**INSARAG Team Leaders Meeting – Netherlands - 2013**

**Operations Working Group (OWG) Chairmans Summary**

**Annex A**

**Modifications to the new INSARAG Coordination Methodology following feedback from the TL Meeting**

**Post Team Leaders Meeting**

The Operations Working Group met immediately following the TL meeting to analyse the feedback received during the meeting and make any final modifications to the system. All the feedback was analysed and discussed by the Group, taking into account the comments made, the background, the INSARAG mandate and the impact of any change. Once OWG agreed a position on each issue these were then presented to and discussed with a wider consultation group which comprised:-

* Terje Skavdal (Chief of FCSS)
* Chair and 5 members of OWG
* Chair and 4 members of TWG members
* Chair of MWG
* 5 x GRG members (including the 2 new Team Leaders representatives)

Each point was explained and debated and a final position agreed by the whole group. The table below lists all the points raised with the analysis outlined and the agreed outcomes shown. The outcomes have been or will be implemented in the final versions of the Coordination Handbook and the related documentation and training materials.

*Note: The final Chairman’s Summary included some of the comments made at the plenary sessions but did not include all the feedback. These comments have been considered within the analysis listed below.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item**  **No.** | **Comment or summary of the issue** | **Analysis points** | **Agreed Outcome** |
| 1 | *“Changing things can cause problems*  *The existing systems within the INSARAG and OSOCC Guidelines took a decade to be disseminated and for many national teams to adopt and integrate into their training programme and national response systems. The methodology is a positive first step, and needs to be clearly seen as an ‘improved evolution’, instead of a drastic make over.”* | The changes have been kept as few as possible but some are still needed. The impact on teams has been considered and kept as low as possible. It has been evolution where possible but there was an identified need to enhance coordination which takes some effort and change by everyone otherwise there will be no progress.  Change was proposed by INSARAG community initially and the mandate was to enhance coordination.  OWG has removed various non-essential elements or documentation that were not directly for coordination to minimise change.  People are naturally wary of change but proper implementation and training will help with the challenge of ‘change management’. | Accepted by the group that OWG had removed some non- essential elements from earlier proposals and modified some aspects to minimise change. The final proposals now only have the essential elements that match the INSARAG mandate, keep change to a minimum but still achieve an appropriate professional level of coordination.  This approach will also be kept in mind when considering any final or future modifications. |
| 2 | *“International USAR is primarily a bilateral response; with voluntarily participation by responders. Greater clarity (and importance) on engagements with LEMA, OSOCC and national Teams should be taken into account.”* | This comment was made at the start of the TL meeting and the following presentations and discussions made it clear that the system fully accepts the importance of LEMA and the relationship with teams and countries. However it is accepted that the importance, role and links between LEMA and the teams at all levels needs to be made clearer in the written documentation. | OWG will review all the documents and add wording to make the LEMA / Team relationships clearer. |
| 3 | *“Will full Team Leaders meetings still happen if Sector Coordination is used?”* | Some people said there must always be overall TL meetings where all teams attend, some said if there are Sectors then only the Sector Coordinator goes to the UC meetings and the TLs should only attend the Sector TL meetings.  The analysis concluded that there is no fixed answer and circumstances will dictate this. An overall daily OSOCC to TL meeting is the default position but the decision will be made by the OSOCC manager and LEMA based on the circumstances. | The Coordination Handbook will be revised to reflect the options and make it clear it can be done either way depending on the situation.  The UC training should include input on the ‘meeting schedule’. The default position is to have a daily TLM if practicable. |
| I**tem No** | **Comment or summary of the issue** | **Analysis points** | **Agreed Outcome** |
| 4 | The UC function needs more clarity regarding its position in the OSOCC structure, staffing, training, roles, authority etc. | 4a) Several comments were made saying the UC function should sit under Operations within OSOCC rather than be its own function.  But evidence from several exercises showed that having the UC function working as a specific entity within the OSOCC works better. Analysis concluded that the important point was that the UC manager links very closely to Operations in the OSOCC. | The Handbook should emphasize the link between the UC manager and the OSOCC Operations function. The Org diagram will be modified to show this link more clearly and future training should cover this relationship fully. |
