specifies the establishment and organisation of a protection and rescue system, including provisions on risk assessment, planning and the protection and rescue facilities. The Law on Crisis Management of 2005 sets basis for the crisis management system, focusing on the prevention of, preparedness for and
mitigation of the more “interdisciplinary” crisis situations. The main difference is observed to cover coordination-related issues in theory. While in our perspective the Law on Crisis Management sets the principles for strategic coordination without defining the operational resources of response, the Law on Protection and Rescue is rather dealing with tactical coordination and with the management of intervention forces in the given situations. In practice, however, the related division of competencies of responsible institutions does not seem to fully materialize, mainly due to the differing interpretation of mandates given by these pieces of legislation.

3. The institutional framework is also found segmented. The crisis management system (CMS) becomes “activated” only in case of a declared crisis situation. On the other hand, however, the CMS and its core institution, the Crisis Management Centre (CMC) has responsibilities to lead the nation-wide risk assessment and to collect information on any incident via its unique 24/7 operational centre also in a non-crisis case. While the CMS provides a platform for cross-sector coordination in case of a declared crisis situation, coordination of involved bodies does not seem to be a clear-cut issue in case of a non-crisis situation, since the Main Headquarters within the Protection and Rescue Directorate is responsible only for protection and rescue activities, explicitly listed in Art. 61. of the Law for Protection and Rescue.

Whilst the protection and rescue system seems to be involved in the CMS, the Protection and Rescue Directorate (PRD), being a separate legal entity as governmental organisation, is not subordinate\(^43\) in any way to the CMC. Furthermore, one of the most important features of PRD is its responsibility to manage the protection and rescue forces\(^44\), including its rapid response teams, the core assets of the national protection and rescue system.

This obvious overlapping of jurisdiction among some elements of the crisis management system and the protection and rescue system, as detailed above, as well as the not-well defined connection in between the two also has, without doubt, significant effects on the host nation support arrangements. During the research information was gathered both from CMC and PRD. Should the opinion of them on the same subject matter happen not to be consistent, both positions will be retained so as that the actual status quo is better clarified.

\(^43\) Both CMC and PRD are independent state authorities, reporting directly to the Government. Each of them is headed by a director, appointed by the Government for 4 years.

\(^44\) PRD disagrees that one of the most important tasks of PRD is to manage operational forces. PRD’s responsibilities include, among others, the following: a) develops plans for protection and rescue; b) develops threat assessments of natural and other disaster in cooperation with competent state authorities; c) organizes develops and manages the protection and rescue system, d) provides for timely engagement and effective use of the regional protection and rescue forces as well as of the fast response teams; e) provides for in-kind commodities to cover protection and rescue needs; f) supervises the protection and rescue forces’ preparedness; g) organizes and implements trainings and exercises for the protection and rescue needs; h) plans and implements international cooperation in the field of protection and rescue; i) participates in damage inspection activities; j) keeps databases of all resources for all risks.
As for the functioning of the existing host nation support arrangements, the first big experience since the establishment of the above mentioned institutions was obtained during the 2007 forest fires, where crisis situation was declared by the government and the Mechanism was also activated. In the meantime, the gaps in the coordination structure revealed during a national exercise just before this disaster were being rectified; the “Procedures for coordination and cooperation of the Crisis Management Centre with international organisations, institutions and individuals in crisis situations” was prepared by CMC in 2009. Also, in November 2011, the national DALGA table-top exercise aimed to test the SOPs for communication, coordination and cooperation amongst the crisis management system stakeholders, which included a HNS segment.

The research has revealed that the two institutions dissent regarding the lessons learned; whilst PRD reported to have experienced problems related to internal decision making, cooperation across sectors, common situational awareness, and with the quality of incoming assistance, CMC declared no negative experience at all.

In the self-assessment exercise included in the online-questionnaire the institutions’ ratings of their country’s HNS-related preparedness approximate, with an average 3.25 points out of 5. This is supported by the following opinions:

A) PRD:
- Most laws and strategic documents are in place to cover HNS. All bilateral agreements include the HNS-related aspects.
- All employed personnel are qualified and the number is rising. However this could lead to shortage of office space.
- Some resources are still needed for effective response: for e.g. PRD has no 24/7 operational centre established, but all PRD staff is on call for the moment.

B) CMC:
- Certain gaps may be experienced in providing proper logistics support for international teams
- Specific training shall be provided for those personnel dealing with international teams
- A pool of trained liaison officers needs to be set up
- The existing list of resources needs to be updated once the current risk mapping is completed

The institutions report to be familiar with most of the HNS-related works, of which many the fYR of Macedonia have signed up or pledged to.

45 See Annex I, point 3.3 of the Questionnaire summary table
46 See Annex I, point 3.2 of the Questionnaire summary table
47 See Annex I, points 4.3 and 4.4
6.5.1 Emergency planning

The fYR of Macedonia’s disaster management system is built on the Law on Crisis Management and the Law on Protection and Rescue. The most detailed HNS-related provisions are, however, included in other legislative acts, such as the bilateral agreements and the Standard Operating Procedures for crisis situations, adopted as secondary legislation.

The decision making and administrative structure seems to also be determined by the above mentioned dualism. While the governmental Steering Committee, composed of different ministries and other relevant state services, assumes responsibility for coordination in a crisis situation with the operational backing of the non-permanent Headquarters within the Crisis Management Centre, the Protection and Rescue Directorate is in charge of the protection and rescue activities also in a “non-crisis” emergency of any scale. In this latter case, coordination is ensured via the Main Headquarters established on the basis of the Law on Protection and Rescue and activated by the Director of PRD. On the other hand, only CMC has a 24/7 alert and operations centre; its role and relation with PRD, however, is not clarified for in case of a non-crisis situation.

There are no legal provisions in place on needs assessment methodology. On the other hand, Art. 144. of the Law on Protection and Rescue refers to a unique Methodology on Damage Assessment. However, it is unclear how much its provisions are considered when the immediate needs assessment is conducted after a disaster.

