

Extract from “International disaster response laws, principles and practice: reflections, prospects and challenges” published by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Geneva, 2003, pp 81-90.

Chapter 5

International disaster response law in a southern African context

Tracy-Lynn Field*

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to consider the extent to which southern African states have an existing body of international disaster response law (IDRL), and to explore whether and how IDRL might be useful in a southern African context.¹

That such a question is raised may seem strange to readers from the northern hemisphere. After all, Africa, particularly southern Africa², is debt-ridden and disaster-prone. More than any other continent, it would seem to need the order and certainty that IDRL could potentially provide.

Such a view is precariously poised on the assumption that southern African governments and civil society are incapable and/or unwilling to construct a regulatory framework to deal with disasters, and that when disaster strikes they are incapable and/or unwilling to assist each other.

This inability to recognize or appreciate existing arrangements – articulated in international treaty law or not – is a major problem in current disaster response and rehabilitation operations. IDRL should ideally support and augment such arrangements.

The study of IDRL in southern African is constrained by the broader definition dilemma: What exactly is IDRL? What is the scope and extent of this body of law? What are its underlying principles? What are the roles of international, regional and national institutions? And on what grounds and in terms of which forums and procedures can they be held accountable?

It is hoped that the presentation of findings of bilateral and multilateral IDRL agreements concluded by southern African states will contribute towards this broader debate. However, since international agreements of this nature only constitute half the picture as regards disaster response³, we can demonstrate how such material potentially interacts with national disaster laws, policies and programmes.

For this purpose, it is constructive to utilize a case study, specifically the 1999-2000 Mozambique floods.⁴ This particular disaster was chosen because it clearly falls within popular

conceptions as to what constitutes a disaster; it was significant in its impact on Mozambique's people and the country's development potential; it was handled relatively successfully⁶; and it was unusual in a number of respects as regards cooperation between national and international disaster management institutions.

The first part of this chapter provides an overview of southern African sources of IDRL. The second part presents the challenges that should be uppermost in the minds of those responsible for further development of IDRL, given research findings, and with reference to the Mozambique case study. The third part concludes the chapter with thoughts on further research.

Overview of existing international legal materials on disaster response in the southern African region

The various sources of international law include treaty law, customary international law (*ius cogens*) and soft-law. IDRL, at least in so far as European states are concerned, is constituted by a complex system of bilateral and multilateral agreements between states. The United Nations (UN) General Assembly and the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent have, in particular, generated a vast body of soft law instruments that affirm principles applicable to disaster response, not all of which are necessarily articulated in hard treaty law.⁷

To what extent have hard and soft law instruments relating to international disaster response been concluded by southern African states? More importantly, would we be able to recognize such instruments when we saw them? The following were adopted as guidelines in the research process:

- the broad definition of IDRL adopted at the 2001 Council of Delegates of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement that disaster response law “covers humanitarian responses to natural and technological disasters, including all measures in the areas of disaster prevention, relief and post-disaster rehabilitation”;
- Horst Fischer’s definition of core IDRL documents as mutual assistance treaties setting up the framework of response after disasters; treaties dealing with the financing of disaster operations or reduction; prevention and mitigation measures; and treaties dealing with assistance given to refugees and internally displaced persons after a disaster⁸;
- given the scarcity of published materials in the southern African region, a preference for including as many materials as possible, bearing in mind how some treaty provisions could be utilized in disaster response operations; and
- concentration of resources on finding hard law, given that southern African states would have ascribed to the soft law principles generated at an international level through their participation in the UN General Assembly and the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent.

There is no multilateral agreement between African states specifically regulating disaster response, either at a continental or regional level including through the Southern African Development Community (SADC).⁹ Neither is there a comprehensive bilateral treaty network on mutual assistance in case of disasters in place for the southern African region.¹⁰

Southern African states recognize the need for bilateral and multilateral cooperation on issues of disaster response, evident from the existence of bodies such as the SADC Disaster Management Committee.¹¹ However, the level of consensus on these issues has generally not yet been articulated in formal written agreements.¹²

Research yielded a total of 15 multilateral and 24 bilateral agreements with some relevance to disaster response.¹³ The multilateral agreements generally treat disaster response as an incidence of continental or regional cooperation in trade¹⁴, transport¹⁵, health¹⁶ and the management of natural resources.¹⁷ None of the multilateral agreements present a systematic approach to disaster response, and the issue tends to be mentioned in passing. A possible exception is the Dar es Salaam Declaration on Feeding of Infants and Young Children in Emergency Situations in Africa, which provides a comprehensive statement of the approach to infant feeding in emergencies.¹⁸

Two agreements can be classified as multilateral border region agreements¹⁹, their objective being to control natural phenomena with cross-border effects, namely water resources along the Limpopo River and mosquito vector densities in the border regions of South Africa, Swaziland and Mozambique.

