| Figures and Tables  | 11 |
|---|----|
| Inventory of abbreviations  | 15 |
| Executive summary   | 19 |
| Introduction  | 23 |
| Space: Description and geography  |    |
| of Heidelberg and Rhine-Neckar district   | 23 |
| Time: The great COVID-19 pandemic   | 25 |
| Knowns & Unknowns: Federal pandemic risk analysis of 2012   | 29 |
| Circumstances: A mission in a VUCA setting  | 29 |
| Framework: CIMIC in disasters worldwide and in Germany  | 31 |
| The cookie, the truck, and the bridge—types of military assistance                                    | 31 |
| Main sectors of humanitarian action and disaster relief operations—the UN cluster approach            | 32 |
| Respecting the humanitarian mindset is a foundation for successful cooperation with civilian partners | 32 |
| The constitutional basis for domestic CIMIC in Germany  |    |
| in disaster relief situations   | 33 |
| Operationalization of subsidiary domestic CIMIC support   |    |
| in disaster management  | 33 |
| Rationale and goals for this research project   | 34 |
| Research question   | 34 |
| Content and structure: Three modules of this work and their objectives                                | 35 |
|   |    |
| Methods   | 37 |
| Study type and study design   | 37 |
| Data sources  | 37 |
| Ethics  | 38 |

| Study Registration   | 38 |
|--|----|
| Module 1: CIMIC mission in Heidelberg and Rhine-Neckar   | 38 |
| (1) Understanding the thinking   | 38 |
| (2) Understanding the players  | 39 |
| (3) Understanding the mission  | 39 |
| Medical information exchange analysis  | 39 |
| Mission analysis   | 39 |
| Modules 2 and 3: Impact of the Heidelberg/Rhine-Neckar   |    |
| CIMIC mission and lessons learned to be better prepared  |    |
| for future catastrophes  | 40 |
| Inclusion criteria   | 40 |
| Exclusion criteria   | 40 |
| Interviewees   | 40 |
| Semi-structured interview guide  | 41 |
| Qualitative data analysis: Coding of significant statements,   |    |
| horizontalization, grouping into clusters of meaning   | 44 |
| Techniques to enhance trustworthiness  | 44 |
| Analytic framework: Appraisal of findings through a harmonized community resilience lens                           | 44 |
| -  |    |
| Variables and codes  | 45 |
| Statistical analysis of quantitative variables   | 47 |
| Epidemiological data: COVID-19 seven-day incidences and cumulative deaths for Heidelberg and Rhine-Neckar district | 47 |
| Researcher characteristics and reflexivity   | 47 |
| Researcher characteristics and reflexivity   | 47 |
|  |    |
| Results  | 49 |
| Module 1: Civil-military disaster relief support to Heidelberg   |    |
| and Rhine-Neckar district during the COVID-19 crisis.  |    |
| Autoethnographic qualitative, empiric—observational analysis   | 49 |
| Systems-based guiding principle for CIMIC medical information  |    |
| exchange: A COVID-19 patient's journey   | 49 |
| Actors' diagram: Civilian administrative crisis management team and civilian disaster relief                       | 53 |
| Actors' diagram: Regional interclinical medical task force   | 55 |
| CIMIC support provided to the population of Heidelberg   |    |
| and Rhine-Neckar   | 57 |

