



Co-Financed by the
European Union

Union Civil Protection Mechanism – Prevention and preparedness project in civil protection and marine pollution

Common Standard Operational Procedures for the Union Civil Protection Mechanism Modules and Teams (UCPM SOPs)

Work Package 1: Report on Assessment Workshop

Date of submission: 09 July 2018

Submitted to: The European Commission

Written by: German Federal Agency for Technical Relief (THW)

Submitted by: Crisis Management Centre Finland (CMC)

Content

1.	Preface	3
2.	Workshop Preparation	4
3.	Assessment Results	4
4.	Key findings	7
5.	Tasks	11
6.	Next steps	12
7.	Annexes	12

1. Preface

The European Union, represented by the European Commission awarded the project „Common Standard Operational Procedures for the Union Civil Protection Mechanism Modules and Teams (UCPM SOPs)”, to a consortium composed of the Crisis Management Centre Finland (CMC), the German Federal Agency for Technical Relief (THW) and the Humanitarian Association of Volunteer Firefighters of Peniche (BVP).

The project is composed of the following Work Packages:

Work Package 0	Management and Coordination of the Action
Work Package 1	Assessment Workshop
Work Package 2	Expert Workshop
Work Package 3	SOP Development
Work Package 4	Pilot SOP Training

The main component of the Work Package 1 **“Assessment Workshop”** took place from 11 to 13 June 2018 in Oberwinter, Germany, with 15 participants and 7 representatives from the consortium (see Annex 1). The approach of the activities were aligned with the objective highlighted in the respective work package: *“Review of the current state of the SOPs, what guidelines exist for SOPs, assessment of what guidelines are needed, and what is required of modules and teams on EU-level.”*

2. Workshop Preparation

As part of the workshop preparation and assessment phase, the consortium has disseminated a questionnaire amongst participants, the respective organization of respective modules / teams and the pool of certifiers. The aim was to reach a representative group of experts, who have different perspectives on Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) as well as experiences in developing, applying and evaluating the predefined SOP. Thus, two different questionnaires have been developed for internal experts (e.g. module representatives; see Annex 3) and external experts / certifiers (see Annex 4).

The questionnaire as well as the assessment workshop focused on key questions of the SOP (e.g. purpose, target group, added value, strengths and weaknesses). The consortium aimed at gaining a broad picture of approaches, experiences and opinions amongst experts and organizations as a pre-requirement for the next phases of the project, which will aim at elaborating a detailed guideline for SOP.

The Workshop Preparation and draft of the agenda (see Annex 2) did take into account the ongoing assessment phase and results from the questionnaires. The workshop approach aimed at picking up the fundamental questions about SOP to achieve a mutual understanding amongst the audience as well as continue from an agreed standpoint. This particular refers to the definition of SOP, its purpose, aims & objectives and target group of SOP, which determine the key characteristics of a SOP Guidance Document and subsequently the development and added value of modules' / teams' SOP.

All administrative and logistical arrangement were finalized in due time to conduct the workshop without any friction. Apart from two short term cancellation, the workshop started as foreseen on 11 June 2018 in Oberwinter with all partners and all remaining participants on board.

3. Assessment Results

The following questions have been issued to key stakeholders in the UCPM and key experts in the field and their response have been summarized (see Annex X) and analyzed for further usage

No	Questions for participants, sending organization etc.	Questions for certifiers
1	What are the aim and objectives of your SOPs?	What are the aim and objectives of SOPs?
2	Who is the main target group of your SOPs?	Who is the main target group of SOPs?

3	How do you make use of the SOPs?	How are the SOPs used by modules / teams?
4	How do you rate the added value of written SOPs (in English)?	What is the added value of written SOPs (in English)? What are the weaknesses?
5	Does the SOP Guidance Document provide sufficient information to develop SOPs for registered modules / teams? What is lacking or deficient?	Does the SOP Guidance Document provide sufficient information to develop SOPs for registered modules / teams? What is lacking or deficient?
6	What are your recommendation(s) for a new SOP Guidance Document?	What are your recommendation(s) for a new SOP Guidance Document?

