

Vol 2, Section 2	SOI Number	2205.3
Subject: Enemy Prisoners of War and Detention Centres	Sponsor	SO1 J1/J4
	Last Updated	Feb 03

References:

- A. NATO STANAG 2033 – Interrogation of PW.
- B. NATO STANAG 2044 – Procedures for Dealing with PW.
- C. NATO STANAG 2084 – Handling and Reporting of Captured Enemy Equipment and Documents.
- D. AJP - 2.5 – Handling of Captured Personnel, Equipment and Documents.
- E. JWP 1-10 Enemy Prisoners of War.

AIM

1. To outline a framework and key factors for PW and detention centre planning.

DEFINITION

2. Commanders can expect to capture PW from more than one nation during war-fighting operations. National governments and their commanders are responsible for the welfare of PW under the explicit provisions of Geneva Convention (GC) III (1949). For peace support operations commanders are also likely to have responsibility for refugees and detainees. During non-combatant evacuation operations commanders can expect to encounter and to have to detain suspicious, violent or hostile personnel.

DOCTRINE AND PUBLICATIONS

3. There is some doctrine for UK PW on their conduct after capture by the enemy. Alliance publications about enemy prisoners of war (EPW) are readily available (see References A, B, C and D). There is a JWP on PW (Reference E).
4. From the moment of capture, PW are the responsibility of the “detaining nation”, not of the detaining unit or sub-unit. A Protecting Power¹ - often another nation but sometimes the ICRC - is responsible for inspecting parties to a conflict to ensure they are complying with the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC).² It is probable that HMG’s policy would be to secure agreement from the host nation or nations - likely to be most akin in culture to the captives - to accept responsibility by MoU for PW handling. In practice, there might be

¹ See Alliance and UK glossaries.

² International Humanitarian Law such as the Geneva Conventions & Protocols. See Chapter One JWP 0-10 Doctrine for National and Multi-national Operations.