

Exercise Evaluation Report

Operation Pegasus

Location: Whitianga

Date: 7TH APRIL 2018

Report version: Draft 1

Evaluator(s): *Allan Mundy Surf lifesaving New Zealand*

Contents

- Executive Summary 2
- 1. Recommendations 3
- 2. Introduction 4
- 3. Background..... 7
- 4. Evaluation Methodology10
- 5. Findings14
- 6. Conclusions.....16
- 7. Appendix17

Executive Summary

Marine SAR Agencies participate in exercises that consider or simulate real life situations. The aims of these exercises are to improve Operational readiness and identify any gaps or weaknesses in the SOP's of all participating Agencies. They also clarify roles, demonstrate agency capabilities and provide a sound training platform.

This exercise occurred on Saturday 7th April 2018, it comprised of two phases. Both run simultaneously around the coastal waters off Hot Water Beach from Hahei in the North to Pauanui in the south, with the IMT being based at the Whitianga Coast Guard Headquarters.

The two phases tested the IMT's ability to effectively manage the incident within the CIMS process in phase one. While the on-water scenario will test the participant's ability to work together to achieve the outcomes required by the Incident Action Plan in phase two.

This report reflects only the observations during the two phases of the exercise and focused upon the three objectives set by the Exercise Directors.

It makes recommendations for the improvement of the planning process for the MSAREX at Director Level, the improvement of IMT situational awareness and improvement of Health and Safety application in the IMT from the field.

1. Recommendations

- 1 When planning a multi- agency and –multiunit exercise selection of the directors should be coordinated by their overarching agency authority. This will avoid any local unit politics misdirecting the exercise development.
- 2 To allow the IMT the best possible chance to develop a full situational awareness from the IMT to the field and back! The IMT should aim to have representation from all the agencies operating in the field.
- 3 The IMT must ensure all relevant information is collected from the Field Teams before sending them past the SFP's. Following this process would have ensured all crews on the water were accounted for.

2. Introduction

Periodically Marine SAR Agencies participate in exercises that consider or simulate real life situations. The aims of these exercises are to improve Operational readiness and identify any gaps or weaknesses in the SOP's of all participating Agencies. They also clarify roles, demonstrate agency capabilities and provide a sound training platform.

The New Zealand Police, Waikato Police SAR District, have requested that selected Coastguard Units and Surf Life Saving Clubs take part in a combined SAREX to provide training for and to test the capabilities of on water Marine SAR resources to work together, in a multi-agency SAR response, whilst under the direction of an Incident Management team, working within the CIMS process.

Needs Assessment:

A comprehensive need assessment in relation to this SAREX has been carried out and is fully documented on the attached NZSAR SAREX guidelines planning sheet.

Likewise, the specific SAREX objectives and key performance indicators which have been set by the SAREX Directors have also been documented on the NZSAR SAREX planning sheet.

Functions to be exercised:

- The handling and activation of Marine distress Flares by Coastguard personal.
- Multi-Agency and intergroup coordination with the emphasis being to test the Inter-capability of communications between participating SAR Agencies.
- Search and Rescue incident management
- Applying CIMS to SAR at a moderate level within a scenario based environment.
- Coastguard Units/Surf life Saving Clubs Wet Units and their resources

Objective 1

To test the ability of a multi-agency IMT to effectively set up an ICP, and put into place an Action Plan; to exercise the documentation of the formal planning process within the IMT; to exercise the control and coordination functions of the on-water resources in implementing the IMT's Plan.

Objective 2

To test the ability of On-Water Resources (Coastguard and Surf) to work effectively together to complete the tasking's assigned to them by the IMT.

Objective 3

To test communications between the various participating agencies with emphasis on communication between IMT and On-Water Resources

Operation Pegasus:

Operation Pegasus is a Marine SAREX which incorporates the activation of a number of Coastguard Units/Surf Life Saving Clubs to respond to an on water Marine SAR Scenario. The SAR response will be coordinated by a Police Incident Controller utilising a Multi-Agency IMT. It will test the IMT's ability to effectively manage the incident within the CIMS process. The on-water scenario will test the participant's ability to work together to achieve the outcomes required by the Incident Action Plan. It will also present the opportunity to identify any communication problems between the on-water resources and the IMT.

Coordinating Authority:

New Zealand Police.

