Summary of Discussions from the Regional and Team Leader's Meetings in 2017 and ISG Decisions on 8 February 2018

	AP Regional Chair: Japan Troika: Australia, Malaysia	AEME Regional Chair: France Troika: Italy, Turkey	AMERICAS Regional Chair: Mexico Troika: Argentina, Ecuador	TL MEETING Representatives: Arjan Stam Paul Burns	ISG 2018 Decisions

1. IER Pre-Greening Arrangements Proposals	**Summary:**
	Develop a separate checklist: cost efficient and higher quality assurance beyond "minimum" standards expected.
	
	Discussion:
	• The separate IER Checklist would set the bar higher and assess team improvements, such as demonstrative capabilities beyond the rubble, once defined, and taking into consideration each team's different structure, turnover of team members, technological advances, and new techniques.
	• Teams to conduct robust annual exercises which could be used as evidence in pre-greening certain areas, i.e., management logistics.
	• INSARAG Secretariat could put in place auditing procedures to ensure high quality compliance of pre-greened item.
		Summary:
		• IER Pre-greening procedures need to be clear (at the moment they are subject to Chief Classifier's interpretation)
		• The Working Group supports the Pre-Greening (until arrival in an affected country (chapter 9)), however, classifiers can check Pre-Greened items during an exercise
		• A separate checklist should be developed with more emphasis put on management and coordination (UCC) and not on operational skills (which the teams need to demonstrate as well).
		
		Discussion:
		• Integration of IER in MODEX exercises: important for the organizers to know what IER is about and for an INSARAG representative to be at all planning meetings to ensure that IER runs smoothly.
			Summary:
			The concept was presented to the participants, and feedback was invited by email to the INSARAG Secretariat. The three classified teams in the region were all present at the TL meeting in Bali and raised their views there.
				Summary:
				The main concept of the pre-greening is to lighten the burden, but the fine balance between simplification of IER process and quality assurance needs to be carefully considered
				
				Discussion:
				Many interpretations of "pre-greening" exist. Guidance needs to be drafted to control the quality of the evaluation.
				
				Items, which can be pre-greened:
				• Administration items
				
				Items, which that should not be pre-greened:
				• The 36-hour field exercise
				• Checklist items marked as "yellow" in the original classification
				
				Further considerations:
				• Goal of IER needs to be further clarified. Different perspectives on IER were seen:
				  • As an opportunity to demonstrate a team has the expected capability at minimum standard level.
				  • Or as an opportunity to check further improvement than just a minimum standard.
				• When apply the pre-greening, importance of PoE information should be more emphasized.
				• Consideration should be taken for the suitability of the current checklist to IER.
				• Separate checklist for IER is proposed to be looked at for the future solution. The separate checklist may have 3 sections: (1) Mandatory, (2) Optional, (3) Good to have.
					Summary:
					1. Instruct the TWG to develop a separate IER Checklist in 2018.
					
					2. Consult with Team Leaders and the INSARAG Classified Teams.
					
					3. Pre-Greening guidance consider the following:
					
					Items, which can be pre-greened:
					a. Administrative items;
					
					Items, which should not be pre-greened:
					a. 36-hour field exercise.
					b. Checklist items marked as "yellow" in the original classification
					
					4. Lessons and Experiences further be shared and reinforced in the next IEC/R TL/Mentors Course/s in 2018 and 2019.
					
					5. Strengthen the Expectations and Required Attainments for IERs
					
					6. Define areas that the mentors can support in the Pre-Greening process
					
					7. To integrate and revise the Guidelines Volume II, Manual C-IEC/R Process, and in the Guidelines Review process 2018-2020.

2. Light Teams – Quality Assurance					

2. Light Teams – Quality Assurance

Summary:

A light classification process for International Light Teams to ensure quality assurance, details of which are proposed to be developed by the LT-QA WG and for regional consultations and at the Team Leaders meeting and ISG during HNPW.

Discussion:

Asia Pacific Region discussed the four options proposed by the working group:

- Option 1 - Self-assessment, with oversight by the national focal point and /IEC team/s. Limited Quality Assurance
- Option 2 – Use of a checklist process, linked to the National Accreditation Process, (additional INSARAG coordination component). Limited Quality assurance
- Option 3 – Light Classification system. Good Quality Assurance – Cost effective
- Option 4 – Full Classification system. Good Quality Assurance – Not cost effective.

