Work conducted under contract N00014-91-C-0002. This Research Memorandum represents the best opinion of CNA at the time of issue. It does not necessarily represent the opinion of the Department of the Navy.

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.



CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES

4401 Ford Avenue • Post Office Box 16268 • Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268 • (703) 824-2000

28 April 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION LIST

CNA Research Memorandum 91-211

CNA Research Memorandum 91-211, Eastern Exit: The Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) From Mogadishu, Somalia, in January 1991 (U), by Adam B. Siegel, Oct 1991

- 1. Enclosure (1) is forwarded as a matter of possible interest.
- This research memorandum documents the events and discusses lessons learned from the noncombatant evacuation operation (NEO) from the $\ensuremath{\text{U.S.}}$ Embassy in Mogadishu, Somalia, in January 1991. During this operation, named "Eastern Exit," U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps forces evacuated 281 people from 30 countries (including 8 Ambassadors and 39 Soviet citizens).

Mark T. Lewellyn

Director

Strike and Amphibious Warfare

Department

Distribution List: Reverse page

Distribution List

| SNDL | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------|---|
| 21A1 | CINCLANTFLT | 45V | 11 MEU |
| 21A2 | CINCPACFLT | 45V | 13 MEU |
| 21A3 | CINCUSNAVEUR | 45V | 15 MEU |
| 22A1 | COMSECONDFLT | 45V | 22 MEU |
| 22A2 | COMTHIRDFLT | 45V | 24 MEU |
| 22A2 | COMSEVENTHFLT | 45V | 26 MEU |
| 23B2 | COMNAVSPECWARCOM | 45V | CG FIRST MEB |
| AJBE . | CORONADO | 45V | CG FOURTH MEB |
| 23B4 | COMIDEASTFOR | 45V | CG FIFTH MEB |
| 24D1 | COMNAVSURFLANT | 45V | CG SIXTH MEB |
| 24D1 24D2 | COMNAVSURFPAC | 45V | CG SEVENTH MEB |
| 24H1 | COMTRALANT | 45V | CG NINTH MEB |
| 24H2 | COMTRAPAC | 46B | CG FIRST MAW |
| 24J1 | CG FMFLANT/HQ FMFEUR | 46B | CG SECOND MAW |
| | | 46B | CG THIRD MAW |
| 24J2 | CG FMFPAC | | |
| 24J3 | HQ FMFEUR | 46B | CG FOURTH MAW |
| 26A1 | COMPHIBGRU TWO | 46C1 | MAG 11 |
| 26A1 | COMPHIBWARCEN | 46C1 | MAG 12 |
| 26A2 | COMPHIBGRU ONE | 46C1 | MAG 13 |
| 26A2 | COMPHIBGRU THREE | 46C1 | MAG 14 |
| | Attn: RAdm. S.S. Clarey | 46C1 | MAG 15 |
| 26V1 | LFTCLANT | 46C1 | MAG 16 |
| 26V2 | LFTCPAC | 46C1 | M.AG 24 |
| 26QQ1 | COMNAVSPECWARDEVGRU | 46C1 | MAG 26 |
| | DAM NECK | 46C1 | MAG 29 |
| 26QQ1 | COMNAVSPECWARGRU TWO | 46C1 | MAG 31 |
| 26QQ1 | COMNAVSPECWARUNIT TWO | 46C1 | MAG 32 |
| 26QQ2 | COMNAVSPECWARGRU ONE | 46C1 | MAG 36 |
| 26QQ2 | COMNAVSPECWARUNIT ONE | 46C1 | MAG 39 |
| 26KKK1 | TACTRAGRULANT | 46C1 | MAG 42 |
| 26KKK2 | TACTRAGRUPAC | 46H | VMGR-252 |
| 28L1 | COMPHIBRON 10 | 46H | VMGR-352 |
| 28L1 | COMPHIBRON 12 | 46P2 | HMM-263 |
| 28L1 | COMPHIBRON 2 | 46P2 | HMM-365 |
| 28L1 | COMPHIBRON 4 | 46P2 | HMM-461 |
| 28L1 | COMPHIBRON 6 | 46U | MAWTS 1 |
| 28L1 | COMPHIBRON 8 | 50A | USCINCCENT |
| 28L2 | COMPHIBRON 1 | | Attn. J-3 |
| 28L2 | COMPHIBRON 3 | | Attn: Col. J. W. Schmidt, USMC, |
| 28L2 | COMPHIBRON 5 | | J-3 (NEO Plans Officer) |
| 28L2 | COMPHIBRON 7 | 50A | USCINCEUR |
| 28L2 | COMPHIBRON 9 | 50A | USCINCLANT |
| 31G1 | USS TRENTON (LPH 14) | 50A | USCINCPAC |
| 3101 | Attn: Commanding Officer | 50A | USCINCSO |
| 21111 | | | *************************************** |
| 31H1 | USS GUAM (LPH 9) Attn: Commanding Officer | 50A A1 | NAVY OLA |
| 45.40 | | | SECNAV |
| 45A2 | CG I MEF | A1A | |
| 45A2 | CG II MEF | A1B | UNSECNAV |
| 45A2 | CG III MEF | A2A | CHINFO |
| 45B | CG FIRST MARDIV | A2A | CNR |
| 45B | CG SECONDMARDIV | A2A | OPA |
| 45B | CG THIRD MARDIV | A3 | NAVY LIBRARY |
| 45B | CG FOURTH MARDIV | A5 | CHNAVPERS |
| 45Q | CG FIRST FSSG | A6 | HQMC ACMC |
| 45Q | CG SECOND FSSG | A6 | HQMC AVN |
| 45Q | CG THIRD FSSG | | Attn: Code APW-91 |
| 45Q | CG FOURTH FSSG | A6 | HQMC C4I2 |