The following key remarks were issued in both, the written responses from the key experts and the verbal feedback from the workshop participants:

Aims & Objectives

- Give guidance to involved stakeholders for every mission phase
- Ensure swift and efficient operations of the module in the field; clear and simple guide
- Improve efficiency and increase quality
- Minimize misunderstandings inside the team and reduce the possibility of failure
- Instruction to carry out complex routine operations to achieve efficiency, quality output and uniformity of performance

Target Group

- DG ECHO, ERCC
- National HQ staff and training staff
- EUCPT
- Module Management and Module Staff / Members
- LEMA, Beneficiaries, other modules

Usage

- Check lists for their actions in the field
- Guiding document for team management; common guidance within the module
- Use of draft templates and procedures to simplify work of management
- Set a framework for the deployment in an international mission
- Assistance in briefing / familiarizing new members of the module

- To cross check and ensure the fulfillment of all requirements
- Used during all phases of the emergency management cycle; used during preparedness and response phases

Added value

- Useful tool to harmonize procedures
- Written SOP in English might support the communication with other actors in the field to achieve the objective of the mission
- If the SOP is well made (simple, instructive, practical) the added value can be significant; it is essential to have a written SOP which people can refer to
- To have a common framework and structure
- Support for the modules / team to perform more unified, allowing the team members to align the response with the biggest possible efficiency
- Possibility to exchange good practices and lessons learned among modules
- Standardization of the response, clarify tasks required from modules
- The added value is that everyone knows what is expected from the team and the team members; SOP gives guidance.
- International partner know how module / team works
- Positive effect on interoperability and coordination of modules / teams

Weaknesses

- Main problem is that the organization did often copy-paste the SOP without putting sufficient effort in developing specific SOP
- It is sometimes a problem that too much operational procedures are fixed into a written SOP. This can lead to a loss of flexibility and that the teams don't improvise anymore
- Risk of adding too much details to the module management
- Mother tongue would be more suitable, as the translation in English seems only useful for the certification process
- In real operation, this document will never be read by external persons; the fact sheet is enough and the translation of the SOP is therefore time consuming.
- Administrative burden for staff
- Not all team members speak English and can understand the SOP

Feedback on SOP Guidance Document

- SOP Guidance Document provides a good platform of information for someone who wants to develop SOP for registered modules
- All necessary topics are covered
- Add: communication and media, transmissions

- Add a template (skeleton) of a plan of action
- A bit outdated lacking practical and operational design. Topics should be more precise and focus more on different phases and situations
- Not really suitable for multinational teams' needs

Recommendations for a new SOP Guidance Document

- A template with more solid outline and limit writer's improvisations
- I recommend to split the SOP in two documents: 1) Description of the modules (administrative, financial and organizational issues) and 2) Operational SOP for the team (short and operational centered)
- Redefinition of "Code of Conduct", which are usually much shorter.
- Simplification / reorganization of diagram in part 10.5, which often look very different
- A skeleton document with all the common elements between all modules regarding SOP for the deployment process could be more effective
- SOP Guidance Document should contain all annexes for countries to use as a further guideline
- More precise, detailed and practical approach (SOP should above all be written for operational, not administrative personnel)
- Add more data about interoperability with others

4. Key findings

The workshop discussions and general discourse about the role and relevance of SOP has been welcomed by all participants and highlighted in their feedback as well. It has demonstrated the major shortcoming of SOP that the current structure and focus of the SOP Guideline Documents and subsequently the SOP themselves do not put the focus on operations. To a certain extent, the added value depend on the single SOP of the respective sending organization, but also relates to the SOP Guidance Document as working basis for the development of the document.

Purpose

The following points have been made regarding the purpose of SOP, which marks the baseline for the ongoing development of the Sop Guidance Document and directly refers to the target group of the SOP.

- Improve efficiency of modules' / teams' performances in the field
- Improve transparency and mutual understanding amongst key staff (HQ staff and Team Management) of an essential standardized procedures

- Facilitating interoperability between modules / teams
- Enhanced preparedness of modules / teams for international missions
- Key Document for compiling all relevant documentation, standards, procedures for mission preparedness and operations / response

Target Group

It has been a consensus amongst all participants of the workshop that the main target group of a SOP should be the team management (Team Leader, Deputy Team Leader, Liaison Officer) of a module. In contrast, the module / team staff are not the primary focus group, as their subject matter expertise and associated SOP for technical experts could not be covered in an appropriate manner. It also highlighted by the language barrier of UCPM SOP, which are written in English and therefore not necessarily accessible to all experts of a module / team.

The second addressee / target group of SOP are the respective sending organization. The participants have highlighted that the SOP should be divided into two sections, which refer to the respective addressees. The part on preparedness describes all standards and procedures in place, which are fundamental for a deployable module / team. These are mainly administered and organized within such organization and describe internal procedures and standards.

A critical remark has been issued denominating the COM as a target group of the SOP. Albeit the SOP is crucial for the certification of modules / teams for the Voluntary Pool, it seems insufficient to solely link the document to the institution itself. The added value and purpose of the SOP is partly undermined, if sending organizations only aim at fulfilling a prerequisite of the COM and are less concerned with the content of the SOP. The tendency is well reflected in the questionnaires and the consortium aims at proposing a template and approach, which marks an incentive for sending organization to reflect on their SOP.

