

# INCIDENT WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT GROUP (IWDG)

<https://www.nwccg.gov/partners/iwdg>

## Fall 2022 Complex Incident Management (CIM) After Action Review (AAR)

**Date:** 17 October 2022, 1300 – 1430 MST

**PRESENT:** See list on page 4.

---

### NOTES

#### Training and Qualifications

##### CIM Field Evaluation

- Given the interim standard, IPSC feels the Field Evaluation met the intent, using the same evaluation criteria as S-520, Advanced Incident Management and Complex Incident Management Course (CIMC) to evaluate Type 2 qualified Command and General Staff (C&G) for Complex Incident Management (CIM) qualification.
  - Acknowledge that implementation was rapid in 2022, but successful overall.
- Leaving the evaluation open to variability created inconsistencies and variations in practice across GACCs.
- Ultimately the home unit makes the final decision on certifications.
- NWCCG Executive Board memo on transition for 2023 should articulate intent of evaluations, highlight expectations, and provide best practices for field evaluations.
  - Suggestions include identifying a Geographic Area group of people to conduct evaluations, evaluating personnel in command of incident (as opposed to ordering personnel to work with another team in command), providing estimated length of evaluation period, and ensuring availability of leaders to answer questions.
  - Evaluation should still be conducted on fires of either Type 2 or 1 complexity.
- Establish sideboards to create balance between clear guidance from decision-makers while allowing creative authority for field.
- Difficult to apply checks and balances without standards.
- IPSC will discuss a separate identifier in qualification systems for those qualified as CIM by field evaluation.
- Need short-, mid-, and long-term plans for continued transition, recognizing affects Systems Improvement will have on the positions and training courses.
- For 2023, CIM Position Task Books and CIM Field Evaluation should be aligned.
- Emphasis on mentors as part of transition, recognizing not all evaluators are equal and not all teams perform at the same level.
- Will always have human inconsistency in system.
- Ensure broader participation in 2023 to continue learning and growing.

##### Position and Qualifications Standards

- IPSC has not yet addressed appropriate pathways to Type 3 C&G and CIM C&G. Meeting in Boise at end of month and will discuss prior to providing recommendations to NWCCG Executive Board.
  - Need to evaluate the necessary competencies and skills and ensure those are developed.
    - Recognition that our current system may also have shortcomings in doing so.

- Short- and long-term options:
  - Reevaluate S-520/CIMC and S-420, Command and General Staff and adjust as necessary for Type 3 and CIM C&G.
    - Look to the future of fire management so the courses remain relevant.
    - Complexity of fires has greatly evolved over the past 15 years.
  - Systems Improvement will reduce training redundancies and alleviate the bottlenecks to receive high demand courses while providing more holistic approach to learning.
  - Focus on less experienced (Type 3) personnel who are in the most dynamic situations.
    - Type 3 C&G have the biggest need for improved training and support and need appropriate pathway upward to fill CIMTs in the future.
    - Leverage Type 3 workforce in local and state government.
    - Establishing a Type 3 IMT standard is important.
  - For local and state government, Type 1 and Type 2 qualifications will be maintained to ensure compliance with FEMA and allow for grant funding.
- Outcome should be development of a skilled workforce that can adapt to changing environment and system.

### ***NWCG Wildland Fire Risk and Complexity Assessment (RCA), PMS 236***

- Pros and cons to keeping Type 2 and Type 1 incident complexity vs having one level (Complex Incidents).
  - Need to redefine Type 2 and Type 1 due to extreme changes. Current RCA seems biased towards ordering teams.
  - Keeping the current complexity may make it difficult to switch to a CIM system.
  - However, incident typing structure does not have to be synonymous with team typing.
- Pros and cons of assessing complexity and organizational needs by functional areas.
  - Assessing complexity by functional areas would allow for more flexibility and would assist with right sizing the team based on each function's needs, not one overall rating.
  - Freelancing could increase capacity overall, and create better use of hard-to-find position qualifications.
- IPSC to discuss revision timeframes for WFDSS to ensure the programming changes are not an inhibitor.
- Changing incident complexity does not address the staffing issue. Nor does CIM resolve all staffing issues. It does make all teams available for more assignments and adaptable to the necessary changes.
  - Teams need to be flexible and accepting of all qualified personnel.
- Incident Commanders Advisory Council (ICAC) recommended incident visits by CIM experts.
- Agency Administrator (AA) expectations and feedback are necessary in revision of RCA.
  - FMB is standing up an AA subgroup with IWDG that can assist.
  - Some AA are reportedly worried about a liability risk with a CIMT. Establishing the standard will help.
  - Complexity changes from day to day over the lifetime of an incident; ultimately conversations between ICs and AAs set complexity rating.