The working group should investigate Option 3 further and submit draft findings to the region to enable wide consultation before any endorsement at the ISG in 2018.

Summary:

A LT concept should be needs-driven. Suggested path: First responder – National Capacity – National Accreditation – Cross boarding. Upon completion of all steps, proceed to International Deployment.

Heavy and medium teams may benefit from LT standards to reconfigure themselves into a lighter version.

Discussion:

- Current International Light Standard is well accepted.
- 12-hour shifts of Light Teams will require more coordination capacity in UC.
- Integration of Government Organizations + NGOs (inclusiveness).
- Two Light Teams from two different countries may form one International Light Team.
- International Light Teams will add value by bringing in highly skilled team members and instructors, may build up an affected country's capacity during the mission.
- Need for flexibility in standards.
- If teams decide not to be reclassified, they may lose contact with the INSARAG community
- A medium National Team may be accredited as an international Light Team.

Feedback:

- Integration of Light Teams will be less costly and will allow more flexibility
- Acknowledge the need to concentrate the efforts on building national capacity in the disaster-prone zones as opposed to building International Light Teams
- No need to create extra dozens of classified teams since a classification gives a team a priority for an international deployment and a higher level of acceptance; affected countries do not have the capacity/systems/mechanisms to receive international assistance and to integrate national and international efforts
- Important to support Light Teams, however, only locally, otherwise there will be too many Light Teams deployed internationally
- INSARAG Secretariat will not stop any team willing to classify; concrete standards and tools need to be developed; many light teams deployed in the aftermath of recent disasters; light teams need to be included and influenced; nomination of each team goes through a National Focal Point; the Working Group will consider the feedback and recommendations of this meeting

---

Summary:

Following group discussions on the issue, the regional group agreed on the global approach to this as follows:

- The description on what constitutes a Light USAR team in Volume II, Manual A of the INSARAG Guidelines needs to be enhanced.
- Light teams should not be encouraged to deploy internationally.
- Should the decision be made that light teams would be part of an international USAR response, they should undergo the full IEC process to assure their quality (Option 4).

Discussion:

- The regional consensus was clear, that light teams should be used to respond only at the community/national level.
- INSARAG as a global network should prioritise building national capacity instead of promoting/enabling the deployment of international light teams.
- There was a concern with the exponential increase in USAR teams if this concept is rolled out, and with the potentially negative impact this could have on the national accreditation processes across the region.

Summary:

Number of teams could be considerably high (letter of endorsement from National Focal Point is a requirement) – LTWG will do a survey within the network.

Separate classification of management has some challenges - the whole team should demonstrate ability to operate with 17-20 people.

It's all about quality:

- Quality of the operational performance should be the same as medium and heavy teams
- Reclassification process will apply to LT's
- EU offered to host a pilot exercise for option 3 in 2018 MODEX
- Option 3 may be a consideration for future IER of Medium and Heavy Teams

Discussion:

(Percentages out of 46 total answers):

a. Are you a member of a Medium or Heavy IEC USAR team?
- Yes: 71.7%
- No: 28.3%

b. What is you preferred option?
- Option 1: Self-assessment, with oversight by the national Focal Point – 4.3%
- Option 2: Use of a Checklist process, linked to the National Accreditation Process (additional INSARAG coordination component) – 19.6%
- Option 3: Light Classification Process – 47.8%
- Option 4: Full Classification Process – 28.3%

c. Which option (from the afore mentioned) can your team support?
- Option 1: 2.1%
- Option 2: 19.6%
- Option 3: 43.5%
- Option 4: 34.8%

Summary:

1. Any team wishing to classify as an international light USAR team must have the support of their INSARAG Policy Focal Point, and undergo the INSARAG National Accreditation Process.

2. Instruct the LTWG to develop a "USAR Team Classification Process and Checklist" in 2018 meeting IEC Standards.

3. To pilot the "International Light Teams IEC system" in the late 2018 or 2019 with one or two selected teams from countries supportive of the concept. –Supported by France AEME Chair and Turkey-Troika AEME.

(Details of the Pilot launch be consulted through members of LTWG from the 3 regions and with their respective regional groups.)

4. Existing Medium and Heavy classified teams will have the ability to deploy as Light USAR teams, as per the established concept, without further assessment, should they choose to do so and if this be requested by affected countries.