Subj: Center for Naval Analyses Research Memorandum 91-211

Distribution List

| SNDL | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| A6 | HQMC INTEL | OP-06 |
| A6 | HQMC MCH&M | OP-07 |
| A6 | HQMC MPR & RA | OP-08 |
| A6 | HQMC OLA | OP-092 |
| A6 | HOMC PA | OP-31 |
| A6 | HOMC PP&O | OP-372 |
| | Attn: SO/LIC | OP-372E |
| | Attn: Warfighting Requirements | OP-40 |
| A6 | MC HISTCEN | OP-401 |
| B1A | SECDEF | OP-50W1 |
| B1B | ASD/ISA | OP-60B |
| B1B | OASD - Intelligence Oversight | OP-602 |
| B1B | OASD - International Security Policy | OP-603 |
| B1B | OASD - Special Operations | OP-604 |
| B1B | OASD - C3I | OP-605 |
| B1B | USD/P | OP-607 |
| B2A | DIA | OP-61 |
| B2A | JCS | OP-61B |
| B 3 | AFSC | OP-611 |
| B 3 | NDU | OP-615B |
| FF20 | HISTORICAL CENTER | OP-641 |
| | Attn: Dr. Dean Allard, Director | OP-701 |
| | Attn: Dr. E. Marolda | OP-703 |
| | Attn: Operational Archives | OP-704 |
| FF38 | USNA | OP-73 |
| FF42 | NAVPGSCOL | OP-74 |
| FF44 | NAVWARCOL | OP-743 |
| FT35 | NAVPHIBSCOL CORONADO | OP-745 |
| FT35 | NAVPHIBSCOL LITTLE CREEK | OP-816 |
| V8 | CG MCRDAC WASHINGTON | OP-922 |
| V12 | CG MCCDC | OP-932 |
| | Attn: Studies and Analyses Branch | OP-932C |
| | Attn: Warfighting Center (SO/LIC) | OP-940C |
| | Attn: Dr. Keith Fleming | OP -941 |
| | Attn: Proponency & Requirements | |
| | Attn: Wargaming Center | OTHER |
| V12 | MAGTEC | Air University |
| V25 | MCAGCC | Army War College |
| V28 | CG MCRDAC - QUANTICO | Army Research Institute |
| | | Central Intelligence Agency |
| OPNAV | | Defense Intelligence Agency |
| OP-00K | | Depatment of State |
| OP-00S | | Attn Ambassador James K. Bishop |
| OP-03 | | Institute for Defense Analyses |
| OP-04 | | Mitre, Bedford |
| OP-05 | | Rand, Santa Monica |

