INSARAG TEAM LEADERS MEETING
CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY
Doha, Qatar
22-24 September 2014

OCHA

INSARAG
Preparedness – Response

FIELD COORDINATION SUPPORT SECTION (FCSS)

Emergency Services Branch (ESB)

Opening Remarks

The annual meeting of INSARAG Team Leaders Meeting 2014 was held in Doha, Qatar from 22-24 September 2014 and hosted by the Government of the Qatar. This meeting was jointly organized by the Internal Security Force (ISF) and the Field Coordination Support Section (FCSS-INSARAG Secretariat), Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Geneva.

Opening remarks were made by the following:
- Brigadier Mahadi Al-Quhtami, Head of Training and Courses Department, ISF, Qatar
- Major Khamees Mohammad Al-Morikhi, INSARAG National Focal Point, ISF, Qatar
- Mr. Jesper Lund, the Chief of OCHA-FCSS

On behalf of OCHA and the participants, Mr. Lund expressed appreciation and thanked the Government of Qatar for organizing and hosting this meeting.

Participants Introduction and Adoption of Agenda

A total of **20 national and 110 international participants from 37 countries** and organizations attended the meeting *(see Annex A).*

The meeting adopted the agenda unanimously *(see Annex B).*

The meeting discussed the following:

Monday, 22 September 2014 (Day 1):

1. **Update of INSARAG Activities in 2013/14**

Mr. Jesper Lund and Mr. Winston Chang, the INSARAG Secretariat of OCHA-FCSS, updated the participants on the INSARAG events that have taken place globally since the 2013 meeting.

Areas reported on, include the outcomes of the INSARAG Steering Group Meeting held in Geneva in February 2013 and key issues raised from the Team Leaders Meeting 2013. Key on the agenda in these meetings were discussions on the INSARAG Guidelines review, updates on the planned INSARAG AEME Exercise in Turkey, the Global Meeting in Abu Dhabi in 2015, and World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in Turkey in 2016. The UAE Declaration for the global meeting will be put forward as an INSARAG contribution to the WHS in 2016.

The video message on the WHS by the UN Secretary General and the welcome video for the Global Meeting 2015, produced by the host country, UAE, was shown to the participants. INSARAG teams are further encouraged to contribute to the INSARAG 25-year commemorative book by submitting short impactful articles and photos to the INSARAG Secretariat. The request was earlier sent to the focal points of the IEC-classified teams.

(Action: Member States, IEC teams, INSARAG Secretariat)

www.unocha.org
The mission of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) is to mobilize and coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action in partnership with national and international actors.
Coordination Saves Lives

2. INSARAG Working Group Update

Mr. Anthony Macintyre, the Chair of the Medical Working Group (MWG), gave a presentation on behalf of the MWG. The MWG requested the team leaders to suggest and raise any key issues that the MWG could look into and contribute.

Mr. Dewey Perks, the Chair of the Training Working Group (TWG), gave a presentation on behalf of the TWG. The TWG asked team leaders if there is any particular need for training (e.g. Guidelines familiarization), and introduced the on-going project of E-learning.

Mr. Arjan Stam, from the Netherland, introduced the contribution from the Team Leaders Meeting, represented by Mr. Stam and Mr. Paul Burns of New Zealand(absent with regrets), to the Guidelines review process, and asked the team leaders' active participation in the Guidelines review process.

In 2014/15, both WGs have a primary mandate to support the on-going work of the INSARAG guidelines review process and thereafter the training plans for the roll-out of the guidelines. The team leaders appreciated the contributions from both the MWG and TWG.

The Chairman's Summaries of the Working Group Meetings including their work plans are available on the Virtual OSOCC and INSARAG website.

(Action: Member States, INSARAG Working Groups, INSARAG Secretariat)

3. INSARAG External Classification and Reclassification (IEC/R) Process

The INSARAG Secretariat, represented by Mr. Winston Chang, updated the IEC/R developments in 2014 and planned activities for 2015 and beyond, and expressed appreciation for the support from IEC member countries, in contributing suitable classifiers to the system.

The IEC/R for 2015 will transition into the new 2015 checklist available in the INSARAG Guidelines Volume II , Manual C on IEC/R. The new checklist will be used for all IEC/R starting in 2015.

To alleviate strain to the donor community, the IER system will be discussed in the regional meetings on ways to 'lighten the load', while maintaining the full quality and integrity of this unique peer- review system.

The following panel members made the following presentations:

Mr. John Cawcutt, from Australia, shared the experience of mentoring Japan Disaster Relief Team and New Zealand Fire Services. His findings include the advantages and disadvantages of individual mentoring and team mentoring, necessary commitment to the team, etc.

Major Khamees Mohammad Al-Morikhi, from Qatar, shared the meeting on the response system of the QSART (Qatar Search and Rescue Team) and their road to IEC, which is planned in late-2015.

Mr. Dewey Perks, from the United States, and Chair of the Training Working Group (TWG), updated the meeting on the enhancement of the IEC/R Checklist.

