

Summary of Breakout Discussions in the INSARAG AP Meeting 2017

1. IER Pre-Greening Arrangements Proposals:

Facilitated by: Paul Bailey Australia, Paul Turner New Zealand, Tristan Arao OCHA Philippines

Discussion:

- IERs require immense resources and could stretch capacities particularly if teams are responding to emergencies.
- Pre-greening could lead teams to become complacent and could result in low standards of IERs/exercises.
- Putting the onus to pre-green on the mentors could open them to external influence.
- Pre-greening will require more time and resources of the IER classifiers who may have to make visits prior to the actual IER.

Participants Opinions:

- Develop a separate IER checklist that will assess team improvements, such as demonstrative capabilities beyond the rubble, once defined. A separate IER checklist should take into consideration each team's different structure, turnover of team members, technological advances, and new techniques. Greater clarification on how "developing a separate IER checklist" would contribute to the pre-greening and lesser the burden of conducting IERs.
- 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.

2. International Light Teams- Quality Assurance

Facilitators: LTWG AP Reps- Brad Commens Australia, Zhao Rui Hua China, Samantha Orr OCHA ROAP

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

Participants Opinion:

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

Of concern is the effective use of limited resources from the network -a large amount of resources are already spent for IEC/R by IEC teams; therefore it should be carefully considered that any additional burden put on IEC teams should be avoided. And should the Light team quality assurance be implemented in the future, it needs to be sustainable and realistically feasible.

3. National Accreditation Arrangements

Facilitated by: Martin Gomez Americas Representative, Winston Chang OCHA FCSS

Discussion:

Member states were very interested to learn more about the process, and the key points are:

Martin from Argentina provided an overview of work done by Americas Working Group-NAP and INSARAG External Support and Recognition Process (IESRP). The Secretariat shared the experience of other regional groups – France and THW as mentors, China –an ongoing process towards the NAP process. A flowchart was also shared to clarify the process of accrediting governments to carry out their own accreditations of national USAR teams.

On one hand, while some countries, such as Indonesia, said that they are carrying out the INSARAG (IEC) classification process, on the other hand, they find that the national accreditation process that is adequate to the national response needs according to the geography and characteristics of the country and others, this is repeated with other nations.

Many countries are still unsure on how to comply with the national standards recommended in the INSARAG guidelines, nor do they even know if they meet them. For this reason, it is necessary to have a more detailed explanation of the criteria and stages of the process, it is not enough to refer to the formats or supporting documentation. A suggestion coming out is to focus on interested countries to develop examples that are then replicated in the region, choosing who could lead this the region.

i) NAP-IESRP discussion

There is still confusion about the difference among the NAP national accreditation process, and IESRP external recognition of the accreditation process. The translation does not help and creates confusion when it is described as it seems like a tongue twister (the process of external support and recognition of the processes of national USAR Team accreditation process) in English is confusing.

ii) Flexibility and adapting this in the AP Region.

Regarding the adaptation of this methodology, many expressed their interest in the process of advisory carried out by the TSG, and how this work team can be adapted to the region.

Suggestions from the AP group is to further simplify the acronyms, so something shorter helps your early recognition, for example:

ACCREDITATION: *in refers to the national process.*

NAP: *National acreditación process (for internal Accreditation) and*

RAP: *Recognition Accreditation Process (for external recognition)*

Participants Opinions:

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

Currently there appears that more clarity is expected for implementation of the NAP in the AP region. More time and examples from other regions – success stories , be shared and where relevant be adopted by the AP network. The AEME and Americas region and countries who have adopted the process could share and offer advice on starting this in the AP region.

4. UCC and KoBo Implementation - 01012018

Facilitators: Tsukasa Katsube Japan, Ian, Jeff M New Zealand, Oliver Lacey-Hall OCHA Indonesia

Discussion:

A brief review and developments in UC-USAR Coordination and KoBo trainings (as shared by the TWG presentations and Mr Peter Wolff from THW, Germany and Chair of the Kobo Working Group) and on the – ISG, Global Strategy statements and outcomes from the ISG 2017 – indicating that both the UC and Kobo will become IEC/R checklist items from 2018 onwards. The session covered and summarized:

- Work done and ongoing by both TWG and KWG
- Discussions on the Training roadmap for AP
- Recommendations from the AP

Participants Opinions:

The AP group proposes to:

i) Consider 3 main areas of impact for team's /countries policy and operations focal points:

- o Suitable Staff
- o Training
- o Equipment

ii) 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.

- All participants agreed that Coordination is the key to saving lives, so that any thing that made it better and faster would have an immediate impact on life saving, victim relief and community resilience.

iii) Set and define both criteria and expectations for UCC capabilities – looking forward for TWG and KWG to share these criteria expected for IEC/R.

iv) 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.

v) An Implementation programme for Kobo:

- a. 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.
- b. Training – essential.
- c. Sooner rather than later
- d. Risk analysis including Redundancy plans for when it does not work

vi) 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

vii) **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.

It must be noted that AP member countries will review these and feedback any recommendation to the AP Chair for further discussions before the 2018 ISG meeting, so that all member countries and agencies understand the overall implications of engaging in UCC/KoBo. This will ensure support for both functions and present the best opportunity for success.

5. Guidelines Review Group -2020

Facilitators: Mr Rahim Aziz, SMART Malaysia, Mr Anwar Abdullah Singapore, Ms Olga Provokaya OCHA FCSS

Discussion:

The AP group discussed on guidelines and new developments to be added such as the UC Manual, KoBo Manual(under development by KWG), National Accreditation Process, Beyond the Rubble-approved work done, and technical guidelines along with translation and format for the guidelines.

The group also talked about the possible nominees and profile for the GRG chairperson.

Participants Opinions:

- 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, once developed
- 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 Chair person candidate – key considerations:
 - Holding a key appointment
 - Held INSARAG Operational Focal point appointment before
- Consider a co-chair option from different regions as example

AP group will look forward to the official call for nominations and later discuss the most suitable representative/s to be represented.