Exercise writing Agency:

Coastguard Eastern Region.

Participating Agencies:

New Zealand Police, Coastguard Eastern Region, Whitianga Coastguard, Tairua/Pauanui Coastguard, Whangamata Coastguard, Auckland Coastguard Air patrol, Hot Water Beach Surf lifesaving Club, KSAR land Search and Rescue

EXERCISE COORDINATING INSTRUCTIONS

Ground:

The Incident Control Point (ICP) for this exercise will be based at the Whitianga Coastguard HQ, Dundas Street Whitianga.

Phase one of the on-water exercise, the Marine distress flares activations, will be held off shore opposite the Reserve area of Buffalo Beach.

The on-water scenario will be conducted in the coastal waters off Hot Water Beach.

Situation:

On Saturday the 7th of April 2018 resources from Whitianga, Tairua/ Pauanui, Whangamata Coastguard Units along with IRB crews from HWB Surf Lifesaving will take part in a full scale search and rescue exercise in the Coastal waters off Hot water Beach.

The exercise will be conducted in two phases,

Phase one: Flare exercises.

Phase two: on water SAR scenario.

The on-water crews will be coordinated by a Police coordinated IMT working from the designated ICP at Whitianga Coastguard HQ.

Mission:

To ascertain how effectively a Multi-Agency IMT working from a centralised ICP can manage the on-water scenario of this exercise in respect to, utilizing gathered information, formulating an effective Action Plan, establishing effective communication with on water resources and coordinating and controlling the SAR response within existing SOP's.

To test how the on-water resources of Multi-agencies can effectively work together to complete the tasking's assigned to them by the IMT. How they communicate with the IMT. How their SOP's mesh and to identify any changes needed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their response.

3. Background

3.1 Background to the Exercise

Operation Pegasus is a Marine SAREX which incorporates the activation of a number of Coastguard Units/Surf Life Saving Clubs to respond to an on water Marine SAR Scenario. The SAR response will be coordinated by a Police Incident Controller utilising a Multi-Agency IMT. It will test the IMT's ability to effectively manage the incident within the CIMS process. The on-water scenario will test the participant's ability to work together to achieve the outcomes required by the Incident Action Plan. It will also present the opportunity to identify any communication problems between the on-water resources and the IMT

3.2 Dates, location, organising agency(s), key people

Coastguard Eastern Region.

The Incident Control Point (ICP) for this exercise will be based at the Whitianga Coastguard HQ, Dundas Street, and Whitianga.

Phase one of the on-water exercise, the Marine distress flares activations, will be held off shore opposite the Reserve area of Buffalo Beach.

The on-water scenario will be conducted in the coastal waters off Hot Water Beach

3.3 Participating organisations

New Zealand Police, Coastguard Eastern Region, Whitianga Coastguard, Tairua/Pauanui Coastguard, Whangamata Coastguard, Auckland Coastguard Air patrol, Hot Water Beach Surf lifesaving Club, KSAR land Search and Rescue

3.4 Exercise aim

To ascertain how effectively a Multi-Agency IMT working from a centralised ICP can manage the on-water scenario of this exercise in respect to, utilizing gathered information, formulating an effective Action Plan, establishing effective communication with on water resources and coordinating and controlling the SAR response within existing SOP's.

To test how the on-water resources of Multi-agencies can effectively work together to complete the tasking's assigned to them by the IMT. How they communicate with the IMT. How their SOP's mesh and to identify any changes needed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their response.

3.5 Exercise objectives

Objective 1

To test the ability of a multi-agency IMT to effectively set up an ICP, and put into place an Action Plan; to exercise the documentation of the formal planning process within the IMT; to exercise the control and coordination functions of the on-water resources in implementing the IMT's Plan.

Objective 2

To test the ability of On-Water Resources (Coastguard and Surf) to work effectively together to complete the tasking's assigned to them by the IMT.

Objective 3

To test communications between the various participating agencies with emphasis on communication between IMT and On-Water Resources

3.6 Exercise Scenario

On Thursday the 4th of April 2018 the Jones Family and extended Family members are gathering at the Family batch in Pauanui for a final reunion and clean up before the property is placed on the market.

Included on the list of things to do is the job of towing the Grandfathers old 18-foot Sea Nymph Run about PEGASUS over to Whitianga where a friend has offered to store it until it can be sold.