Eastern Exit: The Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) From Mogadishu, Somalia, in January 1991

Adam B. Siegel

Strike and Amphibious Warfare Department



ABSTRACT

This research memorandum documents the events and discusses lessons learned from the non-combatant evacuation operation (NEO) from the U.S. Embassy in Mogadishu, Somalia, in January 1991. During this operation, named "Eastern Exit," U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps forces evacuated 281 people from 30 countries (including 8 Ambassadors and 39 Soviet citizens).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In early January 1991, U.S. military forces executed Operation Eastern Exit, a non-combatant evacuation operation (NEO) of the U.S. Embassy in Mogadishu, Somalia. The primary forces involved in this ten-day operation were U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine forces diverted from Operation Desert Shield.

Eastern Exit received relatively little attention as it was conducted on the eve of the war with Iraq. In other circumstances, the execution of such a short-notice and high-risk operation might have garnered front page headlines around the world. Noteworthy items included the evacuation of 281 people from over 30 nations, including 12 heads of diplomatic missions and 39 Soviet citizens from amidst a bloody civil war.

The military operation itself might seem more like a Hollywood script than reality. Little over two days after leaving the North Arabian Sea, USS *Trenton* launched two CH-53Es with a 60-man combined SEAL and Marine evacuation force. The launch occurred in the middle of the night, over 450 miles from Mogadishu. En route, the two helicopters conducted two nighttime aerial refuelings (though none of the pilots had exercised this for over six months). On arrival off the coast, the two CH-53Es descended to 25 feet and sped over the city, landing in the Embassy compound even as looters were at its walls.

The 60-man evacuation force quickly moved into fighting positions to protect the Embassy and the two CH-53Es soon took off with the first 61 evacuees. Despite intermittent harassing fire, the evacuation force held its fire during the 17 hours it spent on the ground. U.S. forces took advantage of night vision devices and conducted the final evacuation in the middle of the night via ten CH-46s operating from USS Guam.

A close examination of this operation leads to a number of valuable lessons—both positive and negative—of value for future NEOs. Eastern Exit was clearly a very successful operation. Following are some of the reasons things went so right.

- The results of MEU(SOC) training can be found throughout Marine Corps and Navy amphibious forces. While the NEO force was not a MEU(SOC), MEU(SOC)-developed SOPs greatly aided planning. The previous MEU(SOC) training of many Eastern Exit participants aided the execution of the operation.
- Desert Shield training had raised the forces to a high level of preparedness.
- U.S. Navy and Marine cooperation was close-knit, to the point of having a common command space and, essentially, a combined command staff.
- Unlike many other NEOs, the U.S. Ambassador had a clear understanding
 of his role. He had the Embassy organized for an evacuation, maintained a
 clear picture of the situation on the ground, and clearly expressed his
 intentions and orders to the inserted evacuation force. It seems plausible
 that the Ambassador's previous experience with NEO operations (including
 involvement with the first several months of Operation Sharp Edge, the
 NEO from Liberia) contributed to his actions during Eastern Exit.

On the other hand, a number of problems call into question the means by which the military and State Department prepare for and execute NEOs.