| 4b) The roles of each function within the UC team are now detailed in an Annex of the Coordination Handbook. | No change needed but UC training will ensure these roles are clear to the people concerned. |
| 5 | Clarity needed on the numbers of people teams need to provide to the UC (RDC/OSOCC)/SC | Responding international USAR teams are already expected to contribute 1 or 2 staff to the RDC or OSOCC, as per the INSARAG Guidelines.  Teams will not be expected to increase this number but it is more likely that these persons will support the UC (so will need to be trained and suitable for UC roles) and for a longer duration, possibly the entire deployment. | OWG to clarify in the Handbook that teams need to have the capacity for two suitable people and equipment to support an RDC, OSOCC, UC or SC  Also make it clear that a first arriving lone team may have to temporarily staff an RDC and a provisional OSOCC with more people until other teams or UNDAC arrive. But in the longer term teams will only be required to commit a maximum of two people to one of the coordination functions. |
| 6 | Where should the SC function normally be? | 6a) Overwhelming comments were that the default position of the SC should be directly with the Sector, not physically in the UC/OSOCC. In certain circumstances it may reside in the OSOCC/UC depending on the situation. | OWG to modify the Coordination Handbook and training materials to reflect this |
| 6b) It should be made clear that the SC is still an instrument of the OSOCC, it follows LEMA/OSOCC strategy and is not one team ‘commanding’ other teams. | OWG to make this clearer in the Handbook |
| **Item**  **No.** | **Comment or summary of the issue** | **Analysis points** | **Agreed Outcome** |
| 7 | *There were some questions on whether an SC should be a Sub OSOCC* | Analysis was clear that the SC function is solely to coordinate USAR operations in a geographical area.  A Sub OSOCC would deal with **all** humanitarian issues and normally only at very large events where the national OSOCC cannot manage everything.  If a Sub OSOCC covers an area where USAR operations are taking place then a UC cell would be replicated in the Sub OSOCC to support USAR operations in the same way as a standard OSOCC. | OWG to make this clear in the Handbook |
| 8 | Do all teams have to carry out the SC function? | Some teams have expressed concerns about taking on the role of SC. Several would not like it to be a compulsory requirement for various reasons.  Analysis concluded that it should not be compulsory and that selection of the team to host a SC is decided by the OSOCC and UC managers. | OWG to make it clear in the Handbook that hosting an SC is optional and that the SCs would be decided by the OSOCC manager and UC Manager. |
| 9 | *“Who decides where teams are assigned?”* One view expressed was that teams should decide for themselves where they deploy. | It is very clear that the national LEMA has ultimate authority over where teams are deployed. However LEMA normally set the strategy and OSOCC makes plans and assignments through the coordination system. The OSOCC (UC and SC) will gather information so plans can be made to deploy teams in the most effective way. Assignments are then made via the OSOCC, UC or SC and teams would normally be expected to accept the assignments. But teams can discuss the plan with the coordinating body if they have concerns. It was agreed that teams should never freelance outside of the coordination system.  If a team arrives when there is no coordination in place or no information on where to deploy then that team should make efforts to establish information and set up coordination (RDC/provisional OSOCC) so plans can be made for assigning other incoming teams. | OWG to ensure this is made clear in the documentation and TWG to ensure this is captured in future training materials and inputs. |
| **Item**  **No.** | **Comment or summary of the issue** | **Analysis points** | **Agreed Outcome** |
| 10 | EMERCOM of Russia is of the view that the proposed UC system could be too complex and might hamper rapid USAR response. | This was the only expression of this view, all other comments were positive. Analysis concluded that the coordination proposals were necessary, had been kept as simple as possible and met the INSARAG mandate. | No action |
| 11 | There were some questions about how long ‘ASR2 Sector Assessment’ might take. | This seemed to come from one diagram which some interpreted as showing ASR2 taking 24hrs. This was not the intention and it was explained at the time but was not clear to all. | OWG to ensure the documentation and diagram/slide is modified to make it clear that the time to carry out Sector Assessment can vary, must be done as fast as possible and can be done while other operations are being carried out. |
| 12 | It was suggested that the ASR Levels might be improved by merging ASR 1 and 2 | This was one comment, it was not echoed by others at the meeting and has never been suggested at any previous events over the whole project. Analysis concluded that the Level 1 is quite different from 2 and combining them would present other problems. | No action. |
| 13 | Marking System | Mostly good comments |  |