(Action: Member States, IEC teams, INSARAG Secretariat)

4. INSARAG Guidelines Review Progress Report

Mr. David Sochor on behalf of Amb. Manuel Bessler of the SDC and Chair of the Guidelines review Group (GRG), and the GRG members represented by Mr. John Denny (Australia), Mr. Arjan Stam (Netherland) and Mr. Sebastian Mocarquer (Chile) presented on the progress of the GRG work.

The review process and project milestones of the GRG were explained. He further reported that global consultations have commenced since 16 August 2014, through various electronic platforms. The GRG group will participate and consult with members from the other regional group meetings. The final drafts will be

endorsed at the INSARAG Steering Group Meeting in February 2015. The Official launch of the new Guidelines will be taken place at the INSARAG Global meeting in October 2015.

Mr. Sochor and the INSARAG Secretariat thanked Member States for their contribution and active participation to this important process. The inputs from the team leaders to the consultations will be put forward to the GRG for review and consideration in their next meeting in mid-November. The GRG emphasized that the ownership of the Guidelines lies in the Member States and teams.

The rest of the evening was reserved for participants to review the draft guidelines and to come prepared the next day with constructive inputs and contributions to the current documents.
(Action: Member States, GRG, INSARAG Secretariat)

The Day 1 meetings concluded at 1630h.

Tuesday, 23 September 2014 (Day 2):

5.   INSARAG Guidelines Review Workshops

The four break out sessions were taken place, and participants had a chance to participate in all the four break out sessions by rotation. Discussions were facilitated by the GRG members.

> Group 1 – Vol. II Manual A "Capacity Building"
> Group 2 – Vol. II Manual B "Operations"
> Group 3 – Vol. II Manual C "IEC/R"
> Group 4 – Vol. III "Field Handbook"

The Day 2 meetings concluded at 1700h. Participants were invited by the host country to an Official Dinner hosted by ISF, Qatar.

Wednesday, 24 September 2014 (Day 3):

6.   Summary of Break Out Session

Mr. David Sochor (Switzerland), Mr. Steve Smith (Australia), Mr. Sebastian Mocarquer (Chile), Mr. Dewey Perks (the United States), Mr. John Denny (Australia) and Mr. Arjan Stam presented the summary of breakout discussions on the previous day. Summary of discussion is available on the Annex C.

Mr. Shigenobu Kobayashi (Japan) wished the insertion of the importance over gender issues to be under consideration in Vol.I and recommended the further examination of the possibility to extend the classification period (five years) written in Vol.I. for the sake of the workload reduction of the INSARAG and the country.

7.   Experiential Sharing and New Technologies

Mr. Geert de Cubber (Belgium) introduced the UAVs (Unmanned Aerial Vehicles) for disaster assessment. UAVs were already used in the past disasters, such as Balkan Floods in 2014, but it is suggested that the INSARAG start to work on standard setting for using UAVs in international USAR deployment.

Mr. Tim Poluzyn (ISAR Germany) and Mr. John Morrison (Fairfax, the United States) introduced the electronic reporting (e.g. INSARAG Forms) on iPad and Android OS. TWG will take the lead for development of electronic INSARAG Forms.
Note: An INSARAG form app for Android tablets will be made available soon for no cost. Those interested in the app can email info@usarapps.com or check out www.usarapps.com for more information on distribution of the app.

Mr. Alan Toh (Singapore) introduced the Singapore Global Firefighters and Paramedics Challenges 2014 where some INSARAG teams (e.g. Qatar, Saudi Arabia, China) participated. Singapore will welcome the teams, which are new to INSARAG to participate in the events in Singapore from the next year.

Mr. Chris Pritchard (IRO) raised the question about the cadaver dogs. FCSS will open the discussion on Virtual OSOCC, and participants were requested to provide their somments on Virtual OSOCC or send to Chris.

Mr. Dundar Sahin (Turkey) introduced the Syria First Responders Program, conducted by AKUT.

Mr. Marko Rostedt from FINN Rescue presented on new technologies in USAR.

Detailed presentations are available on request from the INSARAG Secretariat at insarag@un.org..

8.   Development of Key Outcomes of the Meeting

a. Announcements of international events by Member States and Teams:

a. INSARAG participating in the field Earthquake Exercise in Istanbul Turkey from 19-21 November 2014.

The following countries have offered to host the next team leaders meeting in 2015:

Emercom of Russia has offered to host the meeting in conjunction with the 25th Anniversary of EMERCOM

As this meeting is rotated by regions, the next region to host this will be in the Americas, they will be consulted if they will host this meeting. The confirmed venue will be announced by the Secretariat in December 2014.

The INSARAG Secretariat and members of the INSARAG team leaders would like to express their deepest appreciation and thanks to the Government of Qatar and ISF, for hosting and supporting the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1500 h.

