AFTER ACTION REPORT SURVEY TEMPLATE

*(Name of Disaster)*

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Information Needed** | *Text goes in text boxes below.* |
| **Name of Organization:** | LPHG |
| **Type of Organization:** | Medium-sized 501(c)(3) personal care business |
| **Region**:  (Coastal, Inland, or Southern) | Coastal |
| **Completed by**: | Dustin McClure |
| **Date report completed:** | May 01, 2022 |
| **Type of event, training, or exercise:** *(actual event, table top, functional or full-scale exercise, pre-identified planned event, training, seminar, workshop, drill, game, etc.)* | Earthquake (7.8 Magnitude) |
| **Summary of the Disaster:** | Earthquake registering 7.8 on the Richter scale, and lasting approximately 30 seconds to 1 minute for the primary quake, with subsequent aftershocks of varying strengths occurring for the next 96 hours. Floods and fires persisted for weeks. |
| **DRP Documents:** *(e.g., disaster recovery plan, backup plans etc.) Include specific details about the documents, including completeness.* | LPHG had a DPP, BIA, and Backup/Recovery Policy on file. The DRP had information listed for the primary emergency contact and secondary emergency contact, which teams and positions will participate in crisis management and emergency planning, which building is considered primary and which would be an alternate if the primary is unavailable, and where the copies of the DRP would be located. The plan also included very general information about notification.  The BIA was completely blank with the exception of the description of LPHG’s only business process(R&D).  The Backup/Recovery policy includes information on which drives will be available to users after a restore and which will not. It also outlines the procedure for restoring from a day of the current week and restoring from a day prior to the last full week. |
| **Post-Disaster Response Summary:** | The employees at LPHG followed the disaster recovery plan as expected, but the plan was severely lacking. They were able to record information about the earthquake, those injured, and who to reach out to for additional help. They set up a command system and reached out to the primary and alternate work sites. Apart from these preliminary steps, the committee members were unsure how to proceed in the way of aiding those injured or how to move toward restoring business. |

**Strengths of Disaster Response EVALUATION**

**Strength #1: Team members followed plan as outlined**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength Details:** | |
| Summary of Strength: | The employees of LPHG were able to band together and follow the disaster response plan that was in place. Though the information and guidance that was available to them in this plan was minimal, the committee followed them with haste. |
| **Contributing Factors:** | |
| Plans | DPP |
| Policies | Primary Crisis manager, Primary processing site, alternate site, notification |
| Documents | DPP, BIA, |
| Positive Consequences: | The employees followed what direction they were given from the DPP, and now have a functional team to move forward with. |
| Ways to Improve: | The company needs a much more thorough DPP and BIA. If this had been accomplished at the time of disaster the committee may have had more resources on hand to help employees on site and those injured. They would have had contact information readily available for all employees, would have had contact information on hand for all necessary emergency and aid services, would have had contact information on hand for their partners and vendors, and would have had an idea about where to start in restoring business based on services impacted. |

**Strength #2: Committee assessed situation in detail**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength Details:** | |
| Summary of Strength: | The committee members took notes of the incident, took note of those injured, and figured out what kind of additional resources they might need to move forward. |
| **Contributing Factors:** | |
| Plans | This was not really outlined in the plans, policies, or documents. The committee did this of their own accord. |
| Policies | This was not really outlined in the plans, policies, or documents. The committee did this of their own accord. |
| Documents | This was not really outlined in the plans, policies, or documents. The committee did this of their own accord. |
| Positive Consequences: | When emergency personnel are on-site, they will be informed about the number of those on-site that were injured. When the business is trying to resume operations they will have some idea of what has been damaged and what needs to be repaired/replaced/etc. |
| Ways to Improve: | From the description, in the response it did not seem like there was much focus on those injured in the disaster apart from noting the number injured. There was also no mention of evacuation of visitors and non-essential personnel. |