However during the course of the day, a plan is hatched to take the old boat for one final trip up the Coast to Whitianga before she is sold. The plan being that on Friday 6.04.2018 Gavin Jones, his Brother Bert, the brother in law Stuart Little and his 16-year son Mike will take the boat out for a night fish slowly working their way up the Coast towards Whitianga where they will meet up with the ladies for breakfast on Saturday Morning. One of the ladies has volunteered to tow the trailer over the hill to Whitianga.

During the Thursday evening and Friday morning the proposed crew pull the cover off the boat and give it a clean-up. A spare battery is produced, and tote tanks filled with fresh fuel. The motor is test run on several occasions. It starts and appears to run well. The vessels GPS and VHF are not working. There are three old kapok life jackets stored in the boat. There are no flares.

The vessel is provisioned with food and water sufficient for the trip as well as a carton of beer and a bottle of Rum.

The vessel PEGASUS is launched at the Pauanui Boat Ramp 1930 Hrs. on Friday 6.04.2018. There is the crew of four on Board. The crew are not wearing life jackets at the time they departed the Boat Ramp. There is no trip report filed with Coastguard. There are two cell phones on Board.

Gavin's wife, Ruth, made cell phone contact with the crew at approximately 1030pm on Friday 6.04.2018. All was well with the vessel and crew at this stage. Gavin Stated that they were still fishing and were sitting about half way between Boat Harbour and Hot water beach. Arrangements were made for Gavin to make contact about 7am on Saturday the 7th of April 2018. The ladies would have the trailer at the Whitianga Ramp at 8am. Once the boat was out of the water the intention was for the group to have breakfast at one of the local cafes.

At 7.30am on Saturday 7.04.2018 having had no contact from Gavin Ruth attempted to contact Gavin without success. Mikes cell phone was also going to answer phone.

Putting the lack of contact down to bad cell phone coverage the ladies drove over to Whitianga as planned. Numerous attempts to contact the crew of PEGASUS are made without success. At 9am Ruth is convinced that there is something wrong and places a 111 Call to Police.

At 9.30 Coast Guard Radio Receives a call from the vessel Free Spirit advising that they have come across a semi submerged run about off the Coast Just North of Hot Water Beach. There is no one with the vessel. There is an old life jacket in the water near the vessel. Coordinated for the position of the vessel are provided.

4. Evaluation Methodology

4.1 The agreed outcomes of the evaluation activity

This report will only focus on Objective 2 and 3.

Each Evaluation activity was scored from 1 to 10. Detailed examples of performance and actions were documented against the

Objective 2 To test the ability of On-Water Resources (Coastguard and Surf) to work effectively together to complete the taskings assigned to them by the IMT.

On-Scene Command	Was On-Scene Command aware of its role?
	Did On-Scene Command brief the other on-water resources in their duties (i.e. reporting to on-scene command vessel instead of direct to IMT)
	Did all Coastguard Rescue Vessels communicate with On- Scene Command?
	Did all Surf On-Water Resources communicate with On-Scene Command?
	Did On-Water Resources communicate effectively in matters of taskings
	Was communication between vessels (as related to search patterns and taskings) clear?
	Did On-Scene Command use correct radio procedure?
	Did On-Scene Command say only appropriate comments over the radio?
	Were all on-water resources aware of contact for On-Scene Command (alternative to radio)
	Did all on-water resources take photos and send to IMT before touching?
	Did all on-water resources record positions of items of interest, and relay to On-Scene Command?
	Did any On-Water Resources try to self-task?

Objective 3

To test communications between the various participating agencies with emphasis on communication between IMT and On-Water Resources

Information Gathering	What initial notification was received, and by whom?
	Was initial notification given to Regional Comms Centre for dissemination?