--------End of Chairman's Summary Report -------

ANNEXES:

Annex A – Participants List
Annex B – Meeting Agenda
Annex C – Summary of the Guidelines Review Workshops

Annex A – Participants List (Attached separately)

Annex B – Meeting Agenda

Sunday, 21 September

All day	Arrival and Registration of INSARAG Team Leaders Meeting participants *Host Country*
19:00 – 21:00	Welcome Reception *Host Country, INSARAG Global Chair*

Monday, 22 September

8:00-09:00	Registration for participants
9:00-9:30	**Official Opening** *Host Country, INSARAG Secretariat*
9:30-9:45	Group Photo *Host Country*
9:45-10:15	Tea/Coffee Break *Host Country*
10:15-10:45	**Introduction of Participants and Adoption of the Agenda** *INSARAG Secretariat*
10:45-11:30	**Update of INSARAG activities in 2013/2014** *INSARAG Secretariat*
11:30-12:00	**INSARAG Working Groups Update** *TWG/MWG, Working Group Chairs / Representatives*
12:00-13:30	Lunch Break *Host Country*
13:30-14:30	**INSARAG External Classification and Reclassification Process:** *Updates from Team Leaders/Mentors*
14:30-15:30	**INSARAG Guidelines Review Progress Report** *Guidelines Review Group, INSARAG Secretariat*
15:30-16:00	Tea/Coffee Break
16:00-17:00	**INSARAG Guidelines Consultations and Approach for Day 2** *Guidelines Review Group*
17:00	Adjourn

Tuesday, 23 September

9:00-10:30	**INSARAG Guidelines Review Workshops** - Breakout Group Discussions (4 sessions) *Guidelines Review Group*
10:30-11:00	Tea/Coffee Break

11:00-12:30   **INSARAG Guidelines Review Workshops**

12:30-13:30   Lunch Break
               Host Country

13:30-15:00   **INSARAG Guidelines Review Workshops**

15:00-15:30   Tea/Coffee Break

15:30-17:00   **INSARAG Guidelines Review Workshops**

18:30-   Official Dinner
               Host Country

Wednesday, 24 September

9:00-10:30   **Summary of Break Out Session**
               Guidelines Review Group and Facilitators

10:30-11:00   Tea/Coffee Break
               Host Country

11:00-13:00   **Experiential Sharing and new technologies**

13:00-14:00   Lunch Break
               Host Country

14:00-15:00   **Development of Key Outcomes of the Meeting**
               The Chairman Summary
               INSARAG Secretariat

15:00-17:00   Reserved for Bilateral meeting, etc.

End of INSARAG Team Leaders Meeting - Departure of participants

Annex C – Summary of the Guidelines Review Workshops

Manual A: Capacity Building
General:
1. Overwhelming recognition that the document is a great step forward from the previous Chapter G and provides a useful tool to the INSARAG community

2. Most expressed a belief that it is substantially correct, (around 80% ready) with only some minor adjustments and some re-wording required.

3. 71 comments recorded across the 4 groups.

4. Acknowledgement for the need to increase the profile and engagement in the capacity building area and that this document would assist in that aim.

5. INSARAG should comment on its area of expertise (USAR) and not on broader capacity development issues.

6. Many countries have a very developed response system and the challenge is to fit the documents content into this.

7. Create a CB register for reference on what projects are occurring or have occurred in a location, what they involve and what were the outcomes – to ensure maximum effectiveness

8. Create a best practice repository/register (not in Manual, perhaps Guidance Notes), include:

    o   Examples of both good and not so good CB outcomes,

    o   Lessons identified (learned?)

    o   Common mistakes/pitfalls

9. Repository/register issue: how you would manage the quality/validation of information. Strong governance arrangements required

Format:
1. Requires better overarching statement of intent (foreword) for the objective of INSARAG with capacity building

2. Definition of "USAR" needs enhanced language and should include a statement about the affect being delivered

3. Simplify the language across the document

4. Language is at times too prescriptive – review for opportunities to soften

5. Layout - key messages, bring them forward

6. Use of term: Capacity vs Capability. Review how it is used to ensure consistency with terminology use

7. Duplication of points (if content exists in another section or elsewhere in the GL refer to it, don't replicate)

8. Create roadmap which needs to be able to be linked to the assessment process

9. Cross referencing in document – check (manual and across GL) for consistency across document to avoid conflicting information e.g. team structure aligning with role description section

10. Risk assessment (involve a problem statement/gap analysis)

11. Annex C page 69; First responder awareness maybe better positioned at the front of the document.

12. Technical remarks - page 74 - regional exercises - change "Turkey" into "country"

13. Annex A OLD VER info. is included, need incorporate the latest version.

Specific:
1. Where is first responder course? Capture statements on community emergency response team or first responders before technical rescue teams.

2. First responder means different things in different countries.

3. Language should acknowledge different first responder starting points for different nations, very basic vs more advanced.