6.5.2 Emergency Management

In case of a declared crisis situation, situation and needs assessment lies within the responsibility of the Headquarters of CMC, with the assistance of the Assessment Group composed of experts from the different ministries and bodies. SOPs for the Group are currently...

---

48 Bilateral agreements are signed with Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Hungary, Montenegro and Slovenia, while the ones with Bulgaria, Serbia and Turkey are under development.

49 The HNS “system” designed for the crisis situation mainly focuses on civil protection response. On the other hand, however, as the national Red Cross Society is part of the integrated crisis management system, the humanitarian actors cannot be excluded.

50 The Headquarters, headed by the Director of CMC, is an operational body that handles activities for prevention and for the management of crisis situations. It is composed of representatives from ministries also involved in the Steering Committee, the Head of PRD and the Chief of Skopje Medical Emergency, as well as representatives of the Army, of the Intelligence Agency and the Macedonian Red Cross. Regional headquarters are established at regional level, composed of the representatives of the regional bodies of the above mentioned ministries and institutions.

51 The Main HQ of PRD is composed of experts, appointed by the Government, from other relevant ministries. The Main HQ is the Government’s operational and professional body, which is activated upon the decision of its commander, the Director of PRD.
being adopted by the Government. On the other hand, PRD’s regional offices also conduct assessment, especially in a non-crisis case, with their own personnel, but no other sectors are included in this process. Supposedly, PRD’s findings are then fed into the overall situation assessment in case of a crisis situation.

The Law on Protection and Rescue stipulates that it is the prerogative of the Government to decide on a request for international assistance, based on the advice of the Steering Group in a declared crisis situation and on the request of the Main HQ’s commander in any other case. Whilst the declaration of a crisis situation is not a prerequisite for a request, in a disaster scenario reaching such scale that international assistance needs to be requested, crisis situation will most probably be declared. Furthermore, it is assumed that a decision on a request is made fairly quickly, as the SOPs set timeframes, by type of crisis, for the Government to act so.

It is less clear-cut, however, which governmental body will serve as contact point for the international partners, as different pieces of legislation vest this responsibility/ability to different organisations. In most bilateral agreements on mutual disaster assistance concluded with partner countries the PRD is the contracting party, also being the nominated and effective contact point for all activities covered by the agreement. On the other hand, Art. 43. of the Law on Crisis Management transfers this “power” to the CMC for in case of a declared crisis situation, and, CMC believes, it shall be the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to serve as contact point for any case of non-crisis nature. Also, both institutions seem to have established working relations with major international actors, which fact may also add to any eventual overlap and duplication when it comes to emergency assistance related cooperation. Additionally, it remains a question how efficient PRD can be contact point without a functioning 24/7 operation centre. For the moment, CMC uses no standardized form/template to request international assistance, while PRD adapts the NATO/MCDA request form to the needs of the actual case.

In a crisis situation strategic coordination is ensured by CMC, which also includes maintaining contacts with international partners at headquarter levels. The SOPs define the responsibility of all national agencies regarding the reception of international assistance. They form an inter-agency team that will be responsible for tactical coordination and logistical support, via its assigned liaison officers, experts from the fields of the respective foreign teams. As CMC does not have operational units, it is less clear, however, how and by which organisation operational coordination is ensured on the site of operations, especially as regards the inclusion of international teams into the on-site command and control structure.

In a non-crisis situation, PRD reports to ensure coordination with international teams, with its International Department being the contact point. They have no preference for the set-up of an OSOCC, but trained liaison officers are assigned to each international team being
“distributed” on site according to the needs reported by the regional office. This system is, however, only theoretic and neither stipulated in any form of legislation nor has it been tested so far.

As for communication, English is considered the primary language to communicate with the forces from abroad, unless other common language is identified. All liaison officers shall speak English or else translators shall be provided.

The Assessment Group also conducts constant assessment of risks that could jeopardize the security of the country and propose measures for prevention, early warning and mitigation of any eventual consequence.

6.5.3 Logistics and transport

Relief personnel of international intervention teams either enjoy visa-free-entry status as being citizens of the EU or of bilateral partners, or their border crossing is facilitated according to the NATO MoU on vital cross-border transport. Disaster relief goods and equipment are all exempt from customs duties, taxes and any similar fees, provided that a detailed inventory of the carried items is available. For this purpose no specific template is requested, but the widely accepted content list forms (such as for e.g. those of NATO) are used, though not yet institutionalised. Also, bilateral agreements usually cover the obligatory content information. Since liaison officers usually meet with the foreign teams as of the border crossing point, the likelihood of any malpractice to violate the above rules is reduced.

INSARAG-certified USAR teams have normally all documentation in place to allow the expeditious entry of search dogs. Otherwise, no further information was available on any eventual provisions in this matter.

To import drugs or narcotic as part of the equipment of a foreign team proper documentation is necessary. Some bilateral agreements limit the amount to the quantity necessary to cover emergency medical needs only.

The FYR of Macedonia is party to the Tampere Convention and accordingly, no significant restrictions are imposed on the use of emergency ICT equipment. The only exception concerns own radio frequencies, which are replaced by allocated frequencies of the host nation to avoid interference with other services’ communication. Proper documentation for border crossing is necessary also in case of such equipment in general.

In general no specific template is requested to document incoming aid items and equipment, but the widely accepted content list forms (such as for e.g. those of NATO) are preferred to be used. Bilateral agreements usually cover the obligatory content information.
In line with the Istanbul Convention equipment of international relief teams and unused goods can freely be re-exported.

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, while providing certain security arrangements for international teams, expects that personal safety of team members is ensured by the individual and / or by the assisting state. It is also required that internationally recommended actions are taken by the team according to the security level in place, in case of need. Escort to the affected area from the border crossing point is provided without having to request for it.

