

**Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

1. The meeting was attended by 15 participants from 10 countries from 14-17 August 2017. Contact List in Annex A
2. The Meeting Agenda is in Annex B
3. The key issues and guidance from the Global and Regional Chairs teleconference of 8 August – to reference for the meeting, and updated by David Sochor, is in Annex C
4. The First Exercise on What INSARAG have been successful, and what can be done better - in Annex D
5. The INSARAG Secretariat, and on behalf of the INSARAG network deeply appreciates the Netherlands, and particularly, Arjan Stam for coordinating and leading discussions and the Commander of the Fire Brigade Hollands Midden, for hosting this meeting. The Secretariat also appreciates the support of and USAR.NL in this meeting.

The Key points moving forward as recommendations to the upcoming regional and team leader's meetings 2017, are:

**1. Discussion topic: to look into the streamlining and rationalization of the current INSARAG Working Groups**, in order to ensure the Network continues to develop as effectively and transparently as possible.

Several models have been discussed – from the use of various technical 'work streams' (Paul Burns) encompassing the 5 core functions of USAR and where technical experts from the network could be tapped to support the project productively. Existing TWG will be the backbone on training issues, while an Operations (or other suitable name chosen by the INSARAG TLs) group will also be required to take on operational methodology to assist the INSARAG system moving forward.

The TL meeting will be consulted on this and the various platforms needed to meet the needs of the TL group to solve and develop INSARAG training and methodologies. At the Regional meeting, the network will request policy makers to consider a new structure, and then nominate and fund participation of such experts.

**2. Discussion topic: the upcoming inclusion of the USAR Coordination (UC) and KoBoToolbox by 1 January 2018 into the IEC/R checklist** and eventually the INSARAG Guidelines requires updating and discussing their implementation –

Both KWG and TWG will draft and propose relevant checklist items – (and not restricted to 4 checklist items, could be 12 or more, but meet the expected operational requirements). Teams will be well briefed and consulted in the TL meeting.

The upcoming regional exercise in Malaysia will play out UC methodology which includes KoBo in the way it should be. This will help the participants to visualise how to demonstrate the UC principals in their own IEC/IER deployment exercises, internal team training, and if needed into their national response operations.

**Is the Start date 01/01/2018 realistic and attainable** was a main issue of discussion, since there has been little guidance from the INSARAG regions on how or when to deliver additional training courses. Jesper Lund commented that "However, there is no ideal time, and if we do not start, or indicate this, then it will never take off. It has been agreed and proposed that for the first team (Finland) undergoing an IEC/R in January 2018 will use the current 2015 version of the Checklist. From January, those teams slated for IEC/R will utilise a revised Checklist, which will include new items on UC. While not required, Finland is encouraged to use the new UC methodology during its IER.

The training manual for Kobo (under development) and the UC manual will both be discussion topics in the TL. Kobo will be operational in the next earthquake with support from KWG.

## **Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

**3. Discussion Topic: the area of IER "pre-greening" for teams**, mentors and classifiers, to achieve predictability and quality standards assurance; The meeting agreed that "pre-greening" is not a "fast pass" or easy ticket to a lighter IER. Proof of pre-greening has to be demonstrated in the 36-hour IER field exercise. Positive international deployment actions in the classified capacity may be considered on a case by case basis, with strong evidence – for pre-greening and only for selected and justifiable areas.

The group unanimously agreed that with leadership and team member turnover, there cannot be any compromise in quality and expected level required for the team to demonstrate in an IER.

The Guidelines states that:

*"The mandate of the IEC/R cadre is to ensure the USAR team undergoing the process is measured in an objective and non-biased manner. Furthermore, they are required to ensure that a USAR team satisfactorily demonstrates all of the competencies and skills required by the IEC/R Manual for the level of classification being sought. As peers within the INSARAG community, IEC/R classifiers are expected to uphold the principles and standards established by INSARAG. Classifiers need to remain objective and conduct the classification according to the minimum standards required by the INSARAG Guidelines and IEC/R Manual. It is important that classifiers do not attempt to promote or enforce their home country's methodology during an IEC/R"*  
– INSARAG Guidelines Vol II, Manual C

The participants further noted that there is to be no pre-greening for an IEC. Another noteworthy area is the discussion on separate IEC and IER checklists – something to consult with the INSARAG TLs, and developed in line with the Guidelines Review.