4. Considering adding more Information on local-national relationship and stakeholder management

5. Review the Light team structure (size, function).

6. CB should be based on building a network to provide all of the population with the same right to rescue intervention. This network should tell us how many light, medium or heavy teams are needed in the country and where. It should be based on community risk and vulnerability.

7. Considering this network and assuming that on the community level you have medical service already created maybe you don't need to have medical component in light teams.

8. Suggest that the personnel numbers for a Medium and Heavy team be changed from "Recommended" to "Minimum Recommended"

9. Clarify (or remove) the comment that indicates the team has a requirement to provide staff for the OSOCC and RDC. (check page 36)

10. Greater emphasis is required on skillsets for CB projects and responding into complex environments.

11. Better tools and more advice needs to be included for integration of INSARAG into National level. (Going beyond advisory, providing clear guidelines and goals) Continuity of service quality in domestic setting.

12. Consider how to describe Light USAR team capacity that works with heavy machinery (cranes, tractors etc.)

13. Does the suggested team structure reflect the possible shift of emphasis on search + assessment (Early ASR phases)?

14. Minimum number of staffing roles documented might need to be scrutinized to ensure it is adequate for the roles being undertaken – belief that there are not enough. Language needs to clearly show it is a guideline, not a prescriptive figure.

15. Greater emphasis on capabilities and skillsets with regard to Light/Medium/Heavy teams – better explanations.

16. Include a focus on training of incident management personnel in order for them to be able to do the proper assessment that enables them to call for the right assistance – USAR Medium/Heavy etc.

17. Incorporation of citizen experts into USAR teams gives rise to more issues than those advocated in section 5.5 (diplomatic issues, export of goods, training of experts, understanding of USAR and INSARAG practices)

18. Review language throughout document to ensure relevancy to all counties - both developed and developing counties

19. National - Local relationship – establish the aim in CB to build a synergy between local and national capacity

20. Comments on committee – reinforce need to carefully consider governance arrangements and makeup (skills of this committee) at various phases of a project. Focus on skills required at each stage and map; e.g. Organizational development vs technical skills at different phases

21. Expand contents of assessment checklist to make it more widely applicable

22. Strengthen language regarding local and donor roles and responsibility for achievement of benchmarks

23. Need to include greater clarity that the CB assessment must include all capabilities that exist. Language must better emphasize integration and interoperability between any resource on the ground

24. Provide advice on a standardised international engagement process to facilitate greater trust within stakeholder group

25. Ref Cert page 7 -25 the methodology to create a CERT that has been outlined in the document is not really compatible with the systems of governance prevalent in developing countries. It should be replaced by an outline of a suggested community team structure, organization and equipment module giving a target for the community to strive for. Leave it to the team as to how to get there, as it differs from country to country.

26. **First responder (starting from zero) CERT has to be broader than USAR - Strengthen the first phase before USAR**

27. **Greater emphasis and more advice on assessment process and use of tool – understanding the context of the environment and tailoring to suit circumstances**

28. Note as a source of knowledge the use of local UN/AID agency workers and other networks to access and emphasize local knowledge, context of environment as a tool in assessment process

29. Document describes well benefits but question must also be asked during assessment what are the implications of not having a team/capability

30. **CB must be informed by context of environment - strengthen the language around flexibility of application and tailoring of programs to this context**

31. Strengthen language around initial discussions and conversations about setting achievable and staged outcomes for CB projects – requires honest and frank discussions and benchmarks established with timelines.

32. Consider the value of USAID Latin American CERT USAR team program – look at using this model as basis – has been working in this area for 20 years

33. **Greater emphasis must be placed on CB programs being sustainable.**

34. Advice should be included on complexity of some CB projects and that they cannot be delivered by a stand-alone agency without support from other agencies (Embassies etc)