The bilateral agreements can be grouped into four categories:

- agreements responding to specific disaster situations²⁰;
- agreements on search and rescue²¹;
- agreements establishing a broad framework for technical cooperation in a given field²²; and
- agreements dealing with the establishment of intergovernmental organization (IGO) and non-governmental organization (NGO) missions and the status, immunities and privileges of their staff.²³ These agreements, while general in nature, have significant implications for the delivery of disaster relief when staff of the relevant organizations is involved.²⁴

The majority of the instruments are binding, although a few of the SADC multilateral protocols have not yet entered into force. The Dar es Salaam Declaration on Feeding of Infants and Young Children in Emergency Situations²⁵ is declaratory rather than binding in nature. The declarations of intent regarding cooperation in the field of health²⁶ are also not binding, although they are indicative of the state's intention to conclude a binding agreement.

The majority of the agreements are between states, or between states and IGOs. Some of the agreements apply to the executing agencies of the IGO or NGO concerned – thus establishing a mechanism whereby rules, for example, on waiver of border procedures, can apply to the operations of less well-established NGOs. Article 2(3) of the agreement between South Africa and the UN Development Programme (UNDP)²⁷ is representative in this regard:

Assistance may be provided by the UNDP to the Government either directly, with such external assistance as the Parties deem appropriate, or through an Executing Agency, which shall have primary responsibility for carrying out the UNDP assistance to the project and which shall have the status of an independent contractor for this purpose.

References in some of the agreements to persons performing services for the IGO or NGO concerned could serve a similar purpose.²⁸

However, it appears that privileges and immunities extended by a state to an IGO are not necessarily extended to their executing agencies. For example, Article 3(e) of the agreement between the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and World Vision on the distribution of food supplies in Zambia provides that:

The personnel assigned by the Recipient Organization to the organization and running of the project shall not be considered as staff members of FAO and shall not be entitled to any privilege, immunity, compensation or reimbursement by FAO... Nothing in this Agreement or in any document relating thereto, shall be construed as constituting a waiver of privileges or immunities of FAO, nor as conferring any privileges or immunities of FAO on the Recipient Organization or its personnel.

Finally, the agreements relate overwhelmingly to natural disasters such as floods, droughts, food security and insect infestations. In fact, the only agreement accommodating technological disasters is arguably the SADC Protocol on Transport, Communications and Meteorology²⁹, which obliges states to harmonize policies and strategies relating to road traffic incidents.

Further development of IDRL in southern Africa: where do the challenges lie?

How effective is the body of law described above when disaster strikes? Does it contribute towards alleviating the vulnerability of people in the face of disaster, or is its inadequacy a contributing factor in such vulnerability? To answer this question, it is necessary to take into account the national level of disaster regulation.

Disasters usually originate in a particular state, even if their effects are ultimately trans-boundary. The manner in which a state chooses to respond to disasters may be articulated in policies, programmes, plans and laws.

The arrangements in place in Mozambique at the time of the 1999-2000 floods provide a case in point.³⁰ In July 1999 a permanent structure for dealing with emergencies – the *Instituto Nacional do Gestão das Calamidades* (INGC)³¹ was established by the Mozambique government. At the same time, the *Conselho Coordenador de Gestão das Calamidades* (CCGC)³² was established to coordinate disaster response policy.

Despite the sparse network of functioning meteorological and flood and river measuring stations, Mozambican meteorologists predicted a 50 per cent higher than average rainfall for the January-March period. Informal flood warnings were issued. Provincial contingency plans were drawn up in October-November 1999, but due to the restructuring, INGC only issued a national contingency plan in late November. Failure to observe national contingency planning for disasters was a major point of contention during the 1999-2000 Mozambique floods. As Christie and Hanlon note³³:

“The aid invasion brought problems and exposed weaknesses on all sides. Aid workers were so desperate to help, and so sure they knew what to do, that they marginalized provincial and local authorities, ignoring their plans, preparations and experience. This created an understandable tension.”