5. Countries who do not wish to deploy light USAR teams internationally are not required to adopt the process.

6. Countries affected by earthquakes can specify if they will require international assistance of Light, Medium and/or Heavy teams

3. National Accreditation Processes(NAP)

Summary:

Simplify the document and retable at the next AP meeting. Five AP member countries indicated their interest to adopt the NAP system and requested support in this regard –Bangladesh, Bhutan, Indonesia, Nepal and the Philippines.

Discussion:

There is still confusion about the difference among the national accreditation process (NAP) and its external recognition (IESRP). The translation does not help.

Flexibility and adapting this in the AP Region: Further simplify acronyms for an earlier recognition, for example:
- *Accreditations*: Refers to the national process
- *NAP*: National Accreditation Process (for internal accreditation)
- *RAP*: Recognition Accreditation Process (for external recognition)

The AP group requested that the document be simplified and an information session is included in the agenda at the next AP meeting

---

Summary:

There is a need to clarify the implications and requirements for the national accreditation process and the INSARAG External Standards for the recognition of the accreditation process.

Several countries recognized the importance of complying with the INSARAG Guidelines when conducting a national accreditation and they agree about the relevance to conduct a national accreditation instead of an IEC. Suggestion is to develop an example starting with one interested country to then extend the example to the rest of the region.

Discussion:

- Confusion between IEC, NAP process and IESRP external recognition of the accreditation process; to be clarified by the INSARAG Secretariat. Suggestion to simplify the acronyms
- Few participants have read the IESRP documents
- Governments need to be motivated and engaged to go through the national accreditation process.

Feedback:

- Strong push from Americas, which is an earthquake prone-region to ensure quality of domestic response; the Working Group formulated how to do a classification in the Americas' region; the teams need to integrate in national disaster response systems in the region; there is no pool of mentors, no technical knowledge to mentor and facilitate the process which should be led by governments.
- A need for a mechanism to identify experts and make them available; to certify a group of specialists that governments in the region can use for domestic classification process
- Significant differences between INSARAG External Classification and National Accreditation Programme; teams that successfully completed NAP are a part of the domestic response systems (e.g. in Turkey, Ankara and Istanbul are for international deployment, they go for IEC/Rs)
- The process will differ region by region due to the differences in terms of capacity.

Summary:

- The Regional Group agreed that there is no additional comment on the IESRP mechanism.
- At the regional level, it is fully developed; the Manual can be consulted on the INSARAG webpage. It is recommended that the Manual is incorporated in the 2020 INSARAG Guidelines.
- It now has to be put into practice: United States, Chile and Guatemala have kindly agreed to implement it in 2018. As these three countries have different characteristics, the outcomes will strengthen the methodology which will consolidate the process even further.

Discussion:

There is a palpable sense of excitement about the process in the region. The roster of the Technical Support Group has been set up with experts from across the region.

Summary:

Things to remember:
- The IESRP is not mandatory, it is an option.
- A successful IESRP does not mean that the teams go on international missions.
- The INSARAG Secretariat endorses the national accreditation process, not the teams.

Outcomes
- The IESRP could become a step before an IEC
- The IESRP should include aspects of interface with international teams (RDC, UC etc.)
- Using a Technical Support Group is mandatory, but teams may also engage a mentor
- Many countries have not submitted their TSG Roster to the Secretariat

Discussion:

Questions
- Can the IESRP be adopted for other teams (HCP, flood, hurricanes)? Yes.
- How do we include NGOs and other local teams not belonging to the Central/Federal Government?
- To be further included (next version): What about heavier teams than Heavy?

Outcomes
- The IESRP is standardized - but it might have to be adjusted locally
- The IESRP may identify that additional workload is needed
- Local (existing) NAP versus IESRP

Summary:

1. National Accreditation Processes (NAPs) can be recognized by INSARAG **through an established and clearly-defined process** (including procedures, criteria and steps, verification checklists and evaluation methodology), such as the INSARAG External Support and TRecognition Process(IESRP). Regions are encouraged to form Technical Support Groups (TSGs), as it is a peer-review process.

2. At the global level, any NAP which has been accepted by the INSARAG Secretariat as meeting INSARAG standards, will be referred to as an **INSARAG-Recognised National Accreditation Process (IRAP).**

3. Countries, whose accreditation processes are recognized by INSARAG, may decide to issue nationally-accredited teams with **standardized patches** (sample and guidance provided by the Secretariat, see below).

   The purpose is two-fold: to ensure the standardization of recognition and visibility, and to inform other national and international responders on the teams' capacities.