35. Guidance on Gender consideration should be included within the staffing section.

36. **Document needs bespoke accredited courses to support it.**

Manual B: Operations

Nº	Section, Page	Observation
Chapter 1 International USAR Response Cycle		
1	Chapter 1	Response cycle is still valid and descriptive enough for that level
2	Chapter 1, Figure 1	Correct spelling in "Demobilization"
Chapter 3 USAR Detailed Operations Following the Response Cycle		
3	Chapter 3	Should there be technical details that provide further guidance in the development of the different USAR components? Should there be Technical Notes that expand the guidance rather than have it in Chapter 3?
4	Chapter 3	The format and content of Chapter 3 gives a good and integrated view of the roles, accountability, etc. and how they interphase. More details could potentially loose that integrated overview.
5	Chapter 3	Safety, health, training, security needs further details.
6	Chapter 3	Management by objectives – Non prescriptive operational content
7	Chapter 3	Logic of the content as we move trough the cycle, Is the information in the correct phase? E.g. dogs
8	Chapter 3.3	The team should not inform LEMA directly, it's the function of the OSOCC.
9	Chapter 3	Consistency is required in the level detail provided throughout the different chapters of the Manual. E.g. dog vaccinations versus team vaccinations More level of detail is required to achieve consistency. Technical guidance is required, especially for developing teams. Should there be Technical Notes to provide further details? Volume IV?
10	**Chapter 3**	**Concept of operations is missing in the document. How is the system used? The narrative of the operations is missing and the document does not provide necessary guidance for the use of the tools, ASR levels, forms, etc.**
11	Chapter 3	Should color codes of helmets/vests be specified in the proposed guidelines?
12	Chapter 3	The structure of the team does not reflect the importance of the assessment, specially given the importance and relevance of the initial ASR levels. Suggested USAR Team structure is too "rescue" focused and should reflect the importance of assessment. Emphasize flexibility for reassignment of team functions in the assessment phase. Team structure may be too prescriptive. Map structure of the USAR team could reflect the evolution of the ASR levels
Chapter 4 USAR Coordination Structure		
13	Chapter 4.5	USAR Cell flexibility should be further emphasized. Is it always needed?
14	Chapter 4, Figure 2	UC should be represented in the figure inside the OSOCC structure
15	**Chapter 4.4**	**Review consistency of team responsibilities for establishing OSOCC and UC. How is the staff provided for the RDC/OSOCC/UC? What is the expectation for the teams to provide RDC/OSOCC/UC capabilities? Should there be an indication or reference of how much time USAR team resources will be engaged in RDC/OSOCC/UC?**
16	Chapter 4, Figure 4	Figure 4 is confusing because of operations and support function represented in the RDC
17	Chapter 4, page 23	The last paragraph needs clarification and review. e.g. UC is not listed as a function of the OSOCC
18	Chapter 4	Consistency is required in the development of the OSOCC guidelines together with the INSARAG Guidelines

19	**Chapter 4**	**Sector coordination- needs further clarification** **What is a suitable team?** **What are the responsibilities?** **What is the reporting structure?** **Should the reference to sector coordination be eliminated? Or should more details be provided?** **Are we ready for teams coordinating teams?**
20	Chapter 4	Communications must be interoperable. More guidance is needed to reflect the communications between LEMA and the international response. A diagram is recommended.
21	Chapter 4	Not enough details of the UCC and structure is not provided in the INSARAG Guideline and OSOCC Guideline. Where is the UCC explanation going to be captured? How should teams develop capabilities and operate with the UCC? There is a gap in the proposed guidelines if the UCC is going to be implemented.
22	Chapter 4, table 1	Reference to sector coordination in the VO needs consistency with later explanation of sector coordination
23	Chapter 4, page 24	Shouldn't it be a Sub-OSOOC? If USAR Team to perform sector coordination, the following could be added "…a suitable USAR Team with support of USAR Teams within sector…" Sector coordination could be treated as a separate section to provide more details.
24	Chapter 4.5	Conflict in Manual B-Operations and OSOCC guideline regarding establishing both RDC/OSOCC versus RDC/UCC. Explanation to be provided and clarified. Equipment needs to reflect both the roles of RDC and OSOCC? e.g. sat phones in IEC cheklist
25	Chapter 4	Guidance on setting up a sub-OSOCC needs to be included as part of overall coordination structure
26	Chapter 4	There is a need to provide indication or reference to emphasize that when setting the OSOCC there will be a need to deal with relief teams and other humanitarian actors
27	Chapter 4	Sub-OSOCC is not mentioned.
28	Chapter 2 – Chapter 4	Clarify that OSOCC must work for LEMA
Chapter 5 USAR Planning		
29	Chapter 5	GPS coordinates format: is a decimal format the best format? The INSARAG community should be surveyed in what format to be used. The Guidelines should not be prescriptive
30	Chapter 5	ASR 3 & 4 could be potentially done together ASR 1 normally would be done by LEMA before the arrival of USAR teams
31	Chapter 5.7	Data protection, privacy rights? There should be considerations in the Manual on how to treat information. Team responsibility to get direction from LEMA on how to deal with information, including social media. Is there an information ownership issue?
32	Chapter 5.1	Need for clarification when do operational periods apply e.g. Teams or UCC, shifts versus reporting periods.
33	Chapter 5.2	Special considerations regarding USAR team capabilities are to be taken into account for assignment of teams to sectors.
34	Chapter 5	Conflict between the request for marking in ASR 2 and the time required to complete the marking The structural marking is not listed as an output of ASR 2
35	Chapter 5	Guidance on how to establish sectors. Provide clarity of the size of the sector.
36	Chapter 5	The terms Rapid and Full Search and Rescue and not clearly defined.
37	**Chapter 5**	**Suggestion for only 4 levels, combining levels 1 and 2**
38	Chapter 5	Worksite Triage should be removed from the system?