The Mozambican arrangements merely provide an indication of the type of arrangements that can be in place at a national level. It is not so much the adequacy of these arrangements that is relevant, but the fact of their existence. Whenever a disaster prompts participation of the international community, many issues can arise:

- How should international organizations relate to the national disaster response institutions? What kind of authority, if any, should the international and national role-players exercise vis-à-vis each other?
- When another state provides civil and/or military assistance to a disaster-stricken state, what kind of authority should the latter's disaster response institutions exercise over such assistance?
- Should international organizations and the civil and military units of assistance provided by other states be bound by the host state's national (and lower-level) disaster planning? If so, how can they be held accountable?
- Should all of the above be the subject of IDRL?

Currently, these issues are not addressed in the body of treaty law described in the first part of this chapter and cannot be adequately resolved unless and until there is broad-based consensus in the international community in general, and southern Africa in particular, on certain principles relating to disaster response. This section explores just three of these:

- the meaning of international disaster;
- state sovereignty in the face of disaster; and
- the nature and scope of international assistance in disaster response.

Once there is agreement on such principles, it will be easier to thresh out the roles and responsibilities of national, regional and international institutions involved in disaster response.

Meaning of international disaster

When does a disaster become an international disaster? This question is significant in that it sets the threshold of application of IDRL. At what point should international assistance step in? When a state requests it, irrespective of national capacity? Where the disaster is such that it exceeds national capacity? Where a state has capacity to deal with a disaster but for political motives or racial, ethnic or other bias refuses to come to the assistance of disaster-stricken people? Or only when a disaster affects more than one state or has trans-boundary effects?

Caron³⁴ suggests there are two possible perspectives, the first emphasizing the interstate effects of catastrophes. On this view, only trans-boundary effects would mandate and mobilize international assistance, and thus, IDRL. The second perspective emphasizes the suffering of the people, the economic cost and damage to the environment, regardless of the location and scope of the people or property affected. On this view, IDRL could therefore apply to a disaster

that was entirely localized in its effects. Caron suggests: “The second perspective dominates public discussion...the first to an uncertain degree swirls in the background and in fact.”³⁶

Caron’s distinction is necessary, but not sufficient, to know with certainty when IDRL should apply. Even if there is consensus that IDRL applies in the second perspective, when should it apply? How severe should the human, economic and environmental cost be before the international community steps in? For example, the Mozambique floods did not have trans-boundary effects, so the basis for international assistance was premised on the second perspective.

A criticism of such assistance was that ‘TV was early but aid was late’.³⁶ In fact, as early as November 1999, at the launch of the national contingency plan for flooding, the INGC had requested US\$ 2.7 million in donor funding for boats, tents and other goods but this request seems to have been ignored by the donor community amidst the overshadowing influence of the country’s preparations for their presidential election campaign in early December 1999.³⁷

If it is established, by way of customary or hard treaty law, that an international disaster is premised on the second perspective described above, should IDRL leave it at that? Or should it go further in defining the severity of human suffering and economic and environmental loss that must occur before international assistance becomes mandatory? And even if this is the case, whose judgment should count: that of the state potentially affected by the disaster or the states that are requested to help?

State sovereignty in the face of disaster

The edifice of public international law has been built on the bedrock of state sovereignty and an important aspect of sovereignty is control over national territory. Yet in the face of a disaster, state officials are pressured to relax controls that ordinarily function to buffer state control over the national territory. Relief agencies call for waiver of import, export and transit restrictions and duties for relief goods, relaxation of visa and other immigration restrictions, and waiver of over-flight and landing restrictions for craft delivering relief goods or participating in rescue operations.

A positive correlation between relaxation of state controls and efficiency of rescue operations is assumed. Principles regulating the relaxation or elimination of such controls in a disaster situation should, it is argued, form part of the corpus of IDRL.

We should, however, remain open to the possibility that such an assumption is open to investigation and challenge. Instead of assuming that all state controls are necessarily obstructive to relief operations, we should research how such controls might in fact assist the quest to coordinate disaster relief actors and goods so as to meet the needs of the victims.