4. The following conditions should be considered for the nationally-accredited USAR teams should they decide on visibility in the field:
   - Rectangle patch of the following size: 75mm x 55mm.
   - Black wordings over white background and a squared light grey outline.
   - The flag of the accrediting country of the following size: 60mm x 40 mm.
   - The patch indicates the following:
     - The words "Nationally Accredited"
     - Name of the accredited team
     - The level and the year of accreditation
     - INSARAG logo of the following size: 22mm x 10 mm

   Sample Patch:

   Template:

   Example:

5. Accrediting countries are required to report back to the INSARAG Secretariat on successful nationally-accredited teams, whose details will be updated in the **INSARAG USAR Directory.**

6. These recognition processes will be **incorporated in the INSARAG Guidelines 2020**, ensuring common minimum standards and inter-operability.

4. USAR Coordination (UC) implementation (01/01/2018)					
	Summary: UC: READY with a 6-month grace period (Starting with IER for Singapore) Training completed/ongoing for Australia, New Zealand, Singapore. With additional training opportunities, slots should be considered for other classified teams in the region. **Discussion:** To consider 3 areas of impact for team's/countries policy and operations focal points: • Suitable Staff • Training • Equipment	**Summary:** Most teams are not yet ready to implement UC/KoBo. Independent deployment of a UCC to be considered Training courses to be delivered including additional UC ToT courses. **Discussion:** • Most teams are not currently sufficiently prepared to implement UC/KoBo • Should the UC role be mandatory or voluntary? • If voluntary, can be requested to be assessed as part of IEC/R • Can a UCC staff be deployed independently of its main team (self-sufficiency) • All teams are required to establish an RDC • If planning to do training, be prepared to invite other teams • Additional UC ToT courses to be delivered. **Feedback:** In the past all teams were required to establish and run a provisional OSOCC, now this can be changed to UCC.	**Summary:** • The issue of IEC/R requirement to implement the UC methodology as of 1 January 2018 is not as relevant to the region, since fewer teams are preparing for an IEC/R. • The group discussion focused on KoBo. The concept of the UCC, however, was presented during the meeting and there is a strong interest in using the methodology by countries and by non-classified teams. • The first USAR Coordination Course in Spanish was scheduled for 4-8 December and was the second one in the region. Two more such courses are planned for 2018. • The USAR Coordination Manual has been translated into Spanish.	**Summary:** • Team and regions have ownership in the training and are strongly encouraged to host UC and Kobo training. • The checklist items for UC and Kobo have been proposed for acceptance and for addition to the 2018 IEC/R checklist on 01/01/2018 **Follow up:** • Continue regional discussions • All INSARAG teams started and are beginning to include UC and Kobo systems in their training plans. • KWG (IMWG) Chair will consult with OCHA on a secure arrangement for stakeholder access to the password and data. • Propose the checklist items to the ISG 2018, and as a IEC/R checklist item from 1/07/2018 **Discussion:** • Importance of information management (data collection, analysis, dissemination, evaluation and visualization) was highlighted as well as the use of information for a broader response (e.g. humanitarian assistance). • There is no need to wait for a perfect system. It should be good enough to start and the potential changes can be reflected during revisions and update as the guidelines is a living document. • Necessity to embrace change was acknowledged, participation in dedicated training courses and Earthquake Response Exercise was proposed.	**Summary:** 1. All 3 regions have qualified trainers following a series of "Training- of-Trainers" Courses by the Training Working Group. 2. Several Countries have organised and others will be initiating UC Courses in 2018 – Regional teams invited to participate. 3. UC Package is available in the INSARAG website and countries are strongly encouraged to translate these as needed, for wider outreach. 4. INSARAG IEC teams are prepared to contribute and deploy UC trained members when called upon for international deployment. 5. New Checklist 2018 with UC elements shared globally and the implementation plan in 2018 are: • **1st January – 30th June**: Trials, 2015 checklist still in force. • **1st July – 2018** onwards teams undergoing **IEC/R will adopt the revised checklist 2018.** 6. INSARAG IEC teams are expected to contribute trained UC staff for operations when called upon.

5. KoBo Implementation (01/01/2018)					

5. KoBo Implementation (01/01/2018)

Summary:

KoBo: based on AP Regional Exercise further testing is required to ensure the platform is stable. A training package needs to be developed and rolled out to ensure teams are across the platform. The platform should then be piloted at the 2018 regional exercise in the Philippines.