Apart from the abovementioned, the group has discussed the usage of SOP in interaction with other modules, LEMA, local partners and organization. The SOP could be a tool to improve the communication and cooperation amongst these actors and therefore a clear objective for the consortium. However, it seems only consequential that a useful SOP as an recognized instrument for the Module Management will automatically have a positive impact on its interaction with others as well.

Format

A major question has been raised at the beginning regarding the scope of the SOP. The group has distinguished between the two following focus areas:

- Focus on the whole mission cycle (Preparedness, Mobilization, Deployment, Operations, Demobilization, Post-mission)
- Focus on the activities in the affected country (Deployment, Operations, Demobilization, Post-mission)

Initially, the workshop has demonstrated the dilemma of the SOP to suit several target groups and experts, whereas limiting / minimizing the added value for the experts in the field. The consortium will aim at proposing a format, which integrates both areas and clearly distinguishes between the “preparedness” of a module / team (Part A) and “operations / response” in the field (Part B).

Another, major remark from the audience referred to the overall objective of promoting a simplistic approach for everyone involved.

- Make usage of given guidelines and SOP approaches in place (link to INSARAG guidelines)
- Keep it as simple and short as possible, avoid long texts and make it as “operational” as possible
- Take into account the given SOP Guidance Document and aim at proposing a new guideline, which can be easily adapted by organization and builds on the chapters of the previous Guidance Document

The remark has been supported throughout the group and is well understood. It not only aims to enhance the tangibility of the final product, but also aims at promoting a SOP guideline document, which is easy accessible and applicable for the own SOP.

With regard to the overall format and design of chapters, the group has further agreed that all supportive documents, templates and detailed information should be annexed. It seems reasonable in order to achieve a short and concise document, which merges all relevant information for the team management and further guides the end-user directly to the relevant documentation, templates etc.

Coordination

The coordination structure within the current SOP Guidance Document is well outdated and it has been reworked within the workshop. Although it is not finalized, the participants have drafted the following sketch and given the following comments:

5. Tasks

The workshop has provided the foundation for the subsequent activities. The participants have issued that they would very much appreciate to remain integrated in the project and review the products, which will be drafted for the Expert Workshop.

The following key areas were defined in the workshop, which shall be reworked and reviewed within the group in beforehand of the next workshop. It is important to note that all these products remain proposals and are meant to steer the Expert Workshop.

Task 1: SOP Format

Proposal of a structure, which will distinguish between Part A: Preparedness and Part B: Operations / Response. The task shall further distinguish between generic, obligatory and optional chapters.

Task 2: SOP Content

Review of the description of different chapters.

Task 3: Coordination Structure

Update and re-design of a coordination structure, which depicts the main stakeholders for EU modules in the field.

Task 4: Templates / Checklists

Review and proposal of templates / checklists, which are commonly used. Proposal of standardized templates / checklists for registered modules / teams.

Task 5: Glossary

Identification of key terms, which are commonly used amongst stakeholders within the UCPM and summary in a glossary.

6. Next steps

The consortium has held a short meeting after the workshop and discussed the next steps. It has been agreed upon that the consortium needs to put some effort in the development of proposed chapters for the upcoming workshop. This shall facilitate an improved exchange between the participants and gain the results necessary to derive a SOP template.

The Save-the-Date for the next workshop from 28 to 30 November 2018 in Peniche has been sent out to all Participating States and the invitation will follow approx. 10 weeks ahead of the workshop. In between, the consortium aims at completing the tasks as mentioned above and commonly prepare the content for the workshop.

7. Annexes

Annex 1	Participants' List
Annex 2	Agenda
Annex 3	Questionnaire – Sending organization
Annex 4	Questionnaire – Certifiers

MASC II first Workshop - DE

25 - 27 September 2017

signature list

No.	First Name	Last Name	Country	11.06.	12.06.	13.06.	Final Dinner	Signature
				22	22	22	22	
1	Grzegorz	Borowiec	PL	1	1	1	1	
2	Valentina	Atanasovska	MK	1	1	1	1	
3	Iva	Brejzova	CZ	1	1	1	1	
4	Ivo	Mezulis	LT	1	1	1	1	
5	Frederic	Delcroix	FR	1	1	1	1	
6	Bernard	Rajau	FR	1	1	1	1	
7	Gilles	Hubert	LU	1	1	1	1	
8	Gordon	MacMillan	UK	1	1	1	1	
9	Erkan	Doganay	TR	1	1	1	1	
10	Vladimir	Damyanov	BG	1	1	1	1	
11	Tamas	Endrödi	HU	1	1	1	1	
12	Eduardo	Gonzales Macho	ES	1	1	1	1	
13	Daniel	Gheorghita	RO	1	1	1	1	
14	NL	0,00	NL	1	1	1	1	
15	NL	0,00	NL	1	1	1	1	
16	PT	0,00	PT	1	1	1	1	
17	PT	0,00	PT	1	1	1	1	
18	Tero	Lähdesmäki	FI	1	1	1	1	
19	Esa	Ahlberg	FI	1	1	1	1	
20	Jose	Ferreira	PT	1	1	1	1	
21								
22	Henri	Schwaiger	DE	1	1	1	1	
23	Jonas	Jost	DE	1	1	1	1	