	How was initial information received and acted upon? Was this correct SOP?
	Was the correct information received?
	Was information analysis done correctly?
	Was the CNZ Incident Sheet used?
	Was information confirmed by independent means?
Logging of Actions Taken in ICP	Was SARNET used as primary platform of communication between ICP members and others? Secondary? At all?
	How was the passage or flow of information from ICP outward?
Radio Procedure	Were the correct radio procedures used in IMT?
	Were all requested broadcasts recorded on specific tasking sheet
	Was correct radio security observed?
	How good in general were the radio procedures during the exercise?
Communication and Information	Was the IMT clear on which radio channel(s) were to be used?
	Was the IMT clear on which phone number(s) were to be used for any sensitive information?
	How good was communication between individual members of the IMT?
	Was the comms room manned to the correct level?
	Did information flow smoothly between IMT and On-Scene Command?
	Did On-Scene Command accurately report positions of all items of interest to the IMT?
	Did the IMT give clear instructions against On-Water Resources self-tasking?
Documentation	Did IMT advise On-Scene Command to take photos of all
	Items of Interest, and send to IMT, before touching?
	Did this happen?
	Were positions of all Items of Interest recorded? Charted? Marked on TracPlus?
	Was all documentation kept in good order, adequate, and legible?
	Did all IMT members keep a log of actions and decisions?
	Were all taskings written and collated with appropriate sign-offs?
	Is all documentation (including charting) sufficient for a trip to the Coroner's Court?

4.2 Evaluation scope

The evaluation was spread between two operational zones. The in house IMT and the Field at the safe forward point at Hot Water Beach. Objective 1 was unable to be observed the start up for the IMT. I was situated in the field at the start of the Scenario to observe and evaluate the field operations and communication between the IMT and the assets on the water.

Objective 1

To test the ability of a multi-agency IMT to effectively set up an ICP, and put into place an Action Plan; to exercise the documentation of the formal planning process within the IMT; to exercise the control and coordinating functions of the on- water resources in implementing the IMT's Action Plan.

Objective 2

To test the ability of On-Water Resources (Coastguard and Surf) to work effectively together to complete the taskings assigned to them by the IMT

Objective 3

To test communications between the various participating agencies with emphasis on communication between IMT and On-Water Resources

4.3 Aspects of the exercise observed, what was not observed

Objective 1

To test the ability of a multi-agency IMT to effectively set up an ICP, and put into place an Action Plan.

4.4 The process followed in preparing and submitting the report

The SAREX KPI's were set by the SAREX Directors back in October 2017
I requested an invite to evaluate the SAREX on 29th/11/2017 this was accepted by Vince that day.

I was invited to a Planning meeting on 23rd/1/2018. Present were some of the exercise Directors
Sergeant Vince Ranger Waikato Police SAR the Lead Agency New Zealand Police.

Sunny Peeters, Coast Guard Eastern Region, Regional Manager.

We agreed to split the evaluation between the two main activities, the IMT (on land) and the in the field (on water) with separate evaluations being compiled.

Looking at the scenario I recommended that the directors consider how they invite the MSAR teams into the SAREX to ensure all appropriate units were given the chance to be involved in a structured way.

The decision to split the observations between Objective 1 then Objective 2&3 respectively with separate evaluations being compiled was confirmed at a pre exercise meeting the night before.

The report development protocol

Following the hot debrief a draft report would be written and sent to the directors for comment. A final report will be generated following the draft feedback comments.

4.5 Other information

The observations for this report were taken from three sites

- 1 Within the IMT at Whitianga Coast Guard during the Per Operation Briefing, this included observing the set up and reading of the Whitianga CG unit.
- 2 Hot Water Beach Tower then Hot Water Beach Surf Club gear shed.
- 3 Whitianga Coast Guard building and IMT from 11.45am once all on water crews were on the water.

5. Findings

Objective 1

To test the ability of a multi-agency IMT to effectively set up an ICP, and put into place an Action Plan; to exercise the documentation of the formal planning process within the IMT; to exercise the control and coordinating functions of the on- water resources in implementing the IMT's Action Plan.

Over all from my limited perspective (being situated at Hot Water beach for the first part of the SAREX) what I saw in the IMT and heard in the field via VHF Channel 61. The IMT was established in good time.

This was evident from the relatively quick taskings issued 10.24 following the 111 Phone Call at 10am.

The ability of the IMT to communicate the IAP to the field teams was outstanding. The coordination of the on water resources to implement the search plan was very good.

The complete effectiveness of the IMT to execute their IAP was limited by the absence of a Surf Lifesaving presence in the room.

The IAP indicated the deployment of a mixture of both Coast Guard units and Surf lifesaving Assets. Yet there was no representation of Surf lifesaving in the IMT. The absence of Surf in the IMT I believe led to the field teams not fully achieving their objectives. Three key pieces of information was therefore missed.