Moreover, if negotiations around the reduction of state controls for disaster relief purposes are to make any headway, it will be essential to acknowledge the purpose such controls serve in the life of the state, and the reasons why states may be unwilling to relinquish controls.

The payment of landing fees (a form of airport tax), for example, was an ongoing point of contention in the Mozambican disaster. Donors felt they were being forced to pay to help.

In early February, the Mozambican government announced that emergency goods would be admitted duty free. No less than US\$ 49 million worth of relief goods were in fact admitted duty free.³⁸ But given that landing fees are utilized to develop and maintain airport infrastructure, who pays for the damage caused to infrastructure by the landing and take off of aircrafts during the disaster period?

The principles of IDRL should therefore not only encompass reduction of state controls, but also the manner in which the possible detrimental effects resulting from the reduction of such controls may be mitigated, minimized and/or reversed.

Related to the theme of state sovereignty is the issue of the relationship between state officials and disaster relief agencies and the deference with which the latter should treat the former. The Mozambican flood disaster was unusual in the manner and extent of cooperation between government officials, international organizations such as UNDP, the World Food Programme (WFP) and UNICEF, and civil society.

The national disaster agency, INGC³⁹, in effect became the forum through which the various stakeholders worked, as opposed to a situation where the international organizations set up their own institutional structures to coordinate the disaster response. The relationship amongst the various players and models for their appropriate interaction is something that will certainly need to be addressed in the development of IDRL principles.

Nature and scope of international assistance in disaster response

In southern Africa, the lack of a comprehensive bilateral treaty network whereby states pledge mutual support and assistance in the event of a disaster befalling the other, means there is no certainty as to whether other states will come to the assistance of a disaster-stricken state, which states these might be, and the extent of their assistance.

In southern Africa, more than anywhere else in the world perhaps, states are vulnerable to the goodwill of the international community of states. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that even if a bilateral treaty network were in place, many southern African states would not have the resources to assist their treaty partners.

How should the international community respond in the context of IDRL? At a minimum, there needs to be consensus on whether a disaster-stricken state can expect direct assistance from other states (for example, sending essential disaster relief goods, dispatching civil or military units to the disaster-stricken area). And whether they can at least anticipate that other states will facilitate the reduction of structural vulnerabilities that can lead to or worsen the effects of a disaster. The last point brings to bear the debate surrounding the fairness of the international trading and financial system on the subject of disasters.

If the world community is serious about alleviating the very real suffering of women, men and young children in the wake of disasters, not to mention the harm done to the environment, surely every effort must be made – including the possibility of meaningful debt relief – to assist disaster-prone states to strengthen their economic, political and social systems so that they can help themselves.

What further research is needed?

Focused debate surrounding the principles highlighted in the second part of this chapter is required if IDRL is to transform disaster response in southern Africa. At present, the region definitely lacks a comprehensive international legal framework for dealing with disasters. But, as this brief chapter has tried to show, further development of the international framework requires understanding of how national frameworks for the coordination of relief actors, goods and the needs of victims stand up to the stresses of a disaster, whether such frameworks are articulated in national laws, policies or programmes.

This will require investigating how laws, policies and programmes have actually played out in disaster relief efforts – a series of case studies may be useful. Such information, in addition to a serious consideration of the implications of concepts such as justice, fairness and equity should then be brought to bear on the further development of IDRL.

*) The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance and comments of Professor André Thomashausen, Institute of Foreign and Comparative Law, University of South Africa.

1. The findings and comments in this chapter were informed by a period of research conducted from 1 October 2002 to 31 January 2003 by the Institute of Foreign and Comparative Law at the University of South Africa, under the auspices of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The primary objectives of the research were to compile a list of international legal materials regulating disaster response operations in southern Africa, having due regard to the emerging definition of IDRL and with the focus on materials concluded under the auspices of African regional organizations or by African states or private actors amongst themselves, and to analyze, classify and identify patterns (if any) within the corpus of African IDRL.
2. For purposes of this chapter, southern African states refers to the 14 member states of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), namely: Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

