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What is the scope of international disaster response law?
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Introduction
International disaster response law (IDRL) is not a new component of international law. However, it is one that has developed with little notice taken among scholars or practitioners, despite the growing human and economic toll taken by peacetime disasters.

The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement has determined that this field of law needs careful consideration. Accordingly, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies is conducting a systematic, scholarly examination of existing international legal sources on peacetime disaster response, and is working with states to ensure that dialogue and development in this important field progresses in an informed, practical way.

States have expected the Movement to play a leadership role in peacetime disaster relief since its earliest days.1 Those responsibilities expanded over time. Today they include the responsibility to provide expert support for development of rules that expedite humanitarian operations and cooperation.2

Given its role as a leader in peacetime disaster response, the International Federation is particularly well suited to lead the Movement’s IDRL work. The Movement has, in fact, asked the International Federation to take the lead in these endeavors.3 And recently, the United Nations (UN) General Assembly took note of the International Federation’s continuing work in this field.4

The Movement has adopted IDRL as terminology describing the body of rules and principles for international humanitarian assistance in the wake of peacetime disasters, whether natural, technological or industrial in origin. This chapter provides a brief commentary on the scope of IDRL and comparative insights from the more familiar field of international humanitarian law (IHL). It also progressively builds a working definition of IDRL, which constitutes the conclusion of this chapter.

IHL, which applies during armed conflict, offers the only universally recognized and systematically studied set of rules designed to alleviate human suffering in response to catastrophic events. It is grounded in many centuries of state experience, practice and
diplomacy, and is therefore a useful source of comparison in deliberations on the future of IDRL.

IDRL can only help victims of peacetime disaster if framed in a pragmatic manner. There is a wide range of important legal subject matter, domestic and international, that relates to IDRL but does not impact directly on humanitarian response to disasters (for example, environmental protection issues). IDRL must be defined with a fair degree of rigor. Otherwise, it could vanish into the general corpus of international law with its promise and utility consequently lost.

**Conceptual scope of IDRL**

The conceptual scope of IDRL should be considered first. Comparing IHL’s scope with that of IDRL, the former is largely restricted to situations involving armed conflict. Most IHL applies only while armed hostilities are underway; IHL in its entirety applies during international armed conflict with a subset of rules applicable during internal armed conflicts. It is unlikely that IDRL will develop along similar lines.

IHL evolved to regulate interstate hostilities. However, in 1949 some rules were adopted for internal armed conflict as well. From then on, such conflicts would not be addressed by reference to municipal law alone.

Though rules for internal armed conflict were first incorporated into treaties in 1949, customary rules emerged in state practice as early as the 18th century. By the time such rules were incorporated into the Geneva Conventions of 1949, there was already a growing consensus that humanitarian rules and constraints should apply during internal as well as international armed conflicts.

IDRL develops in a different context. IHL imposes limits on the conduct of hostilities in order to alleviate their impact, or in other words, to mitigate human activity. However, IDRL applies in a cooperative peacetime environment. Damage inflicted during peacetime disasters is usually unintended and the concept of humanitarian constraint and restraint does not apply as it would during armed conflict. IDRL does not address belligerent acts and conduct that require limitation under international law, whereas IHL does in the context of international and internal armed conflicts alike.

Therefore it is unlikely that a sub-category of IDRL will develop for use in peacetime disasters where these are effectively alleviated without recourse to international assistance. Where such needs are met domestically, there is no need for international legal norms analogous to those developed to alleviate the effects of internal armed conflict. In other words, there is no internal-international taxonomy for IDRL matching the internal-international taxonomy of IHL.

There is also another notable difference. IHL establishes humanitarian protections that alleviate armed conflict. Though diligent application of IHL may also facilitate a return to peace, it does not provide, directly, the means to facilitate an end to armed conflict. As
developed to date, IDRL expedites voluntary assistance when peacetime disasters motivate humanitarian solidarity and support. But IDRL can do more than establish the legal framework for humanitarian assistance in peacetime. If systematically developed, it could, and should, facilitate a rapid response that will bring the emergency phase to its close.