**Strength #3: Reached out to primary disaster contacts**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength Details:** | |
| Summary of Strength: | The committee reached out to each of the disaster contacts listed and notified the proper external groups per the DPP. They also attempted to contact employees, but then found that no employee contact information was found in the DPP |
| **Contributing Factors:** | |
| Plans | DPP |
| Policies | Primary processing site, alternate processing site, primary crisis manager, secondary crisis manager, notification |
| Documents | DPP |
| Positive Consequences: | The committee informed all of the proper parties about the disaster which allows those parties to respond appropriately(showing up to provide aid, clear debris, initiate restoration of business processes, etc.) |
| Ways to Improve: | It seems like those responding did what they could with the information available. The plan itself needs to provide all necessary contact information for employees and vendors. |

**Areas for Improvement of Disaster Response EVALUATION**

**Area for Improvement #1: Further planning for evacuation and on-site assistance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area for Improvement Details:** | |
| Summary of Area for Improvement: | The employee responders took note of the disaster and those injured, but they did not work to evacuate those on-site or aid any injured or stranded occupants. |
| **Contributing Factors:** | |
| Plans | None |
| Policies | This is not addressed in any policies |
| Documents | DPP |
| Consequences: | There are multiple injured and confused occupants at the site that are unsure how to proceed and possibly in need of food, water, and first aid. The first responders in this case are overwhelmed due to lack of funding and the scale of the disaster, and it is unclear how quickly they will be able to provide any of these things. |
| Ways to Improve: | In review of this plan, include provisions for a supply of food, water, and first aid supplies that will be kept on-site. Establish a means to evacuate all unnecessary personnel and visitors in case of a disaster. |

**Area for Improvement #2: Significant development of critical services POA needed**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area for Improvement Details:** | |
| Summary of Area for Improvement: | LPHG has absolutely no information in their Business Impact Analysis. Apart from the information provided in the DPP, the employee’s responsible for responding in case of emergency have no idea where to start in terms of restoring business to normal operation. They do not know the order in which processes need to be brought back online, which processes are considered critical, etc. |
| **Contributing Factors:** | |
| Plans | None |
| Policies | BIA: Critical Dates and Impact Timeline, Operational and Financial Impact, Upstream Dependencies, Downstream dependencies, RTO  DPP: Critical Services, Vendor Contact, Employee Contact |
| Documents | BIA, DPP |
| Consequences: | The employees on the response team have no starting point or foundation from which to launch an attempt at recovering normal business operations. |
| Ways to Improve: | The BIA should include information on what will happen if processes are interrupted, what the operational and financial impact will be if processes fail, what these processes rely (upstream) and what processes rely on them (downstream) so they have an idea of how to restore them and what will be impacted if they are not restored. They should also know what the expected Recovery Time Objective is so they have a benchmark to work toward.  The DPP should include information about which services are critical and who to contact in the case that they fail, which vendors may need to be contacted so they know about things like product delays or a hold placed on deliveries, and employee contact information so that employees can be notified of the current status of business recovery and/or any changes to regular business operations. |

**Area for Improvement #3: Significant development of BIA needed**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area for Improvement Details:** | |
| Summary of Area for Improvement: | There is no information in the BIA except for R&D as a process description. Within R&D there are almost certainly multiple sub-processes that make up the whole, and these need to be accounted for in the BIA. |
| **Contributing Factors:** | |
| Plans | None to speak of. |
| Policies | Critical Dates and Impact Timeline, Operational and Financial Impact, Upstream Dependencies, Downstream Dependencies, RTO |
| Documents | BIA |
| Consequences: | In the businesses attempt to re-establish operations, there will be no cohesive plan to bring processes critical to R&D back online. There will be no consensus as to how long the business has to bring these processes online before they see measurable financial impact. They will have to scramble to figure out which upstream dependencies are needed to restore processes and which downstream dependencies may be affected by failure. |
| Ways to Improve: | There needs to be an in-depth accounting of processes in the R&D department that considers all of the consequences listed above. |