The fYR of Macedonia expects incoming international teams to be self-sufficient for a period of 3 – 7 days. Once this period has elapsed, logistical support can be provided by the host nation. Depending on the nature of the crisis, it is either PRD or CMC is the one responsible for the distribution. Most commodities are free of charge, provided that information on potentially needed resources are submitted in advance, preferably already with the offer itself of before arriving in the country.

### 6.5.4 Legal and financial issues

**Professional qualifications, licences and certificates** allowing foreign disaster relief personnel to perform their activities are recognized with no additional certification procedure.

While it has not been considered to establish a formal list of eligible international actors, the fYR of Macedonia seems to have clear indications from which they would accept disaster relief assistance.

The **status of personnel** of bilateral partners is always clarified in the bilateral agreements, including more or less the same provisions so that they are in line with corresponding national legislation. As for the status (incl. liability) of other assisting actors’ personnel it can be said in general that the rule of equal treatment applies and no distinction is made regarding the personnel of the different “type” of international actors.

---

53 See details included in Annex I, point 7.6 of the Questionnaire summary table
54 See also Annex I, point 6.1 of the Questionnaire summary table
6.6 Montenegro

(Facts are endorsed as valid on 04 June 2012)

Montenegro’s HNS framework is currently being elaborated, supposedly on the basis of IDRL. The National Strategy for Emergencies\(^{55}\) of 2006 dedicates a special annex (p. 148-154) to the Recommended Rules and Practices adopted at the Balkan National Societies Meeting on IDRL in Belgrade in September 2004. The other legal documents studied\(^{56}\), however, do not contain detailed provisions on issues relating to incoming assistance; it is assumed, therefore, that the current system is based rather on some established practices than legislation.

Some recent emergencies\(^{57}\), where also the Mechanism was activated, could provide the possibility to verify the existing procedures, the lessons learned activities did not cover, however, host nation support. On the other hand, Montenegro has reported\(^{58}\) that they did not experience major problems during past operations.

In the self-assessment exercise included in the online-questionnaire\(^{59}\) Montenegro has rated its HNS-related preparedness an average 3.6 points out of 5, which rating has not been supported by reported details on any eventual strength and shortcoming. Montenegro apparently has a good knowledge of HNS-related works, though they have not signed up or pledged to some important ones\(^{60}\).

---

\(^{55}\) [http://www.questionnaire.gov.me/Annexes/Annex094.pdf]

\(^{56}\) The Law on Protection and Rescue of December 2007 ([http://www.questionnaire.gov.me/Annexes/Annex068.pdf](http://www.questionnaire.gov.me/Annexes/Annex068.pdf)), the Law on the Red Cross of Montenegro ([http://www.ckcg.co.me/images/stories/dokumenti/Law_MRC.doc](http://www.ckcg.co.me/images/stories/dokumenti/Law_MRC.doc)), National Plan (NP) / Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Flooding (as an example of the 12 SOPs, each for different hazard)

\(^{57}\) Flooding in December 2010 (Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Italy, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey assisted with teams and in-kind assistance, a MIC liaison officer was sent on site). Severe weather conditions in February 2012 (Croatia, Greece, Slovenia and the US assisted with helicopters to evacuate the affected population and to distribute supplies).

\(^{58}\) See Annex I, point 3.3 of the Questionnaire summary table

\(^{59}\) See Annex I, point 3.2 of the Questionnaire summary table

\(^{60}\) See Annex I. point 4.3 and 4.4

6.6.1 Emergency planning

The disaster management system in Montenegro is based on the Law on Protection and Rescue, stipulating who shall perform the detailed protection and rescue activities and giving mandate for the adoption of further legislative measures, such as the National Strategy for Emergency Situations and for the National Plans (NP) to be developed for all risks identified by the National Strategy based on studies of vulnerability assessment. Apart from the designation of the bodies competent to decide on sending or requesting international assistance, the studied legislation does not seem to contain further provisions regarding the HNS issues subject to this Study.
On the other hand, Montenegro has signed several bilateral agreements\textsuperscript{61} on mutual disaster relief and Memorandums of Understanding\textsuperscript{62}, which cover most of the HNS issues.

As regards the \textbf{decision-making, coordination and administrative structure}, in the core of the protection and rescue system stands with a leading role the \textit{Sector for Emergency Management} (hereinafter the Sector) within the Ministry of Interior, which is responsible, amongst other tasks, for adopting the national plans and for cooperation with international actors in the disaster management domain. The \textit{Emergency Management Coordination Team}\textsuperscript{63} is the body that ensures strategic level coordination in between the different services taking part in the operation. The Sector’s \textit{112 Operational Communication Centre}, as a single \textbf{communication} hub, collects and processes all emergency-related data to all stakeholders. It also serves as the communication centre for international teams operating in Montenegro, while Montenegro’s point of contact \textit{vis-à-vis} the international actors remain the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

According to the \textit{Law on the Red Cross of Montenegro} the \textit{Red Cross} has a special auxiliary role to the government, with a wide spectrum of public powers. This includes also tasks related to disaster management, such as for e.g. needs assessment after a disaster, the evacuation of affected population as well as the receipt and distribution of in-kind assistance from abroad.

\textbf{Needs assessment methodology} in its proper sense has not been institutionalized in Montenegro. Situation assessment following a disaster is completed against the company-level, local level and national level risk assessments forming part of the corresponding national action plan and elaborated on the basis of a special methodology on risk assessment, adopted by the Ministry of Interior.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Bilateral agreements in force are with Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Greece, Serbia and Slovenia
  \item Memorandums of Understanding are in force with Russia, Italy and Armenia
  \item The Emergency Management Coordination Team is headed by the Prime Minister with the Minister of Interior being his/her deputy, and comprises of representatives of all relevant ministries (foreign affairs, defence, health, transport, social welfare, etc.), other state services (i.e. Sector for Emergency Management, police, army).
\end{itemize}

6.6.2 \textbf{Emergency Management}

\textbf{Situation assessment} following a disaster is completed against the company-level, local level and national level risk assessments forming part of the corresponding National Action Plan\textsuperscript{64}. On this basis the Emergency Management Coordination Team establishes, with the advice of the Operational Task Team, the list of humanitarian and operational needs.

