Challenges and needs for the EU's Disaster Response

Roberto SCHILIRO

DG ECHO.A.5 Civil Protection Policy, Prevention, Preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction

Treaty on the functioning of the EU

Article 6

The Union shall have competence to carry out actions to support, coordinate or supplement the actions of the Member States. The areas of such action shall, at European level, be:

.....

(f) civil protection;

Treaty on the functioning of the EU

Article 196

1. The Union shall encourage cooperation between Member States in order to improve the effectiveness of systems for preventing and protecting against natural or man-made disasters. Union action shall aim to:

(a) support and complement Member States' action at national, regional and local level in risk prevention, in preparing their civil-protection personnel and **in responding to natural or man-made disasters within the Union**;

Treaty on the functioning of the EU

(b) promote swift, **effective operational cooperation** within the Union between national civil- protection services;
(c) promote **consistency in international civil-protection work**.

2. The European Parliament and the Council, acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure shall establish the measures necessary to help achieve the objectives referred to in paragraph 1, excluding any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of the Member States.

System today

- Currently: ***ad hoc*** system of MS' offers facilitated/supported by the MIC:
  - Inevitable degree of improvisation
  - Reactive rather than pro-active
  - No contingency planning
  - No predictability

Key proposals

- European Emergency Response Capacity based on voluntarily committed MS' assets
- European Emergency Response Centre
- Reinforced arrangements on transport
- Further investigating into areas where EU-funded assets might be appropriate

Pilot actions - testing way ahead

- Preparatory action/pilot projects (2008-2010):
  - Testing standby arrangements with MS' modules
  - Ca. 20 projects involving 17 Member States
  - Positive evaluation – viable model
  - All projects terminate by mid-2012
  - Significant demand to continue such facility

Preparatory action 2008: projects

Main applicant and title	Countries	Modules
Ministère de l'Intérieur FR, DDSC EUACR5	FR	Aerial forest fires fighting – Deployments during forest fires in France and Portugal (August 2010) – operational until end of September 2010.
Dipartimento della Protezione Civile	IT	Seismic module
Estonian Rescue Board – "BaltIfloodcombat II"	EE, LV, LT	Enhancement of the High Capacity Pumping module developed in 2008
Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency "Emergency Temporary Shelter – Camp Support unit"	SE (with DE)	Developing an additional capacity to the European Temporary Shelter developed In 2009
Crisis Management Centre – « Cold Condition Module II »	FIN	Further upgrade of the Medium USAR team able to work in winter conditions (-20 degrees)

Preparatory action 2009: projects

Main applicant and title	Countries	Modules
Crisis Management Centre – « Cold Condition Module for the EU Community Mechanism »	FIN (with SE)	Medium USAR team able to work in winter conditions (-20 degrees) Ready for deployment
Arbeiter Samariter Bund Osterreichs "Emergency Temporary Shelter – Management System – EURETS"	AT (with SK, DE)	Emergency Temporary Shelter Management system Ready for deployment
Veiligheidsregio Haaglanden	NL (with CZ, UK)	Search and rescue in flood conditions Ready for deployment
Ministère de l'Intérieur FR, DDSC EUACR5	FR (with BE, ES, EL and PT)	Standby of various modules including new modules on Ground FFF, flood containment and CBRN decontamination (multiple deployments)
The Johanniter	DE (with AT and SK)	Developing a MEDEVAC module Ready for deployment
Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency "Emergency Temporary Shelter" a reinforced concept"	SE (with DE)	Developing an European Temporary Shelter Ready for deployment
Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency "European Flood response capacity"	SE (with FI)	Developing a Flood containment module Ready for deployment

Preparatory action 2010: projects

Main applicant and title	Countries	Modules
Ministère de l'Intérieur FR, DDSC EUACR5	FR	Aerial forest fires fighting – Deployments during forest fires in France and Portugal (August 2010) – operational until end of September 2010.
Dipartimento della Protezione Civile	IT	Seismic module
Estonian Rescue Board – “Baltlfloodcombat II"	EE, LV, LT	Enhancement of the High Capacity Pumping module developed in 2008
Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency “Emergency Temporary Shelter – Camp Support unit”	SE (with DE)	Developing an additional capacity to the European Temporary Shelter developed In 2009
Crisis Management Centre – « Cold Condition Module II »	FIN	Further upgrade of the Medium USAR team able to work in winter conditions (-20 degrees)

Voluntary pool – proposal

- Predictable system based on **reference scenarios**, **contingency planning** and the pool
- Voluntary pool of pre-identified MS' capacities on standby for deployment in EU operations:
  - **voluntary** arrangement
  - **national direction** and control
  - **commitment** to make assets available
  - **exceptions** to deployment possible (MS' decision)
  - Supplemented by **additional *ad hoc*** offers

Discussion: which pool of assets ?

- Options/questions:
  - size: small – big?
  - degree of commitment?
  - degree of the EU co-funding?
  - scope: CP modules only, which types?

- Aim: ‘adequate’ EU response to disasters?