*International disaster response law applies when states and intergovernmental, humanitarian or other organizations offer, request, provide or accept cross-border disaster assistance.*

**Spatial and temporal scope of IDRL**

Precisely when and where does IDRL actually apply? Again drawing a comparison with IHL, most rules for the latter apply at the locus of armed conflict. IHL regulates the treatment of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces in war zones; prisoners of war held by states involved in conflict; and civilians situated in the territory of a party to the conflict. Likewise, rules applicable during non-international armed conflict apply within the state where hostilities occur. It is useful to consider the spatial scope of IDRL in similar terms. Obviously IDRL will apply at the scene of a disaster. But how does one map out, conceptually and for legal purposes, the boundaries of disaster zones? The legal subject matter of disasters could well apply in places far removed from the site of an obvious emergency.

To adopt an analogy from IHL, armed forces are obliged to follow targeting rules even when weapons are fired from platforms that are located far from any contested territory. Likewise, hurricanes and tsunamis build energy far from their point of impact and IDRL can be productively applied in such circumstances, for example, in agreements facilitating information sharing and establishing early warning systems.

In what time frame does IDRL apply? The consequences of a disaster may be felt many years after the crisis has passed. The temporal scope of IHL offers insights useful in answering this question. The rules of IHL apply in their entirety during armed hostilities, but a limited subset of IHL also applies in peacetime (both pre- and post-conflict).

The temporal parameters of IHL are sometimes intuitive; circumstances unique to armed conflict need to come to an end when conflict terminates. In this regard, prisoners of war and civilian internees – people who have only been detained because of armed conflict and whose detention would have no legal basis but for armed conflict – must be released when it ends. Logically, the time frame for application of such rules continues until such captives have been released and repatriated following termination of active hostilities.

Other IHL rules applicable in peacetime actually bolster the law during armed conflict. The Geneva Conventions require dissemination of IHL in times of peace as well as time of war. Peace-time rules on use of the emblems of the Red Cross and Red Crescent ensure that their protective impact is not diluted during armed conflict. The Geneva Conventions also commit states to try persons who have allegedly committed grave breaches of IHL. Practically speaking,
this commitment extends well beyond the termination of armed conflict – in some cases, decades or generations after.\textsuperscript{18}

Most IDRL identified in the International Federation’s research\textsuperscript{16} applies during the emergency phase of disasters. However, just as some IHL applies in peacetime, there are issues impacting public health and safety that reasonably come within the ambit of IDRL other than during the actual emergency.\textsuperscript{19} It may be useful to examine rules for the pre-disaster phase (for example, pre-positioning relief supplies), and the post-disaster phase (for example, procedures for review of lessons learned and information sharing), that may directly impact humanitarian service delivery in disasters.

The primary question to consider is: When does a disaster begin? Intuitive trigger points for application of IDRL would include the moment of kinetic impact in a natural catastrophe; the moment when the effects of a viral epidemic or man-made contamination are detected; and the moment when food insecurity exacts a measurable toll. It would be reasonable to extend this scope a bit further to include the moment when it becomes apparent that slow or sudden onset disasters will likely trigger these or other events requiring international emergency assistance and cooperation.\textsuperscript{20}

There are circumstances where a humanitarian challenge may be covered by IHL at one point in time and IDRL at another. For example, humanitarian emergencies triggered by armed conflict (such as food insecurity threats) may continue past termination of hostilities and hence past the point where they would be covered by IHL. Such circumstances would call for transition to, and application of, peacetime rules from IDRL.\textsuperscript{21}

International disaster response law applies from the moment forces of nature, human misadventure, or intentionally triggered catastrophic events (other than those taking place in armed conflict) threaten imminent and adverse impact on human beings, and remains in effect until emergency assistance is no longer needed. It applies at the scene of the emergency, and at other locations as well where monitoring, reporting or other forms of cooperation, coordination or assistance can mitigate the impact of events or forces inducing such calamities.