Whilst the Ministry of Interior is the responsible body to “\textit{seek assistance from other states}” (ref. Art. 37. of the Law on Protection and Rescue), even in case no state of emergency has
been declared, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will distribute the request and act as focal point for all international actors. **Forms for the request for international assistance** are included in each national plan, however, the use of forms is also dependent on which international actors (i.e. bilateral partners or international organisations) they are distributed to. In the end, the Government will decide on the acceptance of any foreign aid (ref. Art. 36. of the Law on Protection and Rescue).

Each National Plan contains a chart of coordination, with the Emergency Management Coordination Team and the Sector being in the very centre of the structure in case of a larger scale emergency. None of these, however, consider the possible involvement of international actors in the operations. On the other hand, in line with the international practice, the setting-up of an OSOCC would be very likely should an emergency operation involving a large number of international actors be necessary. In any case, liaison officers were assigned to the foreign intervention teams during previous disaster cases, which practice now seems to be well established.

As for communication, English is considered as the main communication language in case of operations including assistance from abroad, unless other common language is identified. Should there be a need, translators can be provided.

---

**6.6.3 Logistics and transport**

In line with international recommendations visa and customs requirements are apparently waived for incoming international teams, with expeditious border crossing, provided that the nature of the consignment is properly marked and the content is documented. Provisions are reported to be in place to prevent that these rules are violated in any way.

During the research, no information has been received on regulations concerning the entry of search dogs. The import of drugs and narcotics as part of the relief consignment or equipment of teams is said to cause no obstacle to the simplified border crossing procedure or to the success of the relief operation.

As foreseen in the Tampere Convention, which is ratified by Montenegro in May 2010, ICT equipment can be used without limitation. This was confirmed by the experiences during the 2010 flooding operations, where international teams could freely use their equipment and the free frequencies free of charge. The Agency for Electronic Communication and Postal Services is responsible for the implementation of the Convention.
Each National Plan contains the **forms**, very similar to the NATO templates, to document the assisting international teams and their equipment.

No obstacles seem to hinder the **re-exportation** of unused goods; no specific conditions, apart from supporting documentation being available, have to be fulfilled in this respect.

Montenegro as host nation assumes the responsibility for providing adequate **security and safety** measures for the international relief personnel, their equipment and for the relief shipments. This also includes security **escort**, if it deems necessary according to the emergency situation.

Montenegro expects incoming international teams to be self-sufficient for 3-7 days, after which period they are able to provide logistical support free of charge. This normally includes the provision of subsistence commodities (food, water, lodging), administrative and technical support (office, ICT, interpretation), transport (incl. fuel), electricity, healthcare, etc. In general, the Red Cross of Montenegro is responsible for providing the basic logistical support for international teams. If, however, the request for support goes beyond their capacity, the Sector, in cooperation with other state institutions, will seek for solutions to cover the needs of the team as much as possible.

### 6.6.4 Legal and financial issues

**Professional qualifications, licences and certificates** of foreign disaster relief personnel to perform services are said to be generally recognized with no additional certification procedure.

Montenegro reports to have a list of **eligible international actors**, compiled by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration. The content of this list, however, has not been made available, nor has an explanation been given on which basis this list was elaborated. On the other hand, in the questionnaire Montenegro did not exclude the provision of assistance from any of the different “types” of actors presented; i.e. the needed assistance offered would not cause any obstacle on the basis of the nature of the provider. This was also confirmed during the scenario-related questions in the interview.

The **status of personnel** of international actors (incl. liability) has admittedly not been considered yet. It is assumed, however, that existing bilateral agreements cover the issue up to a certain extent. As for the **liability** issue, in the absence of specific regulations, personnel of assisting international actors will be responsible for their conducts according to Montenegrin legislation.

---

65 See Annex I, point 6.1 of the Questionnaire summary table
6.7 Serbia

(Facts are endorsed as valid on 30 April 2012)

The area of disaster and emergency management was admittedly neglected in Serbia as of the early 1990s, with responsibilities being split in between different sectors, such as internal affairs, defence and environment. Based on the new framework law adopted in December 2009, the system is currently in the phase of redevelopment, mainly taking the integrated approach of the global disaster risk reduction concept.

Consequently, Serbia’s HNS framework is not yet elaborated. While the mandate to further regulate the subject is certainly given in the new legal base, several secondary laws are still in the course of being adopted. In the absence of specific legislation and practices implemented on the basis of experience, it is unclear for the moment how much the new system will institutionalize HNS as a concept or leave it as a collection of already existing rules dispersed in various legal and strategic documents.

The only fairly recent emergency where the then existing procedures could be verified was the earthquake hitting the Kraljevo region in early November in 2010. Incoming assistance was coordinated by the Ministry of Local Government, the Sector for Emergency Management of the Ministry of the Interior and the UN Resident Coordinator amid fresh legal changes that also affected the organisational structure just being rearranged in the same time. The implementation of the new legislation and the secondary legislation being adopted takes into account all lessons learned from this incident.

All the above said is reflected in the self-assessment exercise included in the online-questionnaire; Serbia has rated its HNS-related preparedness an average 3.5 points out of 5. This rating, however, keeps improving as the missing pieces of secondary legislation is adopted, which certainly caters for a solid legal background for the HNS arrangements. The major shortcoming reported was the lack of qualified personnel with adequate foreign language knowledge, which could further hinder the effectiveness of the anyway difficult coordination of incident management if involving international actors.

All in all, Serbia has a fairly good knowledge of HNS-related works, though they do not report to have pledged to the more important ones. However, most of the international guidelines are applied in practice; with a “centralized” decision making body (i.e. the National Emergency Management Headquarters) in place there is no need for further implementation.