Discussion:

- Agree to define "KoBo" as a methodology rather than a specific software, ie: KoBo = Infield data collection, analysis and information management on an electronic platform.
- Set and define both criteria and expectations for UCC capabilities
- The agreed syllabus should be followed. There are set entry criteria for those attending – ensure that donor governments are aware of this, and that the appropriate candidates are sent. Similarly, FCSS should not accept candidates that do not meet the set criteria.
- An Implementation programme of Kobo:
  - An engaging narrative of what effect UCC and KoBo have on coordination. This should also reflect the data collection methodology to prepare people for possible future software changes.
  - Training – essential. Sooner rather than later
  - Risk analysis including Redundancy plans for when it does not work
- Engage together to develop and embed UCC and KoBo capability across the region. There should be support offered to those new UCC trainers when delivering in their country from experienced trainers. This then leads to engendering support for continuous improvement in both the UCC and KoBo spaces
- The AP group -Starting with Singapore's IER in 2018 are READY for 01/01/2018 date. Extensive training completed/ ongoing by the teams- by Aust, NZ, Singapore, and encourage teams to offer slots for other classified teams in the region to participate in their UC and Kobo training courses. As we did for 2015, when the new IEC/R checklist was introduced, the AP group supports that the IEC/R for teams in the first half of 2018 will still be assessed on the current checklist, while the new items will be checked alongside, but not counted in the IEC/R.

Summary:

Training required on both data collection and analysis
Issues in using KoBo could arise around data protection (access to sensitive information)
Disaster management authorities need to be briefed on KoBo - When speaking to the LEMA, brief on what KoBo is and does
Translation issues may be encountered.

Feedback:

- Becoming mandatory for all teams undergoing IEC/Rs, how will KoBo affect the outcomes of classification, if the database is not available?
- Suggestion to move to Information Management and not just focus on KoBo
- Teams need to be ready on 1 January 2018 and not by the time of their respective IEC/Rs
- Concerns that if KoBo does not work during SIMEXes, it may not work during real life emergencies
- Need to schedule training activities, incorporate KoBo into regional exercises, conduct UC training courses
- If teams are not ready, recommendations need to be developed to move forward in terms of technology
- Learning how to use KoBo could be achieved through training activities, the question is: 'is the technology stable enough?'
- Three-day practical training courses are needed to move ahead with KoBo
- There is a need to intensify the ToT programme to assist the end users of the KoBo toolbox
- KoBo is for a wider humanitarian response; it is important to remove the mental block and accept the new technology
- Dealing with data collection involves images of people, buildings, any kind of data which can violate confidentiality and privacy; this needs to be addressed
- A dedicated specialist will deal with data protection, however, the forms will not be changed
- Translation challenges may arise in some regions (e.g. Asia-Pacific).

Summary:

- Martijn Boer presented the application and its features and the way to download the application and the forms to be used.
- The Americas being a region with only three classified teams, the discussion was centered around national needs.
- The consensus in the group was that there is not enough knowledge in the region about this tool, and more training is needed.
- The issue of whether KOBO could be used in the context of a small scale disaster at national level was discussed and this will be asked to Mr. Peter Wolff
- Argentina offered to translate the KOBO forms into Spanish after several participants expressed the fact that the forms being in English made it difficult for countries to use it because of the language. They also offered to develop an e-training on VOSOCC and KOBO. It was proposed that the Training WG should look into developing a KoBo tutorial.

Summary:

Kobo-IM KWG in consultation with the Training WG will develop and share the draft Kobo /IM training manual in Dec 2017.

Discussion:

- Some participants expressed their hesitation about the timeframe of KoBo implementation, especially with regards to the teams preparing for IERs in 2018. On the response, will the INSARAG community be ready in two months to implement it in an emergency setting? It was proposed to wait for the final version and then to put it into implementation.
- A draft SOP on KoBo and a document on what KoBo is what it is used for will be finalized in four weeks.
- To demystify KoBo, it was suggested to conduct the final testing both on collection and analysis side, hold a workshop and test the data collection at a simulation exercise.