**Structural and substantive scope of IDRL**

Though IDRL has only recently been the subject of systematic study, it is clearly founded in the same sources of authority as other subject matters of international law.\textsuperscript{22} Though not as well developed as IHL, IDRL follows the same structure in that it is founded in treaties, and its application and interpretation facilitated by reference to resolutions of international organizations and conferences.\textsuperscript{23} Research completed to date does not suggest the existence of a system of customary IDRL, whereas customary rules are a long-established component of IHL.\textsuperscript{24}

Other sources also contribute to the general development of international law and thus have a role to play in shaping IDRL. These sources either contribute to the corpus of IDRL or illuminate areas where the law may need further development. They include:
municipal legislation;
memoranda of understanding between states and humanitarian organizations;
professional standards for humanitarian actors such as the Code of Conduct for the
International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief
(see Box 1.1); and
standards for humanitarian assistance such as those developed by the Sphere Project
(see Box 1.2).

The International Federation’s ongoing study has identified core IDRL subject matter that
appears in many relevant instruments, including guidance on offer and acceptance of
humanitarian assistance; coordination of relief efforts; access to disaster sites; controls on
import of relief goods; status and protection of personnel; and allocation of costs for peacetime
humanitarian relief.\textsuperscript{26}

Though IDRL applies in circumstances quite different from those involving IHL, there is
some conceptual overlap. Accordingly certain principles useful to the development of IDRL
can be derived from international humanitarian law. The status, protection and responsibilities
of individuals and units providing humanitarian assistance in war zones have been an
important focus throughout the development of modern IHL.\textsuperscript{27} The Geneva Conventions of
1949 and the Additional Protocols of 1977 provide contemporary guidance in this area.\textsuperscript{28}

It is reasonable to assume states will maintain an interest in such matters in peacetime as well as
during armed conflict. Humanitarian organizations certainly do, making this a promising area
for development within the framework of IDRL.\textsuperscript{29} Similarly, IHL rules on Red Cross and Red
Crescent emblem use found in the First Geneva Convention provide the starting point for
consideration of any rules on emblem use in non-conflict disaster settings.\textsuperscript{30}

It is also important to consider limitations on the scope of subject matter that might be
productively incorporated into IDRL. As suggested before, there are legal issues quite
important to disaster reduction (for example, land use regulation and environmental
protection rules) that are not directly linked to the emergency response phase. These can be
addressed more productively in contexts other than that provided for by IDRL.\textsuperscript{31}

International disaster response law is found in treaties, municipal law and regulations. Its
development is facilitated through resolutions adopted by the International Conference of the Red
Cross and Red Crescent, the UN, other intergovernmental organizations, and learned societies,
and through public and private codes and standards adopted to guide humanitarian action. It
encompasses information sharing, coordination, deployment of personnel, equipment and supplies,
access and assistance to disaster victims, status of humanitarian responders and standards of
conduct.

Conclusions

Based on the factors explored in this chapter, the following working definition is now proposed
for international disaster response law:
International disaster response law is found in treaties, municipal law and regulations. Its development is facilitated through resolutions adopted by the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, the UN, other intergovernmental organizations, and learned societies, and through public and private codes and standards adopted to guide humanitarian action.

Its rules apply when states or intergovernmental, humanitarian or other organizations offer, request, provide or accept cross-border disaster assistance. It encompasses information sharing, coordination, deployment of personnel, equipment and supplies, access and assistance to disaster victims, status of humanitarian responders and standards of conduct.

It applies from the moment forces of nature, human misdeeds, or intentionally triggered catastrophic events (other than those taking place in armed conflict) threaten imminent and adverse impact on human beings, and remains in effect until emergency assistance is no longer needed. It applies at the scene of the emergency, and at other locations as well where monitoring, reporting or other forms of cooperation, coordination or assistance can mitigate the impact of events or forces inducing such calamities.
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11. First Geneva Convention, Articles 12-44; Second Geneva Convention, Articles 12-45.

12. Third Geneva Convention, Article 12. A limited exception to this principle involves guidance on transfer of wounded and sick prisoners of war for internment in neutral countries during the conflict, Third Geneva Convention, Article 109.


14. “In the case of armed conflict not of an international character occurring in the territory of one of the High Contracting Parties, each Party to the conflict shall be bound to apply, as a minimum, the following provisions...” Article 13 common to the First, Second, Third and Fourth Geneva Conventions. See also Additional Protocol II, Article 1(1), which applies in armed conflicts “which take place in the territory of a High Contracting Party.”
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16. First Geneva Convention, Article 48; Second Geneva Convention, Article 47; Third Geneva Convention, Article 127; Fourth Geneva Convention, Article 144.
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