---

66 The assumption is based only on the legislation made available by the Serbian authorities and on the information gathered from open sources.
67 See Annex I, point 3.2 of the Questionnaire summary table
68 See Annex I, point 4.3 and 4.4
6.7.1 Emergency planning

The Law on Emergency Situations adopted in December 2009 sets the legislative framework for the management of disasters, defining the institutional structure, the responsibilities of stakeholders and outlining the major procedures. This law is reinforced by further secondary legislation being adopted and strategic documents, such as the National Protection and Rescue Strategy, the National Risk Assessment and the National Emergency Plan.

As no detailed HNS-related rules could be identified during the research for this section, the major collection of these rules is assumed to be the bilateral agreements on mutual disaster relief Serbia has already signed or is in the course of signing.

As regards the decision-making, coordination and administrative structure, in the core of the protection and rescue system stand the Government, the National Emergency Management Headquarters and the Sector for Emergency Management (SEM) within the Ministry of Interior. The operational centres of the emergency services (i.e. the fire and rescue units, ambulance services, police) and the National Notification Centre, together with the monitoring posts and the public alerting system compose the emergency communication service. The National Notification Centre and the SEM serve as the contact point for international communication and alert activities.

Needs assessment methodology in its proper sense does not seem to be in place in Serbia.

The Law on Emergency Situations foresees the adoption of a National Risk / Vulnerability Assessment, to include potential threats, their probable consequences, possible needs and the available capacities. It is unclear, however, if it has already been elaborated.

69 Bilateral agreements in force are with Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, the Russian Federation and Slovakia, while others are in the process of signature (with Bulgaria, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary and Romania)

6.7.2 Emergency Management

There is no institutionalised framework established to conduct situation and needs assessment following a disaster. By law, first responders at local level are the responsible actors for initial needs assessment, but no specific teams are set up for this purpose, unless it is proved necessary on the specific case in question. On the other hand, teams including also representatives of insurance companies are in place for damage assessment.

In accordance with the Law on Emergency Situations, once the emergency situation is declared, the Government make the final decision, based on the recommendation of the
National Emergency Management Headquarters, on requesting, accepting and / or providing international disaster relief assistance. In general, the **request for assistance** is issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to international partners via the diplomatic channels, while the point of contact remains the SEM. In case bilateral agreements are activated, the appointed contact point will also inform the partner’s designated contact point about the request. Currently, as established practice, the existing NATO form is used to distribute the request for assistance.

Strategic **coordination** of disaster response is first and foremost ensured by the National Emergency Management Headquarters, consisting of representatives of all relevant ministries, other governmental organisation and scientific / research institutions. This body meets regularly also in normal situation, while it is a decision making body during large scale emergencies. Within this body SEM and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are responsible for coordinating international assistance at headquarters level. Whilst for the moment no specific coordination structure exists regarding the coordination of international teams on site, an OSOCC or an OSOCC-like structure would most probably be set up, assisted by a liaison officer assigned to each international team.

As for communication, English is considered as the main communication **language** in case of operations including assistance from abroad, unless other common language is identified. Should there be a need, translators can be provided.

---

70 To reflect the recent shift in policy approach from “pure” disaster management to more inter-disciplinary disaster risk reduction, and to take into account the new competencies, this body will soon be declared as a National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, which, however, will not change its responsibilities for in case of an emergency situation.

6.7.3 **Logistics and transport**

Participating States and bilateral partners do not require **visa** to enter Serbia. However, it is not clarified whether the sector-specific legislation waives the requirement for those few third countries that need entry documents. Disaster relief goods and equipment of incoming teams are exempt from all **customs duties**, taxes and fees. A liaison officer assigned to each incoming team or consignment as of the border crossing point ensures that these rules are violated in any way.

Entry procedure is made easier for search dogs being part of an internationally certified USAR team. The law on the veterinary services further regulates this area, though no information has been received on the exact content of the respective provisions.
Any drug or narcotic substance, even if part of the team’s equipment, has to be listed in the content list. On departure, the empty morphine bottles will have to be presented; a measure to prevent smuggling of medication.

No enacted legislation seems to cover the use of ICT equipment during emergency operations, though the Law on Telecommunication regulates telecommunication procedures for the ministries of defence, interior and foreign affairs. Equally, it is not confirmed whether this or other sector-specific laws include provisions on emergency telecommunication. Therefore it is not clear if Serbia imposes any restriction on the use of such equipment during emergency operations, for any reason. On the other hand, as for radio communication, own frequencies for internal team communication can still be utilized after border crossing. The Ministry of Telecommunication is the authority responsible for this issue; its representative is member of the National Emergency Management Headquarters.

As for the documentation of teams, equipment, etc., mostly NATO forms are used, but if other forms are presented that contain the obligatory details, those will be also accepted.

While the area is generally regulated by the Law on Customs, it is still to be confirmed whether Serbia allows the re-exportation of unused goods and equipment of international teams.

It is not clear whether Serbia as host nation assumes the responsibility for providing adequate security and safety measures for the international relief teams and to what extent. Traffic escort can always be provided; it shall be requested as a general rule, however, if the situation or the nature of the consignment so requires, it is offered automatically as of the border crossing point till the destination. Security escort is provided only in case of proven need.

Serbia expects incoming international teams to be self-sufficient for 3-7 days; after which period logistical support can be provided free of charge. Normally, the Government’s emergency budget covers such expenses; the needed amounts are forecasted on the basis of the accepted offer. The Ministry of Interior is responsible for arranging the support via the same channels available for national intervention teams.

6.7.4 Legal and financial issues

Professional qualifications, licences and certificates of foreign disaster relief personnel to perform services are said to be generally recognized with no additional certification procedure.

Serbia does not report to have a list of eligible international actors. On the other hand, in the questionnaire Serbia did not specifically exclude the provision of assistance from any of the different “types” of actors presented; i.e. the needed assistance offered would not cause any
obstacle on the basis of the nature of the provider, especially if the offer has arrived through and has been cleared by the official channels.