Complementary EU-funded assets

- Possible development of complementary EU-funded assets

  - EU Funded
  - Identified gaps in EU response
  - Action at EU level more cost-effective
  - Delegated Management

Rationale for EU-funded assets

- Cost-effectiveness
- Shared use of assets
- Filling gaps in capacities
- Financed from EU budget
- Managed by Member States
- Priority for EU operations
- Complementarity
- Increased overall protection
- Small part of all assets

Experiences to date

- Pilot projects/preparatory actions
- FFTR tested in summers of 2009 and 2010
- External evaluation: overall positive
- Other examples
- Study on governance models of shared resources around the world
- Central hub
- Command & control at entity level
- Co-financing and cost-sharing
- Ongoing study on impact assessment

Areas to use EU-funded assets

From experiences/stakeholder input:

- Low probability/high impact risks
  - CBRN (mass decontamination) ?
  - Volcanic ash cloud-like situations ?
- Assets for horizontal tasks
  - Assessment ?
  - Logistics ?
- Specialised high-value assets
  - Specialised aircraft ?

Gaps to be identified:

- By-product of contingency planning ?
- Dedicated exercise ?

Complementary EU-funded assets

EU Forest Fires Tactical Reserve – EUFFTR

Operational activity: 1 July – 30 September 2009

- Operations 6
- Flying hours 275
- Drops 472

- 2 Canadairs CL-215
- Payload: 5400 litres of water
- 150 flying hours / aircraft
- Based in Bastia, Corsica
- Distances: Lisbon (1800km), Athens (1500km), Sofia (1300km)
- Operating hours/day: 6+2

1. FR (Corsica)
08.07.2009 – Rapid intervention

2. FR (Corsica)
23.07.2009 – Rapid intervention

3. IT (Sardinia)
24 – 26.07.2009 – Rapid intervention

4. PT (Monte Real Airbase)
14 – 20.08.2009 Pre-positioning/Detachment

5. GR (Attiki)
22 – 25.08.2009 – Detachment

6. PT Monte Real Airbase)
5-12.09.2009 Pre-positioning/Detachment

Important features of the FF case

Frequency

High frequency meaning a simultaneous need for assets by several different event which provides an incentive for "over-investment"

Capital cost

Capital costs are high – A certain risk is accepted and not all FF are covered by AFFF

Mobile asset

The asset is mobile and the transport cost relative to other costs are relatively low

Probability

All forest fire prone countries have probability levels that provides sufficient incentive for them to invest in response

Sharing mechanism

Imperfect (in an economic sense) sharing mechanisms lead to over-investments in this case and could also lead to deficiencies in pre-planning (including pre-positioning). Financial constraints can lead to under-investment and sharing is a relevant mechanism to reduce the effects from this constraint. The larger the costs the more relevant is this concern

Important features in the case of floods

Frequency

Frequency of separate events happening simultaneously competing for the same response assets is lower? over-investments less likely

Capital cost

Relatively low but maintenance of MS skills and expertise is costly which can still put a limit to the accepted risk level

Mobile asset

Transport cost are very high if not road transport –for road: mobilisation time can still be quite significant and transport cost will still constitute a relatively high fraction of the total cost – host nation support is crucial

Probability

Flood prone countries face significant risks and hence have an incentive to invest themselves

Sharing mechanism

Appears to work well in the Baltic region. Efficient host-nation support can assist to enhance "mobility"

Financial constraint may not be as significant in "up-front" terms, but the costs of maintenance may be a factor of some importance

Important features in the case of CBRN expert back-up team

Frequency

Frequency is low for the individual MS, as CBRN covers many different types of disasters and impacts

Capital cost

Complex in the sense that a CBRN expert back up team would demand the availability of many specific expertises/equipment. Much of this can be MS operated and owned

Mobile asset

Mobility would be high (HR mainly), but accompanying specialised assets could be expensive. Mobility could be increased through Host Nation Support

Probability

Low probabilities for many of the specific events; low incentive to invest to respond to a wider spectrum of potential disasters

Sharing mechanism

A CBRN team could help to address potential complexities and provide fast and immediate response to specific CBRN events

Financial constraints per se may not be significant, but MS may tend to focus only on the disaster types for which they have a probability/risk

Conclusions

Does sharing make sense (i.e. not just sharing of assets, but also sharing of investments)?

- Frequency matters. Many independent events that can be responded to by the asset type in question
- Capital costs. The higher the capital costs, the more can the up-front financial requirements affect the ability/feasibility to implement the optimal solutions
- Mobility must be high in order for sharing to make sense. Mobility relates to transportation but also to the generic applicability of the asset in question
- Probability. If probabilities are very low compared to the exposure, the individual MS will have little if no incentive to invest in response

Investigating into sharing in-optimalities

- Need for a driver to materialise economic benefits from sharing
- Need for a joint initiative to close a gap and investigation of whether the EU "umbrella" is the most feasible and cost-effective solution
- Options to improve the sharing conditions, e.g. improve the mobility
- EU funding may provide the appropriate stimulus through less than 100% funding – mechanisms depend on the issue