**4. Discussion Topic : National Accreditation** - INSARAG External Support and Recognition Process on national USAR team accreditation process - The topic was well explained by Gintare, and captured in the document from the Americas, now available on [www.insarag.org](http://www.insarag.org). Several countries in other regions are already moving ahead with this, and aptly meets the strategy - Goal 1 of INSARAG – "As local as Possible".

The meeting welcomed an Americas representative to participate in other regional and TL meetings and share this concept for global feedback.

**5. Discussion Topic: It has been suggested to establish a Quality Assurance (QA) working group.** Participants discussed that they have received mixed feedback on this proposal and propose it be discussed in more detail during the 2017 INSARAG TL meeting.

Definition of QA :

**Quality Assurance** is a process focused concept, where the processes are put in place to ensure the correct steps are done in the correct way. If the correct processes are in place there is some assurance that the actual results will turn out as expected.

Quality assurance processes are put in place to provide some comfort that the end product is what you want. Quality control is making sure the end product really is what you want.

Areas where QA can be identified and discussed, will be prepared for discussions in the upcoming meetings and led by Arjan Stam.

**6. Discussion Topic LIGHT teams:**

The concept and definition have been endorsed at the ISG - Arjan further explained the background of the WG. Problem: it was originally started as a concept of international Light teams. There is a difference in understanding as cross border, as mentioned by Jesper. Coming from the Americas region, the idea was for countries helping each other in the region (neighborly assistance). International LIGHT however, means something different, i.e. self-sufficient and comprised of all five parts of USAR Team including the capacity for USAR Coordination as seen in the. It is also suggested that these teams, when making its deployment decision, do so when requested by the government of the affected country, and not self-deploy.

Main issue is "how do we recognize Light teams?"

## **Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

Option 1 - a self-assessment, with oversight by the national focal point and /IEC team/s.  
Option 2 – Use of a checklist process, link this to the National Accreditation Process(NAP)  
Option 3 – Classification system

The expected resources that may be needed to be tapped from the network can be debated and if limited resources could be put to better use instead.

It should be noted that the USA did not participate in this discussion.

Christian and Arjan will develop a recommendation for the TLM to discuss, and after that review it for the final paper for RG and ISG and to prepare a draft to share well before the TL meeting and if possible by the AP meeting in the second week of September.

### **7. Discussion topic: GRG Revision and new Chair by David Sochor**

Suggestion for having a similar structure to old GRG, i.e. TL, 3 Regional Groups with the inclusion of Working Group Chairs.

It is suggested that the Chair should be a n experienced and notable member of the INSARAG community and supported by a Deputy Chair. The regional groups will be consulted on this approach.

David Sochor will lead consultations in the upcoming meetings.

### **8. Discussion Topic: Agendas for the TL and AP Regional Meetings**

The meeting discussed and advised the Secretariat on relevant content and time allotment for the agendas, and how the various topics could be facilitated and supported to achieve the sessions required objective/s. Facilitators will be contacted separately by the Secretariat, for support.

### **9. Discussion: Capturing the “best practices” from the IEC/R from 2015 ( new Guidelines/checklist) onwards.**

FCSS will prepare a first draft “lessons learnt report” and further share these reports with the TWG during a proposed meeting in November in the UK. The TWG is requested to assist FCSS in reviewing and capturing the best practices /lessons highlighted from these reports, which will serve as a discussion document with the next TL /Mentors workshop planned for 2018.

The analysis and outcomes will be shared more widely and teams can take reference for improving their own systems, as well as used to revise the Guidelines.

### **10. Discussion: Topic UC/EMT Manual and RDC cooperation**

FCSS is in close contact with a former colleague now working on the WHO EMT initiative. WHO has confirmed that EMTs will support an RDC with staff in any major disaster where an EMT is responding. EMTs are also training alongside INSARAG teams in the INSARAG regional earthquake response exercises.

### **Concluding Remarks**

Generally, the meeting was satisfied that it has been a highly productive week, with the many positive and diverse views while engaging and committed to making INSARAG fit for purpose.

In Conclusion, the Secretariat thanked Arjan and his team for being an excellent host for the meeting, and also further thanked all global participants for their valuable contributions and frank discussions moving INSARAG forward. The meeting suggested that this could be a useful and productive session for a team to come together and prior to the mid-year telecon of the global and regional chairs, to consolidate and discuss the work of INSARAG.

**Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

**Annex A**

**List of Participants**

	Name
1	Tsukasa Katsube
2	Peter Wolff
3	Peter Goxharaj
4	Olga Proshina
5.	Dewey Perks
6.	Martijn Boer
7.	Alan Toh
8.	Jacob Bolwinkel
9.	Paul Burns
10.	David Sochor
11.	Thomas Eckhardt
12.	Christian Baroux
13.	Arjan Stam
14.	Gintare Eidimtaite
15.	Jesper Lund
16.	Winston Chang

**Emails:**

Goxharaj, Peter <Peter.Goxharaj@thw.de>; 'Perks, Dewey' <dperks@ofda.gov>; Peter Wolff <peter.wolff04@gmail.com>; Alan Toh <alan\_toh@scdf.gov.sg>; Christian Baroux <christian.baroux@interieur.gouv.fr>; David Sochor <david.sochor@eda.admin.ch>; Gintare Eidimtaite <eidimtaite@un.org>; Jacob Bolwinkel <jeb@brs.dk>; Jesper Lund <lund@un.org>; Martijn Boer <Martijn.Boer@ifv.nl>; Olga Proshina <dmd.mchs@yandex.ru>; Paul Burns <paul.burns@fireandemergency.nz>; Peter Wolff <peter.wolff@evonik.com>; Arjan Stam <arjan.stam@brandweer.vrhm.nl>; Thomas Eckhardt <thomas.eckhardt@ggdhaaglanden.nl>; tsukasakatsube (yahoo.com) <tsukasakatsube@yahoo.com>; Zweegman, Robert <robert.zweegman@brandweer.vrhm.nl>; Winston Chang [changw@un.org](mailto:changw@un.org); Katsube.Tsukasa.3@jica.go.jp

**Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

**Annex B**

**DRAFT Meeting of INSARAG Working group's to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18, hosted by Brandweer Hollands Middenin Leiden**

13 Aug Sun – participants arrive (FCSS arrives midafternoon, checks meeting venue with Arjan)

14 Aug Mon – Opening and Key issues – Overview, breakout discussion to frame the scope of discussion:

Session 1: the upcoming inclusion of the USAR Coordination(UC) and KoBo Toolbox by 1 January 2018 into the IEC/R checklist and eventually the INSARAG Guidelines requires updating and discussing their implementation - thus, the urgency that both topics be added, and ready for discussions at the regional and Team Leaders meetings coming up. Lead – Dewey and Peter Wolff

Session 2: Additional relevant topic up for discussion in this workshop is the area of IER " pre-greening" for teams, mentors and classifiers, to achieve predictability and quality standards assurance; Lead – David Sochor and Paul Burns, Jacob Bowinkel

Session 3: Following the piloting of the national accreditation process, the finalization of the common standards for light teams as well as ensure more predictable and high quality assurance of the IEC/R and response standards for USAR teams in the INSARAG framework is necessary as we remain fit for purpose. It has been suggested to establish a Quality assurance working group. We have received mixed feedback on this proposal and would like to discuss with you and see how we could fit these pieces together.

WORKING GROUPS – Way Forward - A critical look on which working groups will be needed in order to improve our work; Operations, Medical, QA (including IEC/IER), Training. With “project WG” like Kobo or Search/Air reconnaissance (in future)

Suggested Survey for Upcoming TL meeting for feedback and views on the WG approach/models and suggest a way forward to streamline the form that Working Group takes to be effective and productive, fit for the future.

Lead – Arjan and Sean

Evening – Dinner Event – Host (Arjan)

15 Aug Tue – Breakout Discussions on the Key issues

16 Aug Wed -Thurs - Development of the agreed areas from session 1-3

17 Aug Friday – Departure

**Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

**Annex C**

**INSARAG Mid-Year Teleconference with Global, Regional and Working Group Chairs  
Tuesday, 8 August 2017**

Participants: Global Chair: Ambassador Manuel Bessler (Switzerland) with David Sochor

A Regional Chair: Myr. (B) Jorge Martinez L (Ecuador) with Lourdes Guerrero

A Regional Vice-Chair: Lic Ricardo de la Cruz Musalem (Mexico) with Victor Aznar and Eunice Franco

AEME Regional Chair: Mr. Fatih Ozer (Turkey)

AEME Regional Vice-Chairs: Mr. Philippe Nardin (France) with Christian, Mr. Carlo Post (Netherlands)

AP Regional Chair: Mr. Zainal Azman Abu Seman (Malaysia)

AP Regional Vice-Chair: Mr. Zhao Ming (China)

Kobo Working Group: Mr. Peter Wolff

INSARAG Secretariat Jesper Lund with Winston Chang

Amb Manuel Bessler, the Global INSARAG Chair, welcomed the Regional Chairs and Working Group Chairs to the mid-year teleconference. The following key areas were discussed and comments from participants are recorded below. These will form discussion topics along with the global strategy 2017-2020 in the upcoming regional meetings:

- I. Events:
  1. The Chair and Regional Chairs updated on activities completed and planned (refer to calendar of activities document attached).
- II. Discussion on the 6 Key Issues for initial feedback
  1. **Pre-greening of IERs**
    - i. Overview (Secretariat): At the ISG 2017, steering group agreed for further consultations to for the IER classifiers and mentors to do "pre-greening" (outside the exercise and be verified prior to the IER). Pilot testing has been done and the working group will have a discussion in the Netherlands, which the expected outcome would give a clear indication to future re-classifications, and move this discussion in the Team Leaders meeting in Bali.
    - ii. The Chairs welcomed discussions in this regard, while welcoming a lighter IER system without compromising the quality, be proposed for the ISG 2018.
  2. **International Light teams**
    - i. There will always be the presence of International Light teams, in any major earthquake response. INSARAG must be inclusive and therefore, the need to give space to the International Light teams because they are a reality on the ground and have to come under the coordination system for effective response. During the ISG, inputs were presented by Arjan Stam, as Chair of the Light Team Working Group(LTWG). It is important to move forward with this discussion and have a clear decision on how to recognize light teams.

**Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

- ii. The definition, operations and tactical concept of International light teams were endorsed during the ISG. The discussion in the LTWG stopped short of verifiable standards for Light teams. Arjan Stam, was asked, and agreed to lead on the consultation process with inputs from existing working groups, to come up with several options and proposals, on quality assurance for light teams. This will be discussed in the regional meetings on how the process can move forward. All regional chairs are requested to take this into their agenda in the regional meetings.
- iii. The Global and Regional Chairs agreed that there were still concerns from some member countries while cognizant on the growing interest from NGO and light teams in this regard.

**3. National Accreditation Process**

- i. The Americas group had taken this process forward and presented the concept at the ISG and was endorsed. The Group has developed a comprehensive manual, which is now being translated. The manual will be shared with Regional Chairs and will be in the agenda for discussion at the regional meetings. The next steps would be to share this with the other regional meetings for feedback into the manual, and the processes implemented in the respective regions.
- ii. Some countries have also moved ahead with national accreditation of domestic teams and can share their approach, customizing the guidelines provided from the Americas. Countries adopting the system include Ecuador, Turkey and China, and France. And gaining interest from countries that are earthquake prone but not necessarily having the need to have an internationally classified team.
- iii. The Global and Regional Chairs strongly supported the process of national accreditation moving forward.

**4. KOBO Operationalisation**

- i. Peter Wolff briefed the group on the progress done by the KWG and that the process is on track to include Kobo in the checklist 2018. The KWG will develop the training manual and implementation plan will be shared at the regional and team leader meetings.

**5. USAR Coordination(UC) Concept Implementation**

- i. In the ISG, the UC concept was endorsed. The TWG led by Dewey Perks, developed the UC manual that explains the detailed concept for the UC as an integral function of OSOCC operations. A number of trainings had taken place in all regions to ensure that there are qualified trainers to lead the training and to bring the concept to the classified teams. It is now up to the classified teams to organize individual trainings and to use the list of qualified trainers available in the VO and with the Secretariat.

**6. INSARAG Guidelines Review Group (GRG) 2018 – 2019 for version 2020**

- i. The INSARAG Guidelines is due for a 5 yearly revision in 2020, and the GRG will need to be formed in 2018 -with 2 years to work on revisions and improvements while consulting with the global network.
- ii. Regional groups are requested at the Regional level, to identify potential candidates (for a 2-year period) that could contribute to the process. No major overhaul is expected as the framework is well anchored with the network and teams globally. The GRG have to consult widely and incorporate all the new developments -National Accreditation Process, Kobo, UCC, Light teams and Quality Assurance. This includes the First Responders and UC Manual in the Guidelines 2020.

Regional Troikas are strongly encouraged to exchange information regularly and consider attending other regional meetings and cross fertilise initiatives and plans to make INSARAG fit for purpose.

**Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

Annex D

**First Exercise on What INSARAG have been successful, and what can be better**

What INSARAG has done well	What we can do better/not looked at yet?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Global Minimum Standard</li> <li>2. Acceptance and Adoption</li> <li>3. Peer Review IEC/R</li> <li>4. Cooperation in Operation</li> <li>5. International Network / Family</li> <li>6. Moving Forward (Change)</li> <li>7. Not detailed in „how“</li> <li>8. Principle of inclusiveness</li> <li>9. Multi Lingual (UCC?)</li> <li>10. Policy Cycle (5 Years)</li> <li>11. Structure of Governance (process)</li> <li>12. Quality Driven Network</li> <li>13. Sharing Knowledge</li> <li>14. 25 Years +</li> <li>15. GA 157/50</li> <li>16. Guidelines</li> <li>17. UNDAC</li> <li>18. Standard</li> <li>19. IEC Process and System</li> <li>20. Mentorship</li> <li>21. Network (Member States (NGO!))</li> <li>22. Coordination (VO)</li> <li>23. Capacity Building at all</li> <li>24. Peer Review</li> <li>25. Technology (Social media)</li> <li>26. Response</li> <li>27. FCSS</li> <li>28. Inclusiveness</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. IEC/R Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- best practice circulation</li> <li>- classifiers – right skills for the job</li> <li>- Two checklists (IEC/IER)</li> <li>- living document guidelines</li> <li>- Evidence</li> <li>- Audit of classifiers/TL (AP Course) incl. New ones</li> <li>- ToP for secretariat on IEC/R</li> <li>- Checklist to reflect back office</li> <li>- Advisory notes , as opposed to colours?</li> <li>- Reclass Border Crossing</li> <li>- Reclass LOGISTICS need more time</li> <li>- more depth – question, pro active</li> <li>- Three hours blackout phones</li> <li>- EXCON SMS list for key operations</li> <li>- remote camera for briefing</li> </ul> <p><b>2. General Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNDAC training on UC methodology (introduction) Now do USAR – combine...?</li> <li>- Guidelines – Volume 3 forms field guide Review all forms – add value</li> <li>- Volume 4 or database (Valuable Search) Reference library Example Medical Guidance Notes</li> <li>- Communicate what is happening e.g. Mentors, Donors, NGO</li> <li>- Medical Working Group - WHO issues</li> <li>- TG on how that works IEC/R</li> <li>- Beyond the rubble</li> <li>- information flow bottlenecks?</li> <li>- Need to share at regular frequencies - spread information on all media like facebook etc. one central distribution like on VO or via emails</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Governance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Chair from position to quality improvement</li> <li>- Decision responsibility + Accepting</li> <li>- ISG Governance Agenda for network</li> <li>- Contribution in the Governance / content</li> <li>- Planning / Plan for Agenda (ISG, RG, TL)</li> <li>- Project planning</li> <li>- Use the meetings for new concepts not info sharing</li> <li>- Working Group Assignment / Structure</li> <li>- Relation WG + FCSS</li> <li>- FCSS Role in coming years</li> <li>- From politics to quality (€) Luxus</li> <li>- Role of OCHA in the region</li> </ul>

**Key Discussion Points from the INSARAG Working Group's Meeting to prepare for upcoming events and implementation of the ISG agenda for 2017 - 18**

	<p>- Accountability Region/Teams</p> <p><b>4. Function/Organisation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staffing IEC/IER (ToR)</li> <li>- Consultant or Peer?</li> <li>- Training Peers (central)</li> <li>- Classifier frequency</li> <li>- Functions in teams on <b>how</b> → What</li> <li>- ToR on members of meetings</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Guidelines:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- quality control by the network</li> <li>- Vol II Manual C: Checklist MED/HEAVY identical/separate</li> <li>- Quality questions checklist (Mgm, Log, Med, Rescue, Search) integration/review</li> <li>- Preparation timeline IEC/R (different)</li> <li>- cycle on improvement Volumes versus Vol 4 Technical Guidance</li> <li>- Responsibility formats/form</li> <li>- How Coordination → Standard</li> <li>- Commanders intent on own Minimum Standard</li> <li>- Tool discussion in Technical Guidance → „What“ question</li> </ul> <p><b>6. Information:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Registration on VO profile (Land/Organisation)</li> <li>- VO Members proposed by Focal Point/FCSS</li> <li>- Info quality check</li> <li>- Process of info management (VO operations)</li> <li>- Info sharing passive → active</li> </ul> <p><b>7. Limitation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality naming &amp; short come</li> <li>- Politics versus Quality</li> <li>- possibility for need driven</li> <li>- Risk reduction in Preparation for intl. Assistance acceptance</li> <li>- Language</li> <li>- Focus on own national system → International</li> <li>- the Badge – dog show</li> <li>- colors of checklist</li> </ul> <p><b>8. Challenge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality assurance in INSARAG</li> <li>- change of mentor</li> <li>- Politics versus Quality</li> </ul>
--	--