3. For purposes of this chapter, 'disaster response' includes preparedness, relief and rehabilitation activities in the event of natural, technological and other disasters which are not classified as armed conflict.
4. Information on the Mozambique floods is primarily drawn from Frances Christie & Joseph Hanlon, "Mozambique & The Great Flood of 2000" (2001). The 1999/2000 floods in Mozambique were the worst in living memory in that country, spanning 5 months, involving no less than four periods of flooding and affecting nearly 2 million people. The rain started falling heavily in November 1999 and the first floods hit the country in January 2000 when the Maputo, Umbeluzi, Incomati and Limpopo rivers burst their banks. Just as the waters were receding somewhat, Cyclone Connie moved off the coast in early February dropping record rainfall in Maputo and causing extensive damage. Scarcely two weeks later, Cyclone Eline moved off the coast with extensive rainfall, then moved inland over Zimbabwe and South Africa, swelling the already-swollen rivers that drained in Mozambique. Just when no one imagined the situation could worsen, Cyclone Gloria arrived, bringing more rain.
5. Although there were blunders, mistakes, and accusations of negligence and corruption, this contention is based on the human cost of the disaster: the floods affected 2 million people, but only 700 died. No less than 45 000 people were rescued from the raging floodwaters. Furthermore, there were no major outbreaks of disease and no serious malnutrition in accommodation centers and isolated locations to which people fled from their homes. Frances Christie & Joseph Hanlon, "Mozambique & The Great Flood of 2000" (2001) pp 2.
6. A 'catch-all' concept that includes declaratory instruments and relevant resolutions adopted by intergovernmental organizations as well as agreements between states and international organizations such as the International Federation, ICRC, UNICEF, WFP and WHO.
7. See generally Arjun Katoch, "International natural disaster response and the United Nations", Chapter 6 of this publication and see Boxes 1.1, 2.3 and 4.2.
8. Horst Fischer *International Disaster Response Law: Objectives, Models and Patterns, Challenges, Proposals*, report produced for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in 2002, pp 14-15. See generally, Horst Fischer, "International disaster response law treaties: Trends, patterns and lacunae", Chapter 2 of this publication.
9. Southern African states refers to the 14 member states of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), namely: Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
10. As is the case, for example, in Europe.
11. According to Dr Buys, Head of the South African Disaster Management Organization, the SADC Disaster Management Committee has been meeting since the early 1990's. The Committee's work centres on mutual support and the sharing of knowledge and best practice. Lack of continuity in the Committee's country representatives, as well as language barriers (Portuguese and English), are experienced as constraints.
12. This may be soon set to change through increasing institutionalization of the disaster management function. South Africa is in the process of enacting a Disaster Management Bill that should empower the Disaster Management Organization (DMO) to conclude agreements of co-operation with other State Parties, inter- and non-governmental organizations and the private sector. At the time of writing this report, South Africa (acting through the DMO) and Lesotho are in the process of concluding a bi-lateral Protocol on disaster management covering such issues as border crossing, over flight and landing rights, the use of military equipment, and liability (including criminal liability).
13. A list of these agreements and their citation details can be found in Tracy-Lynn Field, "International Disaster Response Law Research Report: Southern African Region" (2003) <http://www.ifrc.org/cgi/pdf_pubs.pl?disasters/IDRL_sa_report.pdf>.
14. For example, the Treaty establishing the African Economic Community, 1991, 30 ILM 1241 (entered into force 3 June 1991) ("Abuja" Treaty)
15. For example, the Protocol on Transport, Communications and Meteorology, 24 August 1996, Southern African Development Community, articles 6.14; 6.15; 6.16.
16. For example, the Protocol on Health, 18 August 1999, Southern African Development Community, article 25.
17. For example, the Protocol on Shared Watercourse Systems, 28 August 1995, Southern African Development Community articles 2.9; 2.10.
18. Dar es Salaam Declaration on Feeding of Infants and Young Children in emergency Situations in Africa, November 1999, Participants from 18 African countries, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, United Nations Children's Fund.
19. Agreement relative to the Establishment of the Limpopo Basin Permanent Technical Committee, Botswana-Mozambique-South Africa-Zimbabwe (entered into force 5 June 1986 and the Malaria Control Protocol on the Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative, 14 October 1999, South Africa-Swaziland-Mozambique.