		It's a responsibility of the LEMA and the OSOCC? Simplify worksite triage form?
39	Chapter 5.6, table 4	"Unknown Victims and Big Voids" is repeated. Consistency in the use of SAR and ASR (heading of the table and diagram)
40	Chapter 5	Definition of Rapid versus Full ASR Levels. e.g . Rapid is completed within 1 operational period.
Chapter 6 INSARAG Marking and Signaling System		
41	Chapter 6	Marking system is easy to read and logical. Linkage to the management tools is positive.
42	Chapter 6	The marking system could include the operational triage of the worksite, since it could be information of value during the initial phase of operations
43	Chapter 6	Marking system is vey positive. Easy to follow. Easy transition from current system. It can be difficult to apply because of the amount of information in the box. It might not work without a template.
44	Chapter 6	Horizontal line is not consistent with the use of ASR levels (e.g. who can say that no more work is needed at a worksite). If the horizontal line is to be used, further guidance of it's use and meaning should be provided. e.g. no more live victims versus structure fully searched Numbers of victims should be filled out when the USAR team leaves the worksite and should reflect the final count.
45	Chapter 6, Page 47	Number of missing persons should be striked out at the bottom if the horizontal line is drawn in the marking.
46	**Chapter 6**	**Why reflect the number of victims, dead, live rescues? The system does not provide added value at the scene since it's captured in the information management tools and it causes a lot of confusion. It should be eliminated from the marking system.**
47	Chapter 6	Simplify marking system by eliminating: -General Area Marking -Structure orientation (modify as a guidance for teams?) Provide further guidance in the use of: -**Rapid Clearance marking?** -Victim marking?
48	**Chapter 6.2**	**Modify worksite marking (most simple as possible): -Include triage category in marking? -Keep as proposed but remove information regarding the number of victims from the marking.**
49	Chapter 6	Consistency between signaling for evacuation and crane operations in Vol. III and in IEC checklist.
General Remarks and Annexes		
50	Version control issues	Version control issues – Two versions of Manual B Examples: -Response cycle versus Development cycle
51	Beyond the Rubble	Beyond the rubble - Should there be guidance in the INSARAG Guidelines concerning operations beyond the rubble? Should there be a Technical Note? e.g. site disposal and handover issues such as safety and hazmat considerations
52	Gap analysis	Gap analysis based on the current version of the Guidelines to understand what has changed or is missing in the proposed Guidelines.
53	Chapter 7?	HAZMAT considerations should be covered in the Operations Manual, specially after the initial response phase, with consideration of the management aspects
54	Implementation	Transition phase in the implementation plan so teams can adopt new Guidelines
55	Consistency	OSOCC/UNDAC Guidelines: consistency needed
56	Annex C	Annex C is misleading and it's not a USAR function. It should be eliminated.
57	Complete	Consistency of terminology use for victims: victims, casualties, live

	document	victims, and dead victims (including in forms).
58	Include Annex	Brief description of the cluster system and list of focal points

Manual C: IEC/R
Open Questions:
1. Is a crane needed for an IEC/R: consensus is YES
2. Should the colours be removed from the Checklist: consensus is NO

General Comments –
- Throughout the all the Manuals consider using the same punctuation formatting (dot-points, section numbering etc.)
- Statements (guidance notes) to better define 'the what". As example, what is the transportation requirement to move people and equipment? This should be tagged where applicable into the Checklist items. An example is 13.4.4 which outlines Cranes/Heavy Machinery that describes tonnage to be lifted (5MT and 3MT).
- Define "Decontamination" --- not clear of gross/technical, as example…not same in all countries
- Missing is a guidance note ("minimum standard") for waste management
- Safety in general: is there a consistent Risk Hazard analysis, how is it disseminated, how does it get to OSOCC/UCC
- How often will the Checklist be revised; is there a schedule
- Is the 36-hour exercise final, meaning what if everything is done in 29-hours, or that the team is not able to complete the requirements of the exercise in 36-hours, or the team wants to exercise for more than 36+ hours.
- How do we ensure that a classifier is properly prepared to serve? It is suggested that there must be a Classifier-in-Training (as a shadow as example) before being named a classifier.
- Clarify how/when there is the need to remove the INSARAG patch (page 28).
- Internal feedback on performance the classifying team (360 view).
- Where is the list of Best Practices maintained?
- Page 5/6: re-measure the requirements differentiating Heavy and Medium
- More clarity on what is next step after first reclassification (IEC-IER-What's next)
  - Differing opinions –
    - One suggestion is that a team does an IEC, then an IER in 5-years, then nothing for 10-years
    - Most did not agree with this, saying the 5-year cycle maintains the integrity of the minimum standard; that teams are expected to do an annual exercise, which the IEC/R joins – there is not a "special" exercise for IEC/R; that teams need to gather documentation for its CPOE continuously; that if this documentation is gathered consistently it reduces the numbers of classifiers needed for a reclassification.
  - The Secretariat reminded that the newly revised Checklist would be implemented in early 2015, and would immediately go in service.
    - That teams should be proactively studying how to implement the coming changes and not wait until the Global release in October 2015.
- Terminology needs to be consistent throughout all manuals (recon as example)
- The Mentor needs to understand the role of ensuring a USAR Team understands staffing requirements at the RDC/UCC; people assigned to these functions may not return until mission end.
- Plan of Action – not all teams have a consolidated POA; will need to clarify the point
- Section 10 – is there a need to include extreme environmental conditions (hot, cold, altitude) in the IEC/R process?
- If heavy equipment is to be used in place of a crane, what capacity lift is needed?