Summary:

1. All 3 regions have qualified KoBo Working Group Members supporting any request for KoBo needs by IEC teams.
2. Several Countries have organised and others will be initiating KoBo workshops in 2018 and /or as part of UC training – Regional teams invited to participate
3. **KoBo Package is available** in the INSARAG website
4. KoBo WG is working on a "Easy to use" solution for data analyzing and integration via a Dashboard.
5. The KoBo Working Group be renamed the Information Management Working Group.
6. KoBo working Group be renamed Information Management(IM) Working Group to better define their terms of reference.
7. **New Checklist 2018** with KoBo elements shared globally and the implementation plan in 2018 are:

- **1st January – 30th June**: trials, 2015 checklist still in force.
- **1st July – 2018 onwards**: teams undergoing **IEC/R will adopt the revised checklist 2018.**

6. INSARAG Guidelines Review Group (GRG) and Version 2020	Summary:	Summary:	Summary:	Summary:	Summary:

6. INSARAG Guidelines Review Group (GRG) and Version 2020

Summary:

Co-Chair concept proposed, invitations will be shared with the network and interested countries.

Consultations with member states to ensure buy-in.

Keep format, with core paper version/electronic operational manual

Discussion:

- Consider incorporation of the UC and KoBo Manuals (and other manuals) in Volume III
- Consider incorporating operating beyond rubble components into the new version of guidelines
- Capability catalogue needs to be clearly defined
- Incorporate best practices, manuals, technical aspects currently not reflected in the guidelines
- Consider linking online availability of any review ongoing or to be conducted
- Reinforce the role of the national response and the state's responsibility for disaster management
- Map out the frequency of engagement at the regional level during the GRG review process. Develop framework.
- Review the number of the GRG 2018-2020 representatives per region
- Consider different requirements in standards for IEC and IER teams
- Focus on technical aspects of the Guidelines' requirements
- GRG Chairperson candidate – key considerations:
  - Holding a key appointment
  - Held INSARAG Operational Focal point apt before
- Consider a co-chair option from different regions as example

Summary:

Vol 1: responsibilities of donor and recipient countries; resilience, response readiness, benefits of requesting classified teams to be reflected

Vol 2: preemptive ASR1

Vol 2C: consistency between IEC/IER processes to be ensured

Vol 4: forum for discussions, best practices, information exchange to be initiated

Suggestions:

- Application for tablets, smartphones
- The text is too long. It should be more concise.

Summary:

It is recommended to improve the transition between the volumes.

Vol I:

- Aim to improve the involvement and the ToRs of the focal points, as well as the relationship/communication between the operational and the policy focal points
- Specify the role of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Permanent Missions in Geneva
- Alongside the revision of contents, develop an advocacy strategy to bring Vol I to the political stakeholders
- It is important that contents of Vol I are cemented in a legal framework to make it "immune" to changes in personnel and Governments

Vol II:

- Incorporate the IESRP manual
- Incorporate guidance on the relationship/link between light teams and national accreditation processes
- Strengthen the area of radiological detection
- Clarify the complementarity of the INSARAG and OFDA (Incident Command System) methodologies

Vol III:

- Strengthen the volume to become a full reference document ("a bible")

Summary:

A technical reference library is required.

Discussion:

USAR Wikipedia?

Location: INSARAG webpage. Content could include:
- Lessons learnt,
- Best practices from classifiers,
- Research and development,
- Case studies,
- Leadership papers,
- Capacity building
- Technical papers.

Outcomes:
- Governance:
- Need to identify an overseer or group to manage site, either by email or meet once a year before TL meeting
- Chat room for Team leaders/others: Yes
- App: No
- The concept could take load off FCSS (could it be done from within INSARAG teams - on a volunteer basis?)

Needs to be:
- User friendly (using icons)
- Relevant (reminder to post owner after 1 year)
- Best practices
- Consistent with other information sources
- Not a part of the Guidelines
- Secure (ensure information on the site is not used for commercial gain)
- "Downloadable"

Questions:
- Is there a pathway from excellent technical guide notes to the Volume 2 of the guidelines?
- Should this have different levels of users (password protection)?

Summary:

1. **Co- Chairs** from different regions to lead the GRG with technical experts and meeting the ToRs shared with the network.
2. Invite previous GRG members and with support from their respective organisations to ensure continuity of institutional knowledge and experience is maintained.
3. Chairs of existing Working Groups will be **co-opted members** and engaging with relevant partners and agencies when needed.
4. The GRG will take into account of the suggestions from 2017 regional discussions and **widely consult** with the Regional and Team leader groups physically in the respective meetings and on-line, and report back to the ISG.
5. A **Technical Reference** Resource Platform or Library will be considered by the GRG.
6. The tenure of the GRG will be from **2018 to 2020** -with the launch of the Revised version 2020 to coincide with the INSARAG Global Meeting in 2020.