Firstly: Of the 11 IRBs situated in the search area (from Waihi Beach to Hot water beach) only 3 were deployed. The IRB's are easily tailorable and within the proximity of Pauanui Beach there are 4 IRBs' that could have launched off the shore directly into the search area. For the exercise only One Surf Lifesaving club was included in the planning of the seven situated in the search area.

Secondly :Having a presence in the IMT may have brought further information of the potential asset base allowing for a greater number of on water craft covering more area than actually was and deploying onto the water sooner. The IRBS were deployed at 11.25 1.5 hours after the 11 call was logged. The IRB crews from Tirua and Pauanui would have cleared the coastal search between Pauanui and Hot Water Beach well within the IAP along with the CG vessels.

Thirdly: For Health and Safety reasons. The IRB crews did not appear on any H&S check list. The IMT was blind to how many crew were on each boat and who were they. I would expect a surf lifesaving presence in the IMT should have taken down this information.

During the headland search of Tirua a coast guard Person swam into shore to check out a target. With a 1.5 M Swell running was this the best safest option. If IRB's were in close proximity a trained certified swimmer would have undertaken the task.

The SAREX Planning Documentation included a member of HWB SLSC as part of the planning team, this should have been carried over to the IMT at least as an observer.

More focus on the H&S of the field crews back in the IMT.

The IAP indicated the use of a multi-agency deployment. Yet there was limited documentation of the Surf Lifesaving Crews.

Who was on each craft?

The number of crew on each craft

Did they had a full understanding of the Comms Plan?

The hazard identification was superficial, missing the greatest hazard for a shore search which is swell. The Swell size in the IMT was not updated following a sit rep from Tirua CG 09.59hrs of a 1.5m swell. The swell size continued to grow throughout the exercise. The IAP at 12.00hrs -15.00hrs still showed a swell size of 1m.

Swell has a significant impact upon crews with the littoral zone. The likely hood of striking a submerged object increases as foaming water obscures visibility in the water. The increased rise and fall of the water height due to the swell diminishes draft for hulls and creates swirling currents that need to be navigated. The swell size variance between the Pauanui CG Sit Rep and the IAP was over %30. Towards the end of the SAREX this would have doubled.

Upon the conclusion of the SAREX the Crews were not requested to call up the Whitianga CG once they were safely back at base.

Objective 2

To test the ability of On-Water Resources (Coastguard and Surf Life Saving) to work effectively together to complete the taskings assigned to them by the IMT. The majority of these observations were made at Hot Water Beach. Comms were listened to on Channel 61 Operational

The Comms plan was simple and very effective in most parts. All Crews applied excellent radio procedures. The Communication with the on-scene command was good. There could be improvements with Surf Lifesaving units undertaking initial radio checks to the OSC prior to getting on the water.

The rechecking and implementation of taskings was in the most part good. On one occasion a vessel failed to indicate they were taking a break, this generated some confusion back in IMT as the Track Plus was questioned.

The on-water resources (Coastguard and Surf Life Saving) worked effectively together to undertake their taskings.

There was only one example of Self Tasking, a HWB SLSC Rescue Water Craft reported retuning back to base upon the conclusion of the SAREX. This asset was not on any SAREX planning, H&S Log nor known to Comms or Intel during the exercise.

There was some minor hiccups around Comms. The omission of the passing over of the ship to ship VHF Channel 6 during the Safe Forward briefing on Hot Water beach resulted in the HWB IRB reverting to another talk channel resulting in a loss of situational awareness on the IRB and back at the ITM .

Objective 3

To test communications between the various participating agencies with emphasis on communication between IMT and On-Water Resources

The communication between the IMT and On-water crews was very good.

There was an issue with getting Comms from the IRB crews close to the cliff face when searching in close to shore. This can be attributed to the failure to pass on the ship to ship VHF Channel 6 during the IRB teams brief at HWB. This resulted in the missed opportunity to hold the patience back for interrogation.

6. Conclusions

Objective 1

To test the ability of a multi-agency IMT to effectively set up an ICP, and put into place an Action Plan; to exercise the documentation of the formal planning process within the IMT; to exercise the control and coordinating functions of the on- water resources in implementing the IMT's Action Plan.

Objective 1 in the most part was achieved. The KPI of running a multi-agency IMT worked with Police and Coast guard working together to develop an IAP in a timely manner. The coordination and control function of the IMT was well executed all those who took part in the field were well aware of their taskings.