Checklist Comments –
- 1.1/.2 Is there the need for both a policy and operations FP; can that be the same person?

- 3.1 --- clarify --- a team should be registered as an INSARAG member early on; Secretariat will revise the entry once IEc/R is completed
- 3.2 – Clarification on who does input to the VO on baseline information. Is this the role of EXCON, and if so someone needs to be named to do this.
- 4.1 define or make reference to "ratio of 2:1"…as example if a team deploys with 2 Team Leaders, it should have 4 rostered.
- 4.1 – is 2:1 ration sufficient, especially for specialised positions (engineer, doctor and so on); suggested 3:1.
    - o Other comment was this adds cost to sponsor, team, and affected country.
    - o Some teams might not have that capacity
- 4.1 – is there a need to have 4.1 and 4.2? Can they be combined?
- 4.2 – is there a need to repeat the numbers (team size)? Suggest deleting.
- 4.3 – should the doctors doing the medical screening also be the doctors deploying? Reasoning of impartially. If the doctors are the same, there must be a clear definition of deployment disqualification factors which can be measured.
- 4.4 – clarity on the role/need of the veterinarian, as well as how the medical doc can intercede
- 5.2 --- either remove last sentence or clarify it
- 5.3 – this there guidance on 'self-sufficiency' regarding amounts of food/water taken
- 5.3 – how much water
- 6.1 --- need clarity on how record system will be observed…consider language, meaning does not all need to be translated to English, but an overview (in English) will be needed
- 6.1 – definition should be provided that spells out what "specific training" equates to
- 6.1.1/.2 – how is this measured; needs clarity or deletion.
- 6.1.1 – need clarity on this and perhaps separate the items into different lines (categories)
- 6.1.3 – Equivalency for this training – does FCSS do this up front. For the Basic safety training, suggest making this a country/team training initiative. If the DSS course is not used (language and so on), the Team FP, Mentor, and IEC/R TL need to agree on content.
- 6.1.4 – remains mandatory for Managers
- 6.2 – clarify "if there is no other team"
- 6.2 – clarify how to use role players and such, including registered teams, those teams involved in capacity building projects, and suggestions from FCSS
- 6.2 – rewrite opening comment into English that is understandable
- 6.2.1/.2/.3—clarity on how this works in the exercise as well as real life.
- 6.2.1/.2/.3 could be used as injects rather than examples
- 6.3 – name "another recognised resource"…if a team has OSOCC trained personnel can it deliver OSOCC trained. Also is the number of staff (2 and 2) required for both a Heavy and Medium team? Is there a difference in what a Medium and Heavy should be expected to provide in RDC/OSOCC.
- 6.4 – change language: structured training program rather than an annual training program.
- Section 7 – needs to say that a minimum of 6 satt phones (with data capacity) is needed for a heavy team; for a Medium is 3 at a minimum.
    - o Some may have difficulty due to cost and training.
- 7.1 – need to include ICT equipment requirements here. As example satt phone at RDC and OSOCC, as well as USAR command post and so on.
- 7.2 – need to be able to change datum on GPS to meet requirement of the affected country…also GPS is not just for "where am I"; it needs to be able to be applied to mapping at the UCC/OSOCC
- 7.2 – requirement is vague. Needs to have a tie-in to mapping as well as location finding/marking
- 7.2 – add software for mapping
- Section 8 – insurance (repat, self-protection, workers compensation and so on)
- Section 8 – is an import/export license required
- 8.1 – add "spot check" to documentation; system is implemented that everyone's docs are cleared in reality