The status of personnel of international actors has admittedly not been considered yet in national legislation, but in the bilateral agreements. In general, no distinction is made in between the legal status of the different international actors. As for the issue of liability, international teams are not granted immunity; their personnel are liable for their acts according to national Serbian law. Regarding contractual relations, they are not restricted in any way.

71 See Annex I, point 6.1 of the Questionnaire summary table

6.8 Turkey
(Facts are endorsed as valid on 21 June 2012)

Turkey is highly exposed to natural hazards, but to earthquakes in particular, having more than 95% of its landmass and 70% of its population at risk. Disaster risk management has greatly improved after the 1999 earthquakes in the populated and industrial Marmara region and thus the country’s vulnerability was contained to a certain extent. A new, comprehensive disaster law, incorporating prevention, risk mitigation, preparedness and response elements, was enacted in 200972.

Therefore, HNS-related provisions and practices are assumed to be in place in Turkey, host nation support as a concept, however, is not considered a priority at the moment. This can be explained by the following considerations:

- The mandate of the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD) under the Prime Ministry seems to be strong enough to effectively coordinate across sectors in an ad-hoc manner
- Lessons-learned from real life disasters have proved that the system currently in place works sufficiently
- There is a clear preference for the activation of bilateral arrangements in case of need for international assistance, where procedures have already been planned.

The self-assessment exercise included in the online questionnaire73 confirms all the above said; Turkey rates its HNS-related preparedness with an average 4,5 points out of 5, with no major
problems experienced regarding receiving international assistance during real disaster response activities.

Turkey reports to be aware of the major international HNS-related works, of which many it has signed up or pledged to.\textsuperscript{74}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Law no. 5902 on the establishment of AFAD
\item See Annex I, point 3.2 and 3.3 of the Questionnaire summary table
\item See Annex I, points 4.3 and 4.4
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}

6.8.1 Emergency planning

Turkey’s disaster response system is built on \emph{Law No. 7269, the “Disaster Law”} and \emph{Law No. 5902 on the establishment of AFAD}. HNS-related provisions are also included in bilateral agreements\textsuperscript{75} and in other pieces of legislation.

The \textbf{institutional structure} was reformed in 2009, with the establishment of the \textbf{Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD)}, which took up the major duties of the three disaster management organisations: the General Directorate of Disaster Affairs under Ministry of Public Works and Settlement, the General Directorate of Civil Defence under the Ministry of Interior, and the General Directorate of Turkey Emergency Management under the Prime Ministry. AFAD’s main tasks cover the whole “lifecycle” of disaster management, from prevention to risk mitigation and from response to recovery / reconstruction activities. Its 24/7 Crisis Management Centre within the Response Department manages the overall operational coordination in case of a disaster / emergency situation.

Besides AFAD, two coordination bodies were also set up by this law. The \textbf{Supreme Committee of Disaster and Emergency} provides political direction by approving programmes and plans for disaster situations. It is chaired by the Prime Ministers or Deputy Prime Minister and consists of the Ministers of National Defence, Interior, Foreign Affairs, Finance, National Education, Health, Transportation, Energy and Natural Sources, Environment and Forests, Public works and Settlements. The \textbf{Disaster and Emergency Coordination Committee} is responsible for coordination between foundations, institutions and NGOs and for the identification of measures to be taken as well as it ensures the application of approved measure. It is chaired by the Undersecretary of the Prime Minister and consists of the above said Ministries’ Undersecretaries of Defence, plus the Director General of AFAD and the Head of the Turkish Red Crescent. At provincial level Disaster and Emergency Management Directorates were established.

Turkey has no legal provisions in place on \textbf{needs assessment methodology}. On the other hand, damage and loss assessment methodologies and guidelines are available, including procedure
for the collection of information and the calculation of compensation. Also, AFAD is tasked to prepare multi-hazard risk assessments, which are then further developed at regional level. Structural vulnerability assessment also exists; it is still to be verified whether it equals to a gap analysis, i.e. the assessment of the risks against the available resources.

75 Bilateral agreements are signed with Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, the fYR of Macedonia and Romania.

6.8.2 Emergency Management

The Provincial Disaster and Emergency Directorates are the primary responsible bodies for post-disaster assessment according to the guidelines prepared by AFAD. Each directorate has trained units specialized in different fields (CBRN, USAR, mountain rescue, etc.), which can be involved in the assessment activities.

In general, it is AFAD to decide on a request for international assistance, based on the advice of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Clear preference is set to first activate bilateral and regional arrangements in case of need. Experience proves that such decisions are made fairly quickly, especially in case of quick-onset disasters. The first contact point, however, is always the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Turkey has no standardized form / template adopted to request international assistance.

In a disaster the coordination of response is ensured by AFAD, which also includes the coordination of incoming international resources at headquarters level, vis-à-vis the involved national bodies and international partners. On the other hand, coordination measures are applied in an ad-hoc manner so that the actual intervention needs are taken into proper account. In line with the recent decentralisation programme, the operational coordination is now ensured at provincial level. The setting up of an OSOCC is not a preference, but liaison officers often join the incoming international teams.

As for communication, English is considered the primary language to communicate with the forces from abroad, unless other common language is identified. Translators are usually provided.

6.8.3 Logistics and transport

Visa requirements are usually waived for the personnel of international intervention teams. Turkey reports that disaster relief goods and equipment are partially exempt from customs
duties, taxes and similar fees; such decisions are made on a case-by-case basis once the offer is presented.

Teams to enter with search dogs must submit all information about the dogs in advance, while their obligatory medical documentation will have to be presented at border crossing.

A foreign team can import drugs or narcotics, properly documented, as part of their equipment provided that the Turkish Ministry of Health endorses it.

Turkey is not party to the Tampere Convention on emergency telecommunications. Their emergency / disaster laws have, however, provisions covering communication technology. Foreign teams can use their own radios on condition that they are cleared before their entry to the country. Alternatively, Turkey can also provide communication equipment in necessary.