The full objective was not met by in exclusion of a Surf Lifesaving representative in the IMT. This may have attributed to a failure to document all those who were in the field in the Health and Safety log. This may have attributed to a longer time needed to execute the coastal search by not deploying more IRB's from clubs within the search zone.

I recommend that for future MSAREX that the coordinative authority engage with the Surf Lifesaving regional Office to best identify the appropriate assets to use in both multi-agency training and operations.

Objective 2

To test the ability of On-Water Resources (Coastguard and Surf) to work effectively together to complete the taskings assigned to them by the IMT

The on-water cooperation was very evident. The teams on the water achieved objective 2 .No barriers were evident within the agencies out on the water.

Objective 2 in the IMT would have been fully realised if there was some representation of all the agencies in the IMT.

Not having a Surf Lifesaving representative in the team allowed for no checks or consultation of crew capability, availability and accountability.

The IMT was effectively flying blind and placing huge trust in the Surf lifesaving crews assuming they would be able to carry out the tasks given to them from the IMT.

Objective 3

Objective 3 was met. To test communications between the various participating agencies with emphasis on communication between IMT and On-Water Resources

The Comms plan was simple and workable. By checking off with all on-water crews, the Comms plan upon their first radio checks the Intel team can be sure the Comms plan is activated.

7. Appendix

Objective 1

To test the ability of a multi-agency IMT to effectively set up an ICP, and put into place an Action Plan; to exercise the documentation of the formal planning process within the IMT; to exercise the control and coordinating functions of the on- water resources in implementing the IMT's Action Plan.

KPI Description	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Grade (1 = poor/ 10= excellent)	Comments
IMT Setup	Was the IMT established in a timely manner for a real-time scenario?	8	Some pre- preparation was carried out in the IMT prior to the start of the exercise. This was great as it set the scene and got the heads in the game. Eliminated any tardiness or game-playing I was in the field for the cold start
	Were the IMT roles established according to standard CIMS procedure?	8	Yes this was clearly evident. Bibs were handed out and worn.
	Did IMT members know their roles and responsibilities?	6	For the most part. When critical information came up from Comms there was some blurring of roles, this led to some side tracking.
	Did IMT members stick to their designated roles and responsibilities?	7	Intel and Planning experienced some confusion, on one occasion this was created when Comms sent info straight to planning prior to it being fact checked by Intel.
	Was the room laid out correctly	9	Yes
	For the IMT to work properly?	8	The mood was diligent and the movement of information was open free and not hindered in any way.
Incident Action Plan	Was an appropriate Operational Period chosen?	5	Yes the period allowed for adequate time for the IAP to be carried out if all crews stuck to the plan.
	How did the transition from Initial Tasking to the Incident Action Plan go?	8	Three phases of the operation were drawn up and there was loads of forward planning towards the next IAP phase prior to the existing IAP running out.
	Was the Incident Action Plan effective?	4	No , the IAP required a large amount of coastal searching (in close) with the limited number of SLS units and the Pauanui Cg unit undertook to search the Pauanui Bar , the expected coastal search area was not achieved Solutions, deploy more SLS units, of the 11 available IRBs' in the SAREX search area only 3 were included in the exercise. Recommend that all units tasked stick to their original taskings. Place a SAR trained lifeguard on each GC vessel.