| re | lodule 2: From civilian capability gaps towards societal esilience—impact of the Heidelberg/Rhine-Neckar CIMIC isaster relief mission. Semi-structured interviews with key |     |
|----|--|-----|
|    | akeholders of the local disaster relief community  | 61  |
|    | Demography of the study population   | 61  |
|    | Professional context   | 62  |
|    | Perception of pandemic phases  | 67  |
|    | Significant actors   | 71  |
|    | Reasons for being considered a significant actor   | 71  |
|    | Own area: Responsibilities   | 74  |
|    | Own area analysis: Synopsis of findings  | 76  |
|    | Own area: Biggest challenges   | 83  |
|    | Own area: Biggest difficulties   | 89  |
|    | Own area: Elements that worked best in the local pandemic  |     |
|    | disaster management  | 94  |
|    | Own area: Elements that worked worst in the local pandemic   |     |
|    | disaster management  | 98  |
|    | Own area: Learning   | 102 |
|    | Own area: Elements that participants would do <i>the same</i> next time  | 109 |
|    | Own area: Elements that participants would do <i>differently</i> next time   | 111 |
|    | Nature of subsidiary civil-military support towards the present study population   | 115 |
|    | Analysis of specific civil-military experiences, topics, outcomes,   |     |
|    | and lessons learned  | 116 |
|    | Civil military cooperation: What worked best   | 120 |
|    | Civil military cooperation: What worked worst  | 122 |
|    | Civil military cooperation: What should be done the same way   |     |
|    | next time?   | 123 |
|    | Civil military cooperation: What should be done <i>differently</i> next time?  | 127 |
|    | Comparison of civilian and military capabilities during the pandemic disaster management: Overview   |     |
|    | Comparison of civilian and military capabilities during the pandemic disaster management: <i>Strengths</i> of the <i>civilian</i>  |     |
|    | side   | 133 |
|    |  |     |

|          | Comparison of civilian and military capabilities during the pandemic disaster management: <i>Strengths</i> of the <i>military</i>  | 134 |
|----------|--|-----|
|          | Comparison of civilian and military capabilities during the pandemic disaster management: <i>Weaknesses</i> of the <i>civilian</i> side  | 137 |
|          | Comparison of civilian and military capabilities during the pandemic disaster management: Weaknesses of the military   |     |
|          | Impact of the subsidiary CIMIC mission on the local community resilience   | 143 |
|          | Elements of community resilience that <i>increased</i> as a result of the subsidiary civil-military mission in Heidelberg/Rhine-   |     |
|          | Neckar   | 144 |
|          | Elements of community resilience that <i>did not increase</i> as a result of the subsidiary civil-military mission in Heidelberg/  |     |
|          | Rhine-Neckar  Possible mutual learning between the military and  |     |
|          | the civilian side  | 149 |
| aí<br>be | reparedness—How well are we prepared for future catastrophes fter lessons learned from the corona pandemic and what must e done to close this gap? Semi-structured interview with key takeholders of the local disaster relief community | 151 |
| -        | Strengths  |     |
|          | Weaknesses   |     |
|          | Necessary actions for better preparedness for future catastrophes  |     |
|          | Résumé   |     |
| D        | iscussion  | 175 |
|          | ocus question 1: What was done in Heidelberg/Rhine-Neckar?   |     |
| г        | Expanded contextual perspective: Worldwide medico-scientific contributions with the participation of military medical personnel  |     |
|          | or institutions  Expanded contextual perspective: Worldwide CIMIC field  |     |
| Fo       | experiences or analyses  | 178 |
|          | isaster relief mission have?   | 184 |
|          | Expanded contextual perspective: Role models for crisis  |     |
|          | management and mutual learning   | 185 |

| Focus question 3: How well are we prepared for future catastrophes after lessons learned from the corona pandemic |     |
|---|-----|
| and what must be done to close this gap?  | 188 |
| Cutting of red tape   | 189 |
| Breaking the "panic-then-forget" cycle through sustainable  |     |
| preparedness  | 189 |
| Achieving timely operational readiness  | 190 |
| Overcoming the next "infodemic" in a world of social media  | 191 |
| Limitations and directions for future research  | 191 |
|   |     |
| Conclusion  | 195 |
|   |     |
| Epilogue  | 407 |
| Epilogue  | 197 |
|   |     |
| References  | 199 |
|   |     |
| Quality control instruments: Research checklists  | 209 |
| STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies  |     |
| in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement  | 209 |
| Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)   | 213 |