Within the context of the Istanbul Convention on temporary admission Turkey uses the ATA documents / forms for border crossing / custom clearance procedures, which is also requested from partner countries during exercises, but not in real situation. Bilateral agreements usually cover the obligatory content information that needs to be presented in any format to enter the country.

In line with the Istanbul Convention equipment of international relief teams and unused goods can freely be re-exported.

Turkey considers that the security of international disaster relief teams is the responsibility of both the host nation and the assisting state. While security arrangements are certainly provided for, Turkey expects that personal safety of team members is ensured by the individual and / or by the assisting state. International team members are also expected to be aware of cultural differences to avoid security related issues. International teams and consignments are usually provided with escort to the affected area; the level of protection this would entail is decided upon on a case-by-case basis.

Turkey expects incoming international teams to be self-sufficient for a period of 3 – 7 days. Once this period has elapsed, logistical support can be provided by the host nation. This is decided on a case-by-case basis, based on the evaluation of the country’s needs for the further assistance of the team in question and the actual needs of the team. AFAD is assumed to arrange for this service.

6.8.4 Legal and financial issues

Professional qualifications, licences and certificates allowing foreign disaster relief personnel, such as doctors, nurses, engineers, etc., to perform their activities are recognized with an
additional certification procedure. No information could be gathered either on how this certification is arranged or how much that could hinder the efficiency of the response.

The term “eligible international actors” is not considered in Turkey; they accept the offers from any country / organisation / entity based on the real needs identified. Preference is, however, obviously put on existing bilateral and international arrangements.

The status of bilateral / international partners’ personnel (incl. liability) is always clarified in the corresponding agreements / conventions. No national provision covers reportedly this HNS area.
7 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

It is obvious from all the above presented cases that as much as the disaster management systems of the Beneficiary countries differ, the nature of the need for progress in host nation support arrangements differ as well.

Serbia, for example, seems to have adopted a centralised decision making approach during a large scale disaster, which could be just as effective as applying detailed legislative provisions on the matter, like in Croatia. Turkey prefers ad-hoc arrangements, which, in their opinion, could better serve the actual needs of the given response activities. Also, strong decentralisation, like in Bosnia and Herzegovina, or still existing presence of international actors, as in Kosovo, will certainly have an affect on the HNS system.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, several strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats are apparent for the host nation support arrangements in the region76.

Strengths

* While HNS as a system or concept has not yet been institutionalised in many Beneficiary countries, rules and practices pertaining to the same affect do exist and are considered. The present arrangements together with the institutional set-up can well serve as a basis for any progress, as deems appropriate. This is also proved by the overall average rate (3.63 points out of 5) in the self-assessment exercise regarding the preparedness of the Beneficiary countries to receive international assistance.

* Risk assessment is observed to be well developed in most Beneficiary countries, which could open up to a systematic gap analysis to support planning for the eventual receipt of foreign aid.

* Border crossing procedures, including visa and customs regulations, to facilitate expeditious entry of international aid seem to be well regulated.

Weaknesses

* In most cases the present arrangements seem to be sector-specific and are not considered as part of the wider HNS context. While the individual rules / practices may function well in general, the specificities and the complexity of a disaster scenario might prove them inadequate or not appropriate for the case.

* Lessons learned activities, if any, do not really concentrate on the experiences regarding host nation support. It is therefore questionable how mindful the actors /
institutions involved in it are about any eventual weakness of the present arrangements.

* There are still ways to further improve the modalities to integrate international assistance into the national coordination structures.

* As most Beneficiary countries have no experience at all about issues concerning the status of international assistance teams’ personnel, this area seems to be the less regulated and considered.

**Opportunities**

* Exercises specifically targeting the issues of host nation support could be of great added value. They have a great potential in highlighting both the importance of HNS and the actual needs of individual countries to develop a more solid system.

* Many different programmes are being run in the region that could provide avenues of support to make progress in the area of HNS as well.

**Threats**

* It is of a question whether there is enough political will to invest more in the progress of this field.

* Present legislative and administrative procedures of certain Beneficiary countries could delay any significant and visible short-term progress.

76 The observations may not be valid to each individual Beneficiary country, but rather describe a general picture of the region
# ANNEX I – ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

This table summarizes the answers the Beneficiary countries gave in the online questionnaire. Some data presented were clarified / revised and further discussed during the country interviews, therefore this table shall always be read together with the country reports in Chapter 6.

Legend for the below summary table:

1 = poor  
2 = insufficient  
3 = sufficient  
4 = good  
5 = excellent  
Y = yes  
N = no  
NK = Do not know  
U = uncertain  
NC = not considered  
0A = no answer  
P = partially  
NA = not applicable  
€ = yes, against payment  
1/3 = 1–3 days  
3/7 = 3–7 days  
>7 = more than 7 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia PRD</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia CMC</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Prior experience in requesting and receiving international assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Has your country been affected by a natural / technological disaster in the last 5-10 years where international disaster assistance was requested and provided?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Based on past experience(s), how do you rate the … preparedness of your country to receive international assistance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operational</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Logistical</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 During past operations did you experience problems related to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• internal decision making?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cooperation across sectors?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Knowledge about the HNS concept and practices already in place

#### 4.1 Are you familiar with the HNS concept in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia PRD</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia CMC</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 Does your country have a host nation support framework in place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia PRD</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia CMC</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3 Are you familiar with any of the following guidelines / recommendations / agreements / reports relating to HNS?

