

---

## **Annex D – Summary of breakout sessions.**

### **Decision Making Process**

The participants acknowledge the vast differences in the AEME region in terms of disaster risk profiles and response capacities. Increased regionalisation, with more regional sub-structures was presented as a possible solution. A regional franchised INSARAG network is seen as a possibility in the future by the GRG. A franchised network would allow maintaining the same high-quality standards but would adapt them to subregional nuances.

The challenge in the decision-making process within the INSARAG network lies in determining the ideal point on a spectrum that ranges from consensus-based decision-making to having all decisions subject to a vote. Striking the right balance is difficult. It is crucial to establish procedures for decision-making, the GRG suggests keeping them as clear and light as possible while avoiding excessive rules, as too many rules create ambiguity and opportunities to bypass them.

It was also suggested to adopt a multiyear planning system for the selection of the Regional Troika. Planning in advance would help the network to avoid succession issues and would lead to a more efficient allocation of resources.

Finally, the GRG stated their will to strongly support the network and the revision of the Guidelines, with the aim of keeping INSARAG focused as much as possible on technical discussions and leave politics aside.

### **Flood Response**

The breakout discussion was opened by a presentation of the terms of reference of the newly formed Flood Response Working Group. The discussion highlighted the interests of several teams to be part of the discussion on flood response. The participants illustrated the existing capacities and gaps to be addressed in their respective countries, as well as potential support to capacity building initiatives in foreign countries. National response structures and systems were also presented by participants, to get a general understanding of the amount of overlap in terms of staffing between USAR and flood response teams.

The main challenge identified by the participants were:

- The definition of flood response, should it be restricted to search and rescue operations during floods? Or extended to include also high-capacity pumping, water purification, support to affected population, swift water rescue?
- Duplication with existing WASH capacities provided by humanitarian clusters.
- Transport of heavy machinery required for pumping.

The comments were collected by the Co-Chair of the Flood Response Working Group. A paper will be circulated within the network to collect additional feedback.

## Localisation

The first point raised by participants was the need to increase awareness of the localization tools offered by the INSARAG network. Several countries are still unfamiliar with the IEC/R, IRNAP, and NAP processes. It is essential to understand that IEC and IRNAP should not be perceived as competitors; they are different tools suited for different needs.

Furthermore, it was noted that funding from national and foreign agencies remains a significant issue. Often, national agencies have separate offices for funding capacity building and USAR operations. Advocacy and public communication on these topics must be improved. Enhanced advocacy and communication will also help reduce duplication with other humanitarian agencies.

Exploring potential synergies with regional mechanisms such as CEDEMA, CEPREDENAC, and the European Union should be considered to facilitate a more efficient allocation of funds.

## IEC/R

The INSARAG Secretariat will ensure transparency in the classifier selection procedure, ensuring that the focal points are always consulted in advance.

It was noted that IEC/R exercises should be more demanding, requiring teams to be more flexible and prepared to face uncertain circumstances when deploying. To enhance the realism of the simulation and the adaptability of INSARAG teams, it was suggested to conduct IEC/R exercises abroad, in unfamiliar training sites.

The creation of a small training package for EXCON members was proposed, which would include samples of IEC/R timelines, injects, and best practices for scenario development. Experienced teams are encouraged to assist new teams with injects and provide advice.

Finally, the participants emphasized the importance of maintaining high-quality standards for the IEC/R Cadre.