

## Annex D

### Summary of Breakout Discussion in the INSARAG Team Leaders' Meeting 2017

19 October 2017

#### 1. Volume II Manual A

*Facilitated by: Tsukasa, Christian, David*

##### **Outcomes:**

- How have you been involved in the consultation process?
- Everybody → outbreak groups in last 3 TL meetings
- How have you managed the dissemination and implementation in your Team?
- Dissemination is a problem-hardcopies?
- To be shared with other teams in the nation, region → translation
- Translation not always evident / reliable!!
- How has this document helped you to build up and to train your USAR Team?
- Preparing for IEC (BASARNAS&ITA)
- To be included
- More specific details/separation between Light, Medium and Heavy
- More details on local/community capacity building (Tajikistan to Ecuador)
- More specific information on national/international coordination
- National Capacity Building Assessment debriefings should be structured according Manual A → additional Annex?
- More details on finances/budget and training
- Explain the step from national to international capacity → what additional resources needed
- How does this document support national accreditation?
- Local Team - National Team - National Accredited Team → add chapter on National Accreditation Process
- What was useful – what was less useful?
- Good readable (writing and format)
- Comparison with national guidelines → very good reference
- Preparing for exercises, capacity building projects and mentorships
- Keep uniformity in the regions (Asia)
- What information should be enhanced? → more details
- Good level of detail
- SOPs more detailed? → standards for international deployment? → to be reviewed, as Annex?
- Checklist for National Capacity Building Project → review Annex C

## **2. Volume II Manual B and Vol III**

*Facilitated by Paul Burns, Peter Wolff, Arjan Stam*

### **Outcomes:**

Is the Response Cycle described clearly?

- *Does not sync with the VO response cycle, alert, monitoring, deploy, stand down etc.*

Does it describe sufficiently the USAR coordination?

- *Guidelines need a link to UC manual - call it Vol 4*
- ***Remember it is a living document***

How has this document helped you to train your USAR Team?

- *Average response, most teams have their own field guides (FOGS)*

What was useful – what was less useful?

- *Question about forms – their number and usefulness,  
Need to liaise with Kobo group*
- *Why are the forms in the guidelines?  
If in INSARAG .org they can be changed/updated immediately?*
- *Field Guide needs bullet points and pictures*
- *Use correct name for annex, not letters*

What information should be enhanced? →more details

- *Separate the Field guide in five sections, thus reduces each size and more user friendly*
- *Include humanitarian information?*
- *Should include checklist triggers and flowcharts*
- *Coordination forms referenced in Field Guide.*
- *Include change cycle to better represent natural flow of incident*
- *Landscape form for field guide?*
- *Issue around victim accountability on marking system*

What information can be deleted?

- *Forms ///*
- *The name, call them what they are, remove the V2 manual B, just call USAR Operations manual and USAR field guide*

Are you using Volume III in your training?

- *Some teams but once again own FOGS used*
- *Check out UVSAR. Com field guide for formatting, water proof*

Missing information?

- *More detail around operation functions, section 11 as an example, but still have reference library. Especially helpful for new teams*

- *For functions, enhance strategy and overview, but the detailed “how” in reference manual.*
- *Direction around what is a worksite and what requires marking.*
- *Question on standardization of positions in USAR team*

### 3. **Volume II Manual C**

*Facilitated by Dewey Perks, Jacob Bolwinkel, Sebastian Mocarquer*

- Question 1:
  - Clarity needed on issue that the expectation to conduct assessments needs better clarification
  - Clarity needed on what is the ASR team composition; dogs or no dogs, how many buildings should be assessed
  - Need to ensure inclusion of the new UC methodology
    - Becoming more specialized, and if there is only one team being classified/reclassified, how is an effective UCC established
    - Is there a need for every team to have staff trained in UC methodology?
    - Review the number of personnel needed for USAR Coordination; 4 and 2 might not be enough
    - Review UC Manual for dimensions of printable material
    - Expand on the role of the Mentor...does it continue until a Corrective Action Plan is developed and implemented, or at the end of the IEC/R
  - How will checklists be constructed meaning is there only one for both an IEC/R, or will there be a different one for an IER
  - Clarify differences in capacity of Heavy and Medium team
  - Clarity on self-sufficiency (can portable toilets as example be used)
  - There could be an issue with teams flying on commercial (non-chartered air) of not being able to fly with its full complement of equipment and supplies
  - What accommodation can be made for European teams for exercise planning and exercise execution, meaning an EU MODEX does not completely follow Manual C
    - Is revision to Manual C needed to define different models of exercise planning, meaning could there be a different guideline for all three regions?
- Question 2:
  - 5-year timeline is helpful, but not all teams understand its importance. If not followed, should the IEC/R be postponed
  - Clarity is needed on how to conduct ASR levels
  - Culture awareness
  - What medicines are needed; may require review/revision of INSARAG Performance Standards
  - Medical reciprocity and medical specialized training for issues like amputations
  -
- Question 3:
  - 36-hour exercise timeline could be too limiting, meaning that unanticipated delays can happen, like equipment malfunctions, or a worksite assignment is completed in the anticipated amount of time.
  - EXCON at times struggle to plan an exercise to meet the requirements of Manual C.
  - EXCON planning should consider how it builds key points into the front an exercise, rather than the end.

- While a team is required to conduct an annual exercise (evidence in the PoE) it should have a rehearsal the year before to ensure that the thinking of exercise planning meets the requirements of Manual C
- Technical guidance note on best practices for exercise planning
- Suggest a review and possible revision of lifting, breaking, breaching of concrete, structural steel, and rebar, including weights/dimensions
- Question 4:
  - Ambiguity in language of observed, demonstrate, written, review regards policies and procedures
  - More about purpose and intent of quality assurance
  - What if a team has not conducted an annual exercise? Does this mean the IER/IEC is postponed?
  - Quality assurance applies to the classifying team, as much as to the team being classified
  - Should there be a quality audit of current classifiers?
  - Is there a need to perform a daily medical check of all personnel?
  - Some areas of the Manual and checklist are open to different interpretation; clarification is needed
  - There is a need for a separate IER checklist to ensure the minimum standard is raised
  - Eliminate the colour-coding system, and place more emphasis on the Advisory Note for IER; no change to an IEC
- Question 5:
  - No
  - Is there a need to continue to cut timber instead of establishing an effective cut-station to cut lumber for shoring?
- Question 6:
  - Does the IEC/R TL do an evaluation of the other classifiers
  - Does the Secretariat do an evaluation of the IEC/R TL
  - Beyond the rubble actions