### **Team Configuration**

- Rocky Mountain Geographic Area Pilot: Most teams unwilling to go without full roster but were okay with demobing those who were superfluous to the needs of the incident once on scene.
  - Once all teams are operating in the same manner, it will be easier.
  - Challenges to being the only GACC fully participating in the pilot in 2022.
- Alaska works with a rotational pool that works well and may be an option for other GACCs to try.

- AAs set the expectations of the complement a team brings.
  - Expectation from AAs to continue to perform all the historical duties plus new duties developed over the last few years.
  - Some AAs still have concerns with the cost associated with ordering an IMT.
- ICAC is currently working on a tasking from NMAC to develop a national CIMT configuration standard, with a due date of November 15.
- Need the ability to be flexible in the near term, plan for the long term, and uncouple from previous expectations.

## **Mobilization**

- Limited data to analyze given slower fire year overall.
- Struggles with AAs limited knowledge of CIMTs and, in some cases, reliance on their own Geographic Area IMTs over one from another GACC.
- Existing Rocky Mountain Type 1 Team expressed concerns that they were underutilized on fires of low complexity.
- In year 2022 CIM teams took more assignments that had they had previously being Type 2 or 1.
- As of October 4, there are over 600 CIM responders in IROC.
  - Many units are waiting until after fire season to update responder certifications.
  - Will look at the data again regularly and possibly analyze the data to see how responders attained the certification (Type 1 qualified, through field evaluation, etc.).
- NMAC is reviewing recommendations from Coordinating Group Advisory Council (CGAC) for a national CIMT rotation for 2024 and evaluating what components could be implemented in 2023.
  - Need to take strategic steps now and work with GACCs that are less supportive.
  - Recommendations include clear availability periods in national rotation, time unavailable after assignments, and steps to achieve equitability of assignments across all CIMTs.

## **Communication**

- IWDG StoryMap working well as single source of information.
  - Still a lot of people who don't know where to find the information. Continue to share through existing groups and identify any who may not have received information directly yet.
- Lots of misinformation is being shared. Shared ownership of the message is important through this change.
- Need to be consistent with communication as leaders:
  - Highlight the pros and explain that CIM implementation will be an evolving learning process.
  - Fire managers need to break the current cycle and provide shared ownership of CIM.
  - Be responsive to missteps.
  - ICs communication to AAs will be critical to move CIM forward.
  - Messaging/correspondence should be reviewed by all governing bodies to maintain consistency between the three.
- Focus on outcomes and adjustments that can be made to improve the experience and efficiency of our IMT members and supporting personnel.

## **ACTIONS**

- Commit to consistent leadership and communication.
- Define/explain what a CIMT is.
- NWCG Executive Board: review IPSC tasking and provide updated direction as determined following October meeting.
- NWCG Executive Board: 2023 transition memo including best management practices for conducting CIM Field Evaluations.
- NMAC: define who teams work for.

CEPC/PIOSC	Chris	Barth
CGAC	Vince	Carver
Facilitator	Gina	Knudson
FMB	Sarah	Fisher
FMB	Julian	Affuso
FMB	Chris	Wilcox
FMB	Meagan	Conry
FMB	Aaron	Baldwin
FMB	Chad	Fisher
FMB	Jay	Mickey
IBC	Dave	Burley
ICAC	Zeph	Cunningham
IPSC	Mike	Ellsworth
IPSC	Greg	Smith
IPSC	Jeff	Soule
IPSC	Craig	Daughterty
IPSC	Jim	Shultz
IPSC	Sarah	Saarloos
IPSC	Marlene	Eno-Hendren
IPSC/IOSC	Reese	Kerbow
IPSC/IPS	Dylan	Rader
IWDG	Jesse	Bender
IWDG	Mike	Haydon
IWDG	Heath	Cota
IWDG	Rich	Harvey
IWDG	Shane	Greer
IWDG	Chuck	Russell
IWDG	Norm	McDonald
IWDG	Jim	Prevette
NMAC	Dave	Haston
NMAC	Ken	Schmid
NMAC	Josh	Simmons
NMAC	Shawn	Nagle
NMAC	Kim	Christensen
Notes	Darci	Drinkwater
NWCG	Jeff	Arnberger
NWCG	Frank	Guzman
NWCG	Shane	McDonald
NWCG	Jim	Karels
NWCG	Erik	Litzenberg
NWCG	Aitor	Bidaburu
NWCG	Garth	Fisher
NWCG	Jim	Durglo
NWCG	Mark	Koontz
NWCG	Kim	VanHemelryck
NWCG Staff	Katie	Wood
NWCG Staff	Sarah	Lee
NWCG Staff	Tim	Blake
NWCG Staff	Katy	O'Hara
RMC	Eric	Fransted
NICC	Derrek	Hartman