KPI Description	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Grade (1 = poor/ 10= excellent)	Comments
Incident Controller	How did the Incident Controller perform?		
	Did the IC maintain control of the incident?	7	IC's biggest challenge was moderating the enthusiasm of the members of the IMT who strayed off task and became involved in areas other than their own when key information was disseminated. However He was very hands <u>Solution</u> <u>Side bars quietly with those who were not following Comms procedures</u>
	Was Safety Management considered?	4	There were no lists of people in or out from the field operations. Granted CG has lists back at respective bases, however there was no information sort from the Surf Lifesaving Teams. All that was known was how many boats surf was using. No information of how many crew on each boat and a Jet Ski turned up on scene towards the end of the exercise. <u>Solution</u> <u>The H&S board should have names of all crew from all teams on scene. This must be a key role of the H&S officer in the IMT.</u>
	Did the IC hold regular meetings?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	How well were the media managed?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Did the IC ensure that the IAP was developed?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Did the IC conduct a proper handover to incoming IC?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
Logistics	How did the Logistics Manager/team perform?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Did the Logistics Manager conduct a proper handover to incoming Logistics Manager?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
Operations	How did the Operations Team Perform?	5	
	How did Sector Supervisors work together, if any?	4	There was no presence of a Surf Lifesaving Sector leader in the IMT. This should have assisted with the prompt deployment of the assets, the capturing of the crew names in each IRB and provided a clear understanding of the operational capability and limitations of the teams and craft. All other CG units worked well together. <u>solution</u> <u>Appoint an appropriate person to act as the Surf Lifesaving Liaison when tasking any surf lifesaving assets.</u>
	Were the correct resources used in a timely manner, and in correct order?	7	The CG assets appeared to have been tasked in a very timely manner. The Surf Lifesaving assets were not tasked until 11.45, when initial tasking for Gallagher rescue CG was at 10.10. <u>solution</u> <u>Appoint an appropriate person to act as the Surf Lifesaving Liaison when tasking any surf lifesaving assets.</u>
	Were resources tracked?		Yes

KPI Description	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Grade (1 = poor/ 10= excellent)	Comments
	Were taskings achievable in accordance with Search Planning?	8	Yes
	Was an appropriate Coverage Factor achieved?	5	No, this could be related to the CG Pauanui Self Tasking to search Tirua Bar and the delayed tasking of the Surf lifesaving units. <u>Solutions</u> Appoint an appropriate person to act as the Surf Lifesaving Liaison when tasking any surf lifesaving assets. Recommend that all units tasked stick to their original taskings
	How well were tactics developed to support the IAP?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Did the Ops Manager conduct a proper handover with incoming Ops Manager?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
Planning and Intelligence	How did the Planning Team perform?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Did Planning Team review all possible avenues and scenarios?	5	Some of the scenarios suggested did not fit the “most probable “criteria yet they crept into the search plan higher up the priority listing than expected. Thus resulting in time wasted in searching Slipper Island instead of the more likely coastal strip. <u>Solution</u> Spend more time synchronizing the probable scenarios with the search plan.
	Did the Planning Team consider planning into the next Operational Period?	10	Yes planning was well in advance.
	Did the Intelligence Manager properly analyse and distribute the Intelligence?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Was a Scenario Analysis completed		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	How well did the team complete a lost Person Profile/ Behaviour analysis?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Were standard search calculations used to find MPP (datum)?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Were correct tables (e.g. leeway, Sweep Width) used?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	Did Planning / Intelergence conduct a proper handover to incoming Planning/Intelligence?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)

Objective 2

To test the ability of On-Water Resources (Coastguard and Surf Life Saving) to work effectively together to complete the taskings assigned to them by the IMT. The majority of these observations were made at Hot Water Beach. Comms were listened to on Channel 61 Operational

KPI Description	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Grade (1= poor/ 10= excellent)	Comments
On-Scene Command	Was On-Scene Command aware of its role?	7	CJG appointed lead boat
	Did On-Scene Command brief the other on-water resources in their duties (i.e. reporting to on-scene command vessel instead of direct to IMT)	8	The Comms for taskings were clear and confirmation sort and received at all occasions I heard them
	Did all Coastguard Rescue and Surf Vessels communicate with On- Scene Command?	9	Yes there was very good Comms between Command and CH assets.
	Did all Surf On-Water Resources communicate with On-Scene Command?	3	This was not evident with all the Surf assets. This was due to the Comms plan not being fully implemented by the HWB crew to begin with. Solution OSC should routinely undertake a radio check with all on water assets prior to leaving land.
	Did On-Water Resources communicate effectively in matters of taskings	7	The checking of taskings was very well done, all units radioed in upon completion of taskings and stood by for extra taskings. Some Comms were lost when IRBs' got close to shore due to high headland shadowing. Solution Apply the ship to ship channel to a relay station to outer lying CG vessel
	Was communication between vessels (as related to search patterns and taskings) clear?	10	yes
	Did On-Scene Command use correct radio procedure?	10	An excellent example of Comms.
	Did On-Scene Command say only appropriate comments over the radio?	10	An excellent example of Comms.
	Were all on-water resources aware of contact for On-Scene Command (alternative to radio)	7	The cell phone number and channel 6 was not shared with all the IRB crews. Solution Check all Comms plan is in place with all assets upon first radio check.
	Did all on-water resources take photos and send to IMT before touching?	NA	
	Did all on-water resources record positions of items of interest, and relay to On-Scene Command?	10	Coordinates were send through on all targets found.

