

Annex C - Outcomes of the INSARAG Global Meeting 2020 discussions

Breakout 1 – Strengthening Quality Standards and Coordination

Facilitators: Edoardo Cavaleri d'Oro and Giorgio Ciappei

Notetaker: Davide Bocciarelli

Three Key Discussion Areas:

1. What needs to take place (and how) to strengthen the application of the INSARAG quality standards?
2. What should happen (and how) to further strengthen the coordination of the response?
3. What are the key bottlenecks and / or risk factors?

Three Recommendations

1. What needs to take place (and how) to strengthen the application of the INSARAG quality standards?
 - Redefine “reds and yellows” standard in order to have fewer “political issues” in the IEC and IER processes, introduce an orange level or penalties
 - Create a consolidation process between the IEC and the IER, in order to check the team’s skills and quality standards
 - Groups identified as a priority training for classifiers, team leaders and mentors to better interpret the checklists and guidelines, including the improvement of interpersonal skills for classifications
 - Reds are a political issue, not the classifier’s issue
 - Different attitudes between small NGO’s and government entities to face the political issue
 - Reach the goal without political pressure
 - In real emergencies teams avoid realizing the UCC or RDC and teams go straight to the site - the INSARAG mandate should be better understood (it collides sometimes with the mindset of the rescuers)
 - No tool, no checklist to implement attitude in the period between IEC and IER. No mandatory activities but only regional meeting; improve exercises to be closer to reality
 - If you don’t reach the standard, what are the implications?
2. What should happen (and how) to further strengthen the coordination of the response?
 - Dedicated unit to do UCC and RDC only
 - The goal is saving lives, not to coordinate ourselves
 - Improve the national support for incoming teams
 - Cooperation depends of the level of the ego of team leader; - Train the leader to relationship and cooperation
 - Open training to another team not classifier
 - Help country to be ready to receive international support
 - Improve the national support by the host county

- Improve coordination tools like KOBO – ESRI should succeed in this
 - Interoperability in the field about equipment and so on
 - Retraining with different teams
3. What are the key bottlenecks and / or risk factors?
- Human factor, attitude
 - Training
 - Develop relationship in few days it's hard; people change position and there aren't knowledge heritages (working experience)
 - Relationships between countries not only in the INSARAG mechanism, but with bilateral agreements and training; quality of training, different methodology
 - Build teams for national response not only for international response
 - It is not a competition between teams

Breakout 2 – Advancing Flexible Assistance

Facilitators: Krysztof Pietrasik, Paolo Vaccari and Christophe Debray

Notetaker: Adrian Bucalowski

Three key discussion areas:

1. Do we have the knowledge on what additional needs are? Where do we need flexible capabilities of USAR teams? Have we undergone a complex hazard analysis?
2. What can we do within the perimeter of our skills? When thinking about flexibility, should we go into modularity-based approach within existing capabilities of USAR teams or should we attach extra capacities and skills to USAR teams?
3. How to manage the decision-making process, prioritize activities of USAR teams and effectively liaise with other actors involved?

Three recommendations:

1. We need to assess possible disaster risks and scenarios for flexible assistance, meet the community-driven needs and adapt existing expertise for different purposes to make the response more performant and more tailored.
2. At the same time, we need to maintain the standards and quality. Current USAR concept provides predictability for requesting state and actors in the field. Quality assurance for new capabilities stays out of IEC/IER process.
3. We have to maintain our USAR identity within a wider community of responders and we need to have the current INSARAG mandate in mind.

Breakout 3 – Enhancing Preparedness and Bolstering Partnerships

Facilitator: Meg Northrope

Notetaker: Teresa di Francesco

Key discussion areas:

- Groups considered a range of issues in considering this strategic objective within the framework of ensuring that INSARAG remained fit for purpose. Broad discussions were held about how enhancements can be made at the INSARAG level to better integrate and work with the broader humanitarian system.
- Discussions were held regarding the advancement of humanitarian principles within the INSARAG system, to develop an understanding in the network of the principles and trends within the broader system. This includes the UN code of conduct, PSEA and Child Protection, Do-No-Harm principle. There appears to be an information disconnect, which should be fixed by the Secretariat.

Three recommendations:

1. Sensibilization on humanitarian principles
 - Consider different needs of populations. Because all the teams generally are focussed only on operations and worksites, it would be useful to pay attention on risks of popular uprising, terrorism, religious movements and so on.
2. Have a briefing before deployment, in order to enhance all cultural aspects:
 - List of questions, a sort of flowchart to help the teams
 - Conversation between the teams during preparedness and operations
 - Working group to match field level to meeting level
3. During operations it would be useful to extend the contact checklist:
 - Fight the adversity to change
 - Discuss guidelines with the Teams