

Session 1 Feedback

What are the issues, as identified by the agencies?

Combined feedback from the two breakout groups is collated in the following slides. After this was presented to the full workshop, the feedback was summarised into four points which are listed on the last slide.

Group 1: Feedback

- Surf would like to be more involved in MOU discussions with Police, RCCNZ and Coastguard. Believe they have something to offer.
- Surf should be involved in marine SAR advisor programme.
- Relationships vary greatly between agencies around the regions, good relationships occur where resource and training are shared.
- Agencies have sound SOPs with their own organisations but their needs to be better understanding of these SOPs by other agencies.

Group 1: Feedback

- There are no set procedures for interaction between coastguard and Surf units etc. There needs to be SOPs on how this interaction works
- Coordinating authorities could look at tasking surf assets more often, they can be over looked. They would also benefit from an early heads up when a SAR is on.
- All agencies report a need to have better understanding of CIMS at the operational level.

Group 1: Feedback

- CAT I & Cat II are reasonably clear but need clarification on “Good Samaritan” work.
- Needs to be better process on when these incidents are escalated. An escalation framework could be developed.
- This should include a risk assessment processes, needs to include communications plan.
- More interagency training.

Group 1: Feedback

- Air - Marine advisors need to have aviation experience, will better inform the right assets for the job. Or bring in aviation expert from the start.
- Air – need to have a CIMS understanding only.
- Air – Need to be consistent policies between police and RCCNZ in regards to Top Cover and two machines over water at night or offshore.

Group 2: Feedback

Harbour Masters Feedback

- **Communication** – very out of the loop, need to know about (not involvement related) informed
- Here to help have knowledge
- **Unsure** who is doing what who is in charge of incidents at times
- **Coordination** of local groups and meetings, many don't talk to each other and we can see this
- **Local procedures** and safety, capability levels

Group 2: Feedback

NZDF Feedback

- **Don't get used enough**, here to help and keen
- **Lack of awareness** from other agencies of roles and capabilities and availability etc
- **Rarely involved in training or exercises**, very interested in being a part of...
- **Costs**, actually cheap to train with - no charge
- **Communications** between NZDF air assets and other agencies problematic sometimes
- **Updates** during SAROPs, feedback etc to smaller units (helo)

Group 2: Feedback

MOC Feedback

- Duplication of communications can lead to confusion
- Harbour jurisdictions, can be problematic due to number of players
- Potential SAR, when to advise agency
- Handover of incidents and closure of incidents (communication) all stakeholders informed

Group 2: Feedback

Police Feedback

- Work to be done around defining coordinating authority
- Not following tasking requirements of IC
- Apparent resistance to operating on Ch 16 (topographical / procedural challenges)
- Back tasking after over ambitious acceptance of task resulting in request for further assets
- Measured response to better reflect situation and capabilities
- Poor Police accounting procedures - invoicing and payment of SAROPs
- Police North Comms handing over to Police IC before ready to receive

Group 2: Feedback

Police Feedback

- No fulltime District SAR coordinator leads to lower levels of communication with partners
- Common understanding of CIMS processes in SAROPs required. Police / Coastguard / Surf
- Professional contact point to take first up calls in all areas Coastguard, Surf
- Impediments for IC / OSC to task and communicate directly with SRUs / assets
- Dispatch of assets without knowledge and approval of IC
- Asset issue, Taranaki + Eastern BOP no helicopter

Group 2: Feedback

Police Feedback

- Failure to stand down SRUs / assets at times by agencies after suspension by IC
- Not informing or advising of potential SARs
- No Police Liaison Officer permanently in RCCNZ
- No fulltime access to tracking search assets
- No coastal DF with VHF

Group 2: Feedback

RCCNZ Feedback

- **Comms:** when slow, not to right person, delays in getting SAR Coordinated
- **Incident Handover:** RCC-Police, capacity issues, could be kept with Police longer
- **Levels of responsibility:** specific roles within an incident, sometimes assets acting independently, surprises when self tasking happens
- **Trackplus:** would like to have direct access, rather than having to ask to see where assets are

Group 2: Feedback

RCCNZ Feedback

- Can Navy have AIS on at all times unless reason to have off
- SAR Database should be ingrained and updated on a regular basis
- Need to know vs. want to know – incidents in local areas
- Definition of incidents – knowledge

Summary of Issues

- 1. Escalation of incidents** – consistent process and understanding. Cat 1 & Cat 2 – but when does something become cat 1? Clearer definitions.
- 2. Sharing of knowledge – Operationally**
Communications, interagency liaison and operability, including training.
- 3. Sharing of knowledge – Non-Operationally**
Communications, interagency liaison and operability, including training.
- 4. The List** of remaining issues that do not fit into the 3 categories above.