- The information on the U.S. Embassy in Mogadishu possessed by the mission's forces was dated and inaccurate. Among other problems, the two CH-53Es had to fly over embattled Mogadishu for 20 minutes searching for the Embassy compound. A regular review of information provided to amphibious forces should be conducted at U.S. Embassies. On the basis of the Eastern Exit experience, it seems clear that the means by which basic NEO information is prepared and distributed deserves review.
- While the civil war in Somalia intensified rapidly, nonessential personnel
 were evacuated from the Somalia several weeks before the amphibious
 forces in the Persian Gulf were appraised that a NEO via military forces
 might be required. The State Department should request that the military
 commence NEO planning as soon as the decision is made to evacuation
 nonessential personnel (if not earlier).
- The ability of the Embassy to facilitate a NEO was deficient in several potentially vital areas. There was no direct secure communications capability between the Embassy and the evacuation forces (the only means to directly communicate was via an unsecured radio). The Embassy had minimal capabilities to mark a landing zone for rescue helicopters (just a strobe light and someone waving a white flag). Secure voice capabilities between military forces and an Embassy during an evacuation are vital. Common cryptologic material for NEOs should be promulgated, and these codes should be distributed to Embassies and deployed military forces. Means to mark helicopter landing zones should be maintained at every Embassy, possibly by the Marine Security Guard detachments.
- Some links of the chain of command did not receive orders and information
 on the seriousness of the situation on the ground in Mogadishu. This led to
 orders that delayed the movement of amphibious forces south. The chain of
 command must be delineated so that involved commands will not be acting
 on the basis of incomplete information.

These are some of the more vital lessons from Operation Eastern Exit. This research memorandum documents Eastern Exit and highlights issues raised during it.

CONTENTS

| Tables | ix |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Figures | ix |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Eastern Exit: A Brief Summary | 2 |
| Disintegration in Somalia | 7 |
| Discussion | 7 |
| Issues | |
| The Military Option | 11 |
| Discussion | 11 |
| Forming the Amphibious Option | |
| Issues | |
| Preparing for Insertion | 16 |
| Discussion | 16 |
| Issues | |
| Flight of the CH-53Es | 22 |
| Discussion | 22 |
| Issues | 25 |
| On the Ground in Mogadishu | 28 |
| Discussion | 28 |
| Issues | 31 |
| Withdrawal by CH-46 | 33 |
| Discussion | 33 |
| Issues | 34 |
| Processing and Handling Evacuees | 36 |
| Discussion | |
| Conclusion | 41 |

| Issues and Recommendations | 43 |
|--|--------------|
| Command and Control | 43 |
| Chain of Command | 43 |
| Collocation of Blue and Green C2 | 43 |
| Coordination with U.S. Air Force Assets | 44 |
| U.S. Marine Corps Aviation | 44 |
| Aerial Refueling (AR) Exercising for Deployed CH-53E Crews | 44 |
| CH-53E Navigation Equipment | 44 |
| KC-130 Drogue | 45 |
| Night Vision Goggles (NVGs) and CH-46 Cockpits | 45 |
| Miscellaneous | 45 |
| Amphibious Force Night SAR capabilities | 45 |
| LZ Marking Equipment for Embassies | 46 |
| NEO Information Packages | 46 |
| Notice of Evacuation Requirement | 46 |
| Signal for Last Helicopter Wave/Force Recall | 47 |
| List of Acronyms | 49 |
| Appendix A: Fastern Fyit Interviews | Δ = 1 |

FIGURES

| Figure 1. Eastern Exit Map5 | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Figure 2. U.S. Embassy Compound in Mogadishu, Somalia6 | | | | | |
| Figure 3. Operation Eastern Exit Command Relationships | 1 | | | | |
| TABLES | | | | | |
| Table 1. Eastern Exit Chronology2 | | | | | |
| Table 2. Major Somali Rebel Movements, December 19907 | | | | | |
| Table 3. Foreign Evacuation Efforts from Somalia in January 19919 | | | | | |
| Table 4. CINCCENT Eastern Exit Force Options | 1 | | | | |
| Table 5. PHIBGRU TWO Proposed Amphibious Task Force Capabilities | 3 | | | | |
| Table 6. Contingency MAGTF Organization and Forces Available | 6 | | | | |
| Table 7. Composition of Inserted Security/Liaison Group | 8 | | | | |
| Table 8. Eastern Exit U.S. Evacuees | 7 | | | | |
| Table 9. Eastern Exit Evacuees by Country38 | 8 | | | | |