- The current work on the development of EU guidelines for HNS
- IFRC Guidelines for the domestic facilitation and regulation of international disaster relief and initial recovery assistance (IDRL guidelines)
- Balkans National Societies meeting on IDRL in Belgrade on 24-26 September 2004, Recommended Rules and Practices
- UN INSARAG Guidelines – Affected country responsibilities
- Tampere Convention
- Istanbul Convention on temporary admission
- The revised Kyoto Convention (2006) on customs procedures
- NATO principles and policies for HNS
- NATO MoU on vital cross-border transport

#### 4.4 Has your country signed up / pledged to any of the following international treaties / other agreements?
### 4.5 Are you familiar with any regional agreement covering aspects of HNS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR of Macedonia PRD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR of Macedonia CMC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey**</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.6 Are there national provisions in place pertaining to the same affect, i.e. HNS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR of Macedonia PRD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR of Macedonia CMC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey**</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Request for assistance

#### 5.1 Which authority is entitled to request and accept international assistance in case of a disaster?

(See country reports)

#### 5.2 To which international actors do you generally address request for international assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia PRD</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia CMC</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral partners</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN / OCHA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU / MIC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO / EADRCC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Do you have in place a standardized form for requesting assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR of Macedonia PRD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR of Macedonia CMC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey**</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Assistance provided

#### 6.1 Which international actors do you consider eligible in general to provide international disaster relief to your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia PRD</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia CMC</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU Civil Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating States of the EU Civil Protection Mechanism</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO EAPC countries</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>FYR of Macedonia PRD</td>
<td>FYR of Macedonia CMC</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Turkey*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other bilateral partners</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Third countries</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>0A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International NGOs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreign national NGOs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private companies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Do you have an already established list of approved / eligible international actors?  
N | NC | N | NK | NK | Y | Y | OA | Y

6.3 Do you have laws or established practices in place regarding the legal status of personnel of eligible international actors when operating in your country? (e.g. regarding personnel to enter into contracts, liability for causing damage, etc.). If yes, what kind?  
• national laws | Y | N | N | Y | N | Y | NA | N | Y
• international agreements | N | Y | N | N | N | Y | NA | N | Y
• bilateral agreements | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | NA | N | Y
• established practices | Y | N | N | Y | Y | NA | N | N
• other | N | N | N | N | N | N | NA | N | Y

6.4 Do you waive visa (entry or exit) requirements or apply simplified visa procedures to facilitate entry of personnel of international actors?  
Y | NK | Y | N | NK | Y | Y | OA | Y

6.5 Can issued temporary visas be renewed in-country?  
Y | NK | N/A | 0A | NK | Y | Y | Y | Y

6.6 Do you recognize professional qualifications / licences / certificates of foreign disaster relief personnel (e.g. medical personnel, driving licences, engineers, etc.)?  
• Yes, with no additional certification procedure | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y | N
• Yes, with additional certification procedure | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N | Y
• No | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N
• No provisions in place | N | N | N | N | Y | N | N | N
• Do not know | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N | N
• Other | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Regarding requested disaster relief goods and equipment, do you exempt them from all customs duties, taxies or any similar fees?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Do you permit re-exportation of equipment or unused goods?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7 Operations

#### 7.1 Do you have legal framework / procedures in place stipulating how international assistance be integrated with the national coordination structures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no, are there established functioning practices towards this end?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.2 Have measures (e.g. liaison officers, technical equipment, etc.) been put in place to facilitate coordination with international actors being involved in the disaster?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.3 Would the security of the international disaster relief teams be the responsibility of...

- The requesting state
- The international actor
- Both
- Not considered
- Do not know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.4 Would your country be able to provide security escorts to international disaster relief teams and assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.5 Do you expect the disaster relief teams to be self-sufficient?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, for how long?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>&gt;7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.6 Would your country be able to provide logistical support to international disaster relief teams?

- Lodging
- Water
- Food
- Fuel
- Technical / ICT support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of FYR of Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0A</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit country</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>FYR of Macedonia PRD</td>
<td>FYR of Macedonia CMC</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Would the relevant provision in place for HNS also be applicable in case of your country being a transit country for disaster relief items / teams sent to assist another country struck by a disaster?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answers provided in June 2011, before the earthquake in Van in October 2011**
### ANNEX II – HNS GUIDELINES PER BENEFICIARY COUNTRY

This table summarizes the findings presented in detail under the country reports. As clarifications and explanations are presented thereby, this table shall always be reviewed together with Chapter 6.

Legend for the below summary table:
- **Y** = yes, supported also by legislation / strategic documents
- **N** = not considered
- **EP** = established practice
- **P** = partially
- **NI** = no information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EMERGENCY PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Legal framework in place to deal with incoming assistance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Institutional and administrative framework in place to deal with incoming assistance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Decision making system in place with clearly identified responsibilities of key authorities, also in relation to incoming assistance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Needs assessment methodology in place to quickly assess situation and needs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Information management system in place to share information with international actors (incl. maintenance of a national POC)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>All-sector risk assessment in place, incl. a gap (i.e. risks v. resources) analysis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Ensure accurate and timely situation and needs assessment</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Use template for request for international assistance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Coordination structure in place to deal with incoming international assistance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Waive visa requirements or grant visas for entry, exit and transit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Waive customs duties, taxes, tariffs for donated goods and equipment (incl. vehicles) of incoming teams</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Waive or reduce inspection and administrative / documentation requirements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce barriers to the import / export, transit and use of ICT equipment</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>FYR of Macedonia</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reduce barriers to the import / export, transit and use of medication and medical equipment</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reduce barriers to the import / export, transit and use of search dogs</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permit re-exportation of equipment (incl. search dogs, vehicles) and unused goods, even if donated</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ensure appropriate security and safety of international relief personnel, their equipment and relief consignments</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provide administrative support (office, admin. personnel, translation, equipment, etc.)</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provide subsistence commodities (food, water, lodging, electricity, etc.)</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provide medical support</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 LEGAL AND FINANCIAL ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recognize professional qualifications and certificates of international relief personnel</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recognize the legal status of personnel of assisting international actors</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consider issues of liability for damage caused by relief personnel</th>
<th>Albania</th>
<th>Bosnia and Herzegovina</th>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th>Kosovo</th>
<th>FYR of Macedonia</th>
<th>Montenegro</th>
<th>Serbia</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Covers only the competencies of the central government
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