	Did any On-Water Resources try to self-task?	7	HWB Lifeguards entered a Jet Ski into the search group towards the end of the exercise.
--	--	---	---

Objective 3

To test communications between the various participating agencies with emphasis on communication between IMT and On-Water Resources

KPI Description	Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Grade (1= poor/ 10= excellent)	Comments
Information Gathering	What initial notification was received, and by whom?	7	Yes , By the Lead IRB HWB .
	Was initial notification given to Regional Comms Centre for dissemination?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
	How was initial information received and acted upon? Was this correct SOP?	4	By phone to the SFP at HWB Gear shed , no notes were taken or TXT requested for accurate documentation storage
	Was the correct information received?	4	Yes and forwarded verbally to the crews on the beach, this was given next to a skill saw being used for ¼ of the briefing. Solutions Plan a designated place for all SFP briefings that allow for free flow of information and questions from all crews
	Was information analysis done correctly?		
	Was the CNZ Incident Sheet used?	10	The information was all on SAR Net
	Was information confirmed by independent means?		NA (I was unable to comment on this due to being in the field and not in the IMT at the time)
Logging of Actions Taken in ICP	Was SARNET used as primary platform of communication between ICP members and others? Secondary? At all?	10	This was used very well , taskings and Comms were recorded and often looked over for verification.
	How was the passage or flow of information from ICP outward?	7	On occasions the flow from the field was not sent directly to the Intel Team for verification. This created some confusion in the IMT. As the day wore on the correct flow increased. Solutions Focus upon information channels more so at the start of an incident to ensure channels are well established sooner than later.
Radio Procedure	Were the correct radio procedures used in IMT?	10	An excellent example of Comms.
	Were all requested broadcasts recorded on specific tasking sheet	10	Yes on SAR Net

	Was correct radio security observed?	10	An excellent example of Comms.
	How good in general were the radio procedures during the exercise?	10	An excellent example of Comms from all in the IMT and out in the field.
Communication and Information	Was the IMT clear on which radio channel(s) were to be used?	8	There was a Comms plan developed. I didn't hear it checked off over the radio. This was not fully passed onto the Surf Units. Solution Check all Comms plan is in place with all assets upon first radio check.
	Was the IMT clear on which phone number(s) were to be used for any sensitive information?	4	This was not clear in the Comms plan, it was not passed onto the Surf Units. Solution Check all Comms plan is in place with all assets upon first radio check.
	How good was communication between individual members of the IMT?	8	Really good , relaxed , respectful and inclusive.
	Was the Comms room manned to the correct level?	8	The operators became overwhelmed once information was flooding in as targets were discovered. Solution To bring in an extra floating Comms member who can be activated at peak periods but sent out when things are quiet to keep unnecessary chatter down.
	Did information flow smoothly between IMT and On-Scene Command?	10	Yes,
	Did On-Scene Command accurately report positions of all items of interest to the IMT?	10	At all times GPS coordinates were sent, double checked and logged.
	Did the IMT give clear instructions against On-Water Resources self-tasking?	10	They were not aware of the self-tasking HWB SLSC RWC until it radioed in at the conclusion of the SAREX
Documentation	Did IMT advise On-Scene Command to take photos of all Items of Interest, and send to IMT, before touching?	3	I didn't hear any such instructions nor are they evident in the Comms log. However failure to get a request to hold the patients for a full interrogation was missed due to the IRB not operating on the Ship to Shore Channel 6 Solution Check all Comms plan is in place with all assets upon first radio check.
	Were positions of all Items of Interest recorded? Charted? Marked on TracPlus?	10	At all times
	Was all documentation kept in good order, adequate, and legible?	10	At all times
	Did all IMT members keep a log of actions and decisions?	10	Yes
	Were all taskings written and collated with appropriate sign- offs?	?	All the taskings were recorded in SAR Net, I can see where a sign off is stored Solution I need Training on SAR Net.

	Is all documentation (including charting) sufficient for a trip to the Coroner's Court?	8	In my opinion yes. .
--	---	---	-------------------------