20. The Memorandum of Understanding on the Transportation by Road of Commodities Related to Drought Relief, 9 June 1992, South Africa-Zimbabwe and the Memorandum of Understanding on the Transportation by Road of Commodities Related to Drought Relief, 26 June 1992, South Africa-Zambia; the Letter of Intent regarding distribution of food supplies in Zimbabwe, Food and Agriculture Organization-Non-Governmental Organization World Vision (no date) and the Memorandum of Understanding regarding distribution of food supplies in certain areas of Zambia, the National Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit of the Republic of Zambia-Non-Governmental Organization World Vision (no date) (copy with author).
21. The Agreement regarding the Co-ordination of Search and Rescue Services, 8 September 2000, South Africa-Namibia, the Agreement regarding the Co-ordination of Search and Rescue Services, 10 May 2002, South Africa-Mozambique and the Agreement regarding the Co-ordination of Search and Rescue Services, 31 May 2001, South Africa-France.
22. For example, Agreement on Co-operation in the Field of Health and Medical Sciences, 28 March 2002, South Africa-Nigeria.
23. Basic Agreement concerning the Presence, Role, Legal Status, Immunities and Privileges of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and its Personnel in the Republic of South Africa, 6 September 1993, South Africa-UNHCR. Agreement regarding the Legal Status, Privileges and Immunities of the International Committee of the Red Cross, 23 February 1995, South Africa-ICRC. Agreement concerning the Presence, Role, Legal Status, Immunities and Privileges of the International Organization for Migration, 22 February 1995, South Africa-IOM. Agreement between the Republic of South Africa and the United Nations Development Programme, 3 October 1994. Basic Agreement for the Establishment of Technical Advisory Co-operation Relations, 5 December 2000, South Africa-World Health Organization. Agreement to Establish Food and Agriculture Organization Representation in South Africa, 25 August 1997, South Africa-FAO. Agreement on the Establishment of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Headquarters in South Africa, 12 September 1996, South Africa-UNESCO. Basic Co-operation Agreement between United Nations Children's Fund and the Government of the South Africa, 3 May 1996. Agreement regarding the Establishment of a Delegation in the Republic of South Africa, 23 October 1991, South Africa-League of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.
24. Horst Fischer International Disaster Response Law: Objectives, Models and Patterns, Challenges, Proposals, report produced for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in 2002, p24. See generally, Horst Fischer, "International disaster response law treaties: Trends, patterns and lacunae", Chapter 2 of this book.
25. Dar es Salaam Declaration on Feeding of Infants and Young Children in emergency Situations in Africa, November 1999, Participants from 18 African countries, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, United Nations Children's Fund.
26. Declaration of Intent on Co-operation in the Field of Health, 23 May 2002, South Africa-Angola. Declaration of Intent on Co-operation in the Field of Health, 4 June 2002, South Africa-Senegal.
27. Agreement between the Republic of South Africa and the United Nations Development Programme, 3 October 1994.
28. For example, Basic Co-operation Agreement between United Nations Children's Fund and the Government of the South Africa, 3 May 1996, article 25.
29. Protocol on Transport, Communications and Meteorology, 24 August 1996, Southern African Development Community.
30. See Frances Christie & Joseph Hanlon, "Mozambique and The Great Flood of 2000" (2001), Chapter 1.
31. National Disaster Management Institute
32. Co-ordinating Council for Disaster Management, comprising representation of the Prime Minister and the following ministries: Foreign Affairs and Co-operation; Public Works and Housing; Transport and Communications; Health; Agriculture and Rural Development.
33. Frances Christie & Joseph Hanlon, "Mozambique and The Great Flood of 2000" (2001).
34. David D. Caron 'Addressing catastrophes: conflicting images of solidarity and separateness' in David D. Caron and Charles Leben (eds) "Les aspects internationaux des catastrophes naturelles et industrielles/The International Aspects of Natural and Industrial Catastrophes" Hague Academy of International Law Series (2001), pp 12-13.
35. David D. Caron 'Addressing catastrophes: conflicting images of solidarity and separateness' in David D. Caron and Charles Leben (eds) "Les aspects internationaux des catastrophes naturelles et industrielles/The International Aspects of Natural and Industrial Catastrophes" Hague Academy of International Law Series (2001) pp 13.
36. Frances Christie & Joseph Hanlon, "Mozambique and The Great Flood of 2000" (2001), Chapter 7.
37. Frances Christie & Joseph Hanlon, "Mozambique and The Great Flood of 2000" (2001), p 12.
38. Frances Christie & Joseph Hanlon, "Mozambique and The Great Flood of 2000" (2001), pp64-65.
39. By that time, headed by the Minister of Foreign and Co-operation Affairs.