Co-financed by the
European Union

Common Standard Operational Procedures for the Union Civil Protection Mechanism Modules and Teams (UCPM SOPs)

- Assessment Workshop -

11 – 13 June 2018

Oberwinter, Germany

Day 1: 11 June 2018

Time	Topic
13:00 – 15:00	Arrival & Joint lunch
15:00 – 15:45	Official Welcome, Tour de Table
15:45 – 16:15	Project presentation, Aims & Objectives
16:15 – 18:00	Group Work “SOP Fundamentals”
19:00	Dinner



Co-financed by the
European Union

Day 2: 12 June 2018

Time	Topic
09:00 – 09:15	Outline of the day
09:00 – 10:30	Presentation “INSARAG Guidelines and SOPs”
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee Break
11:00 – 12:30	Group Work “Guideline on SOP”
12:30 – 13:00	Presentation “CMC TAST SOP”
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 16:00	Group Work “Structure & Content”
16:00 – 16:30	Coffee Break
16:30 – 18:00	Group Work “Staff & Equipment”, “Preparedness”, “Coordination / Communication”
19:00	Dinner

Day 3: 13 June 2018

Time	Topic
09:00 – 09:30	Completion of Tasks
09:30 – 11:00	Group Work “Templates & Checklists”
11:00 – 11:30	Group Discussion, summary and next steps
11:30 – 12:30	Lunch
13:00	Departure



Co-financed by the
European Union

Participants

Grzegorz	Borowiec	PL
Valentina	Atanasovska	MK
Iva	Brejzova	CZ
Ivo	Mezulis	LT
Frederic	Delcroix	FR
Bernard	Rajau	FR
Gilles	Hubert	LU
Gordon	MacMillan	UK
Erkan	Doganay	TR
Vladimir	Damyanov	BG
Tamas	Endrődi	HU
Pascual	Perez	ES
Daniel	Gheorghita	RO
Pauline	Kauffmann	NL
Efthymios	Christodoulou	GR



Co-financed by the
European Union

André	Fernandes	PT
Tero	Lähdesmäki	FI
Esa	Ahlberg	FI
Jose	Rodriguez	PT
Jose	Augusto Rosa	PT
José	Ferreira	PT
Henri	Schwaiger	DE
Jonas	Jost	DE
Florian	Weber	DE
Peter	Goxharaj	DE



Co-financed by the
European Union

Union Civil Protection Mechanism – Prevention and preparedness project in civil protection and marine pollution

Common Standard Operational Procedures for the Union Civil Protection Mechanism Modules and Teams (UCPM SOPs)

– Questionnaire –

1) What are the aim and objectives of your SOPs?

Comments:

2) Who is the main target group of your SOPs?

Comments:

3) How do you make use of the SOPs?

Comments:

4) How do you rate the added value of written SOPs (in English)?

Comments:

5) Does the SOP Guidance Document provide sufficient information to develop SOPs for registered modules / teams? What is lacking or deficient?

Comments:

6) What are your recommendation(s) for a new SOP Guidance Document?

Comments:

7) How do you view the added value of a standardized template and approach to develop SOPs for modules?

Comments:

Thank you for taking your time to complete this sheet!



Co-financed by the
European Union

Union Civil Protection Mechanism – Prevention and preparedness project in civil protection and marine pollution

Common Standard Operational Procedures for the Union Civil Protection Mechanism Modules and Teams (UCPM SOPs)

– Questionnaire –

1) What are the aim and objectives of SOPs?

Comments:

2) Who is the main target group of SOPs?

Comments:

3) How are the SOPs used by modules / teams?

Comments:

4) What is the added value of written SOPs (in English)? What are the weaknesses?

Comments:

**5) Does the SOP Guidance Document provide sufficient information to develop SOPs for
registered modules / teams? What is lacking or deficient?**

Comments:

6) What are your recommendation(s) for a new SOP Guidance Document?

Comments:

7) How do you view the added value of a standardized template and approach to develop SOPs for modules / teams?

Comments:

Thank you for taking your time to complete this sheet!