How can we organise future IERs?

1. Background

The INSARAG External Classification (IEC) started in 2005, and as of the end of 2015, or after 10 years of the introduction of the IEC, we now have 45 IEC-classified teams in the world. Once classified, all the classified teams are required to go through the INSARAG External reclassification (IER) every 5 years based on the INSARAG Guidelines. As the number of IEC-classified teams increases and as the number of new teams who want to be classified keeps on increasing, INSARAG now has more than 10 IEC/Rs every year, and it is expected that this number will keep increasing.

(Simulation of the number of IEC/Rs and the classified teams)

- Calculated in conditions that 1) 3 IECs/year after 2016 and 2) all the teams go through IER every 5 years.
- There will be a possibility that we have more IEC/Rs if we accept more than 3 IECs/year.

2. Analysis

The total workload of the INSARAG is increasing

The number of IEC/Rs is increasing, and definitely the workload of the INSARAG network is increasing in terms of both budget and human resources. In 2015, there are 45 IEC-classified teams, and based on the projects above, in 2034, we will have 101 IEC-classified teams.

Inefficiency in the process

Given the cost and resources required to conduct a comprehensive IER process every 5 years, a discussion is warranted on whether a more cost-efficient and streamlined process could be possible.
For example, perhaps the re-classification process could assess certain components or modules of a classified team’s capability as opposed to a full, comprehensive assessment looking at all the components. The classifiers could identify these in advance. This would reduce the number of classifiers needed and the time taken to do the IER. Additionally, there could be consideration given to crediting teams who have recently completed a successful exercise, deployment, training or mentoring and thereby demonstrated some of their IEC capabilities.

**Key Considerations**

In considering a more streamlined approach, it will be important to ensure that the standards and qualities of the IEC process are maintained in order to provide adequate assurances of teams’ capabilities. Consideration also should be given to the resources requirements of IER and how those resource requirements are met. For example, can regional INSARAG members play a greater role in the IER process or are there merits in having this centrally managed and coordinated by OCHA as is the current practice?

3. **Possible Discussion Points**
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**Smaller classifier teams**

- Do we really need IER?
  - Yes
  - No

- How do we organize “lighter” IER?
  - Yes
  - No

  **Self-checklist / Points System**

- Regional Group / Each Team organize IERs

  **How do Teams maintain IEC level?**

- Teams can invite USAR experts to exercises but no “IER”
  - No IER
  - IER only if necessary

  **Yes, and we need “full” IER every 5 years.**

- Consideration should be given to resourcing requirements.

4. **Discussion at the ISG 2016**

At the INSARAG Steering Group (ISG) Meeting 2016, the below points were discussed and recommended.

**Issues discussed:**

- Do we really need IER?
  - Yes
  - No

- How do we organize “lighter” IER?
  - Yes
  - No

- Regional Group / Each Team organize IERs

- Teams can invite USAR experts to exercises but no “IER”
  - No IER
  - IER only if necessary

- Yes, and we need “full” IER every 5 years.

- Consideration should be given to resourcing requirements.
1. Need to analyse data carefully, Number of IEC teams required
   - The above simulation is based on the condition that we have three new IEC teams/year, but this is not realistic.
   - Right number of IEC-teams per region or per country should be determined.
2. Number of IER classifiers
   - Based on the IEC, mentor report, annual report, etc., we can decrease the number of IER classifiers (the team being classified should accept the decreased number of classifiers)
3. Requirement for IER
   - International deployment, annual exercise, annual report, etc., should be considered as requirements for the IER. If they don’t satisfy this, they should go through IER, or they can’t renew IEC status. If the team satisfy this, they can (should) postpone IER (7 years, 10 years).

Recommendations:
1. Allow/accept flexibility (e.g. International deployment, annual report, annual exercise can be used as requirements for IER or justification for decreasing the number of IER classifiers; the Secretariat role can be done by member states or regional group)
2. Each regional group needs to undertake risk assessment and prioritisation (in order to identify the team which should go through IEC, or determine the right number of IEC teams in each country)
3. Each country/team and the Secretariat needs planning and consultations with the region (for smoothing number of IERs per year)

Way forward
It was agreed that the INSARAG A-P group take the lead on this topic. New Zealand, together with Singapore, will develop the idea and discuss at the INSARAG A-P regional meeting in China in August. The A-P group will keep the other regional groups updated, and will report back the recommendations at the ISG 2017.