- 8.1.5 – shot records ("yellow books") should be suggested to have a transportable immunization record
- 8.1.6 – for the MWG: is an English translation of this required
- 8.2 – clarify for database, radio comms, satt phone, sectionalized by category (tents, meds, breaking etc)
- Section 8.2 – include radio freq-freq range for fact sheet and border crossing
- 8.2.4 – clarify need for serial numbers
- 8.3 – why is there the need for a written plan of action? There was not consensus on this; other comments were
    - o Legal issues could mean there is a need for a POA
    - o Templates should be in place and used to develop the POA
- 8.3.4 – suggested that hazmat is a bit different from general safety/security…suggest to add hazmat management as a separate line in here.
- 9.1 – what is a reasonable amount of time at the end of the 6-hour period.
- 9.1 – is the 10-hour point valid.
- 9.3 – provide clarity for this statement…what is the expected answer
- 9.4 – revise to follow the pre-departure briefing template found in Manual B
- 9.4.6 – clarify "welfare of staff"
- 9.4.4 – suggest clarifying HM …will need to have foundation in Manual B
- 10.1 – clarify on "1st arriving USAR team" and relationship of LEMA/OSOCC
- 10.2 – where is the USAR team management?
- 10.2.7 – should be "general waste management"; verbiage seen should move to 10.2.11
- Also look at 10.2.10 --- is it the same as 10.2.7?
- Is there a need for a guidance note on priorities of establishing the BoO?
- 10.2.7 – needs clarity and deconflict with 10.2.11
    - o 10.2.7 should focus to waste, showers, toilets, etc.
- 10.2.8 – please clarify this…place to play; place to pee
- 11.1 – remove reference to OSOCC Guidelines; change to "trained in the OSOCC methodology"
- 11.1 -- Suggest deleting "provisional" from RDC
- 11.1 – is it practical to use the team's command tent for the OSOCC?
- 11.2 – differentiate between responsibilities as OSOCC versus 1st arriving USAR team
- 11.4 --- look at lead sentence; consider moving (or repeating) at 11.1
- 11.4.1 -- redefine to catch up with FMTs etc.
- 11.5 – list the forms
- 11.6 – looks at the words
- 12.2 – what is the training level and how is it applied?
- 12.2 -- Structural engineer: position prerequisites, as other position prerequisites should require knowledge and capacities and not academic levels. Academic levels are too specific in different countries to be taken as minimum level or capacity proofs. Delete colour references.
- 12.2 – clarify the difference of rostered engineers versus deployed…does this mean that a heavy team needs to deploy with 2 engineers or one?
- 12.3 – is this written, verbal, hand-phone and so on?
- 12.3 – clarify: at the present only identification is seen – where is the mitigation part of it and how is it integrated into the POA
- Section 13 -- "two sites" – clarify.
- Section 13 – integration of ASR into the process
- 13.1 – check terminology for ASR and so on
- 13.1-.4 – there is no difference seen between medium and heavy teams
- 13.1.3/4 – do these need to be separated
- 13.2 – there is a problem with say "1m under rubble"…is this measured from the feet or the head…suggest language be changed to "the "victims should be under minimally 3m"
- 13.3.8 – may need help finding structural steel

- 13.4.4 – is there a need to differentiate between heavy/medium
- 13.6 – do we need to suggest appropriate harness and rope; not technique
- 13.6 – suggest that the rope work be discussed in advance of the exercise; safety using live victims (in any portion of the exercise) is critical. Agreement between the Team FP, Mentor and IEC/R TL is a must.
- 13.4.4 – is there a need to have different loads limits for Heavy and Medium team
- 13.6 – rope work needs to be done according to the national standard
- 13.6 – how is a storey measured, meaning is it 3-4-5 meters?
- 13.6 – how is working safely at heights measured?
- 13.7.2/.3 – delete --- better said in 13.7.6
- 14.1 – clarify that the hand signs seen in the Guidelines are general guidance…actual hand signals must be clarified with the crane operator before work starts
- 14.2 – add gloves
- 14.3 – define or add "where contaminants are present"

Volume III: Field Handbook
1. Is the field handbook for use by all personnel within a USAR team?
    a. Trying to keep the handbook as small as possible so looking at management and key positions within each USAR team.
    b. Content is valid for all team members
2. Title of handbook might be misleading as it suggests it is for use by the technicians within a team.
3. Checklists are very useful as opposed to the annexes.
4. Baseline information is good but important that teams have the ability to adapt to suit their own procedures.
5. Remember translation issues it will add considerable volume to the handbook.
6. Some annexes should stay
7. Hazmat section should be in a table format rather than an annex.
8. Page 88; change downwind to upwind (bullet points)
9. Try to make more use of pictures and symbols due to the dynamic nature of operations.
    a. Ideas are welcomed from participants to use pictures
10. Handbook content is relevant and flows well however some of the annexes seem disjointed
11. Consider a BoO section that includes logistics, however wider consideration is BoO is part of logistics. Consider checklist for establishing and managing a BoO.
12. Put BoO establishment into a checklist format rather than an annex. That includes multi national considerations.
13. ASR descriptors need to be in the handbook.
14. Volume III needs to link clearly to Volume II
15. FEMA has gone to a one page tactical POA that maybe a useful template to include in the handbook.
16. Annex E does not align to management list on the RDC checklist.
17. Suggest handbook is produced digitally and then teams have options on how to use it. It would be good to have an electronic copy that can be digitally updated by teams, however there is a danger that they will change too much.
18. Water operations post tsunami and aerial assessment checklist to be considered.
19. Consider extreme weather conditions operations and welfare arrangements.
20. Annex H; Recommend change to new team acronyms and ASR levels are not reflected here.
21. Operations working Group should be considered to keep the operations and handbook up to date. Need to have a mechanism to feed in best practice from IECs, exercises, deployments etc into this WG.
22. Review and dissemination of changes to the handbook takes time, and is very important at local level as well.

_____