|  | 13a) Can the Worksite Marking include victim information /numbers missing etc. | Analysis concluded that the main purpose is to identify the Worksite and show what level of work has been completed. It is not considered appropriate to use marking information to try to accurately record victim details. Full information is available from the Worksite Reports and the Victim Extrication forms. The optional Victim Marking ‘V’ can be used locally to identify specific locations. However if a team thinks it is vital to leave specific victim information then this can be added in plain language adjacent to the marking. | OWG to clarify this in the Handbook and in any training materials.  Additional wording also to make it clear that teams should be briefed with the full information from the Worksite Triage form or via a briefing from OSOCC, UC or SC. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item**  **No.** | **Comment or summary of the issue** | **Analysis points** | **Agreed Outcome** |
|  | 13b) Can a line be crossed through the Worksite marking to designate completion? | A previous problem was what a line through a marking actually meant e.g. were all live victims out, were only known victims out, were there any confirmed dead still inside, were all dead bodies removed, did it refer to the whole site etc. In the new system the marking clearly shows what ASR level has been completed; these are considered the relevant and important facts. | No change |
|  | 13c) Can the triage category be added to the Worksite ID | The triage category is only one aspect of assessment, full information is needed for proper assessment and further actions. All this is available in the coordination system from the Worksite Triage form via the team or from the OSOCC/UC/SC. Adding just the triage category to the marking does not provide full information and may tempt teams to freelance. | No change |
|  | 13d) When using the Rapid Clearance Marking what happens when a ‘D’ has been used and then the body(s) are removed? | After discussion it was concluded firstly that this is usually done by LEMA resources and they would follow their own system. But if INSARAG teams do recover bodies ‘D’ sites the marking should then be replaced with a ‘C’ RCM marking. A Victim Extrication Form should also be completed. | OWG to adjust the guidance in the Handbook to make this clear. |
|  | 13e) Is a diamond the best shape for the RCM | There was a discussion on better possible shapes but the group could not establish a better alternative! | No change |
| 14 | Information Management Tools |  |  |
|  | 14a) Worksite Triage form  Could the number of known dead persons at a Worksite be added? | It was considered appropriate to add a specific point to be mentioned in the F17 Information field. To help with this a box for the number of dead bodies will be added. | The latest version of this form will have this included |
|  | 14b) Could a stability and safety factor be added to the triage tree? | It was considered best to add better guidance on stability and safety to the F15 guidance notes rather than change the triage tree. | The latest version of this form will have this included |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item**  **No.** | **Comment or summary of the issue** | **Analysis points** | **Agreed Outcome** |
|  | 14c) Could a factor for the number of victims be added to the triage tree? | This has been considered but it makes the triage tree too complex. The number of victims is captured in the Worksite Triage form and this information is considered when assignments are planned. | No change to the triage tree. |
|  | 14d) Add a high priority ‘flag‘ to triage system | The triage system already has a priority system with A to F categories and the victim numbers are in the Worksite Triage form. This information is considered sufficient to ensure ‘high priority’ sites will be “flagged”. | No change |
|  | 14e) Is the Extrication form necessary? | This was a single comment. The unanimous view of the group and from previous events has been YES. | No change |
|  | 14f) Should the Victim Extrication form capture specific victim details e.g. name, sex, age etc. | There were differing views but this decision will always depend on LEMA requirements.  The LEMA should be consulted on what personal details of victims they want teams to collect.  This is allowed for in the form but the question would be better higher up the form. | OWG will move the relevant box (V12) up to be just after V3 to make this clearer. |
|  | 14g) A standard meeting agenda would be useful for running Team Leader and other meetings. | This exists in the technical reference materials that teams will have access to | OWG to ensure these additional optional forms are made available via INSARAG. |
|  | 14h) Assignment Briefing template would be useful? | This has been developed and will be in the technical reference materials that teams will have access to | OWG to ensure these additional optional forms are made available via INSARAG. |

All these agreed changes will be finalised by OWG and completed documents and other materials handed over to FCSS for implementation via the Guidelines Review Group and Training Working Group. Any further feedback or comments should be addressed to FCSS.

**Peter Crook**

**OWG Chairman**