



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

Date: 17 – 19 October 2023

IWDG and AA Subgroup Members: Jesse Bender, Chair | Mike Haydon, CGAC, Vice Chair | Chuck Russell, CGAC | Dave Celino, IPSC | Jim Prevette, NASF | Michael Minton, ICAC | Zeph Cunningham, ICAC | Colleen Gadd, AHIMTA | Cole Belongie, DMC | Melissa Wegner, GATR | Sean Peterson, NICC | Shane Greer, ICSC | Aaron Thompson, BLM | Steve Griffin, NIMSIC | Carol McElroy, FEMA | Carl Schwoppe, SWCG | Chad Stewart, Chair, USFS | Lynn Polacca, BIA | Tanya Thrift, BLM | Clay Jordan, NPS | Hank Rowland, FEMA | Nicki Johnston, Admin

Not Present: Norm McDonald, NASF | Rich Harvey, IAFC | Joe Sean Kennedy, USFS | Sam Leneave, NASF | Kim Pierson, USFS |

Tuesday, October 17

Opening, Overview, and Shared Expectations

- Open discussions on how CIM implementation is progressing.
 - As questions came up this summer, answers were added to the FAQs.
 - Consider IWDG's future engagements, goals, and any necessary membership changes.
 - Minimal quality feedback overall. Comments on national rotation and the 7 days of unavailability which will be shared through CGAC.
 - NMAC meeting for a refresher on the CGAC recommendations for the national rotation and to discuss the 2024 national rotation.
- Outcome of All AAR Topics: Notes for FMB, NMAC, and NWCG (available at <https://www.nwccg.gov/sites/default/files/docs/eb-iwdg-2023-cim-aar.pdf>)

Update: IPSC

- IPSC fall meeting/AAR the week of October 23.
- *IRPG* is out for review with comments due by the end of October 2023 for January 2025 release.
- Course revision updates provided in detail.
- S-520 is preparing for November and December courses, with eight teams per course.
- Drafting a position paper on X-520 for recording CIM Field Evaluation in IQS/IQCS.
- IMT Course Steering Committee kickoff was October 4; meeting in Boise the week of October 23.
 - Recommend assigning an IWDG member to the IMT Steering Committee.
- Revisit how IWDG makes recommendations to IPSC and other groups to change the system.

Update: AA Subgroup

- Standardize expectations of IMTs and emphasize consistent use of CIMT evaluation form.
 - Not all agencies have been a part of IMT evaluation revision. AA Subgroup can provide input and assist with finalizing for use by all agencies and GAs.
- Recommending coordinating groups provide GA in-briefings for out of area CIMTs.
- Get away from view that the whole team is needed every time and instead have conversations with the AA to evaluate the incident complexities before deciding what is needed.

- AAs have a variety of experience and would benefit from having another experienced person to assist with negotiation discussions, especially when the IMT is asked to downsize.
- Baseline standards for AA training or curriculum would be helpful so they are all aware of the processes and expectations. All agencies may assign AAs based on incident complexity.
- The AA group hasn't discussed prioritization of prescribed fire vs suppression, but are willing to, especially as there can be overlap of resources and agency approaches are changing.
- Fire is extremely dynamic with a broad range so if an IMT shows up with too many people, that's not what's going to break the system. We shouldn't make things so rigid that it's a fight before the team even gets to the fire.
- Do ICs have a say in accepting an assignment without penalization? Some teams may not feel fully prepared for an assignment they receive.
 - System needs to be tolerant of these circumstances, especially in the first year of CIM.
- ICAC is encouraging reaching out for assistance when needed; when taking an assignment, negotiate with the AA to bring mentors and/or additional trainees to build experience.

Update: AD Hiring Discussions

- Discussing challenges in AD hiring with representatives from the Incident Business Committee (IBC). Hiring itself is done at the local level; some host units are ceasing AD hiring.
 - How can we support AD hiring on a national and more consistent scale without creating a more burdensome system? Would a reservist-style program better facilitate AD hiring?
- Inquired into FEMA reservist program, which signs up personnel to support incident response and have primary jobs, allowing them to mobilize and keep their jobs, like military reservists.
- USFS Region 9 has a model in place the states used to hire their ADs through an advisory group to standardize hiring processes across four hubs (Steve Goldman, contact).
- The focus should be on how to increase the capability for workable interagency solutions. We do rely heavily on ADs to fill out many IMTs and most ADs in management positions are retirees.
- Recommending a separate status for state and local employees has benefits for the personnel.
- There are personnel not mobilizing because states aren't staffed to handle the IQS credentialing or keep information up to date so don't entertain sponsoring state and local firefighters.
- The certification for ADs is the heaviest lift; a group that could assist with that would take much of the workload off local centers.
- IMTA is renaming themselves to encompass all IMTs, not just all-hazard, and seeking to become a certifying agency that could alleviate some of the burden on federal employees.
- Program adjustments could be considered that would only apply to single resource overhead positions, not to operational personnel such as FFT2s that are utilized and mobilized differently.
- Much of the AD processing and paperwork lies with the dispatch community. AD paperwork and travel takes a lot of time and work that dispatch centers don't necessarily have, especially when the center is dealing with an influx of initial attack (IA).
 - Number of ADs varies greatly between GAs and centers.
- Must lay down responsibilities for the ADs in addition to the standards, such as self-sufficiency.
- Do not want to centralize the program in a way that causes capability loss.
- We need to figure out how to access the plethora of talented people who would be willing to sign up and do the work.
- Recommend creating a group to discuss solutions, with representatives from ACS and ACS travel.
- USFS gave an exemption for RX this year for AD inclusion.
- Along with program review, the AD pay plan itself would benefit from simplification.

Update: NWCG Glossary Term Updates

- Several NWCG terms should be re-evaluated for usage and clarification as some, including complex, appear in the glossary numerous times with different meanings.
- This has been brought up numerous times already in NIMSIC and changes are more necessary than simply being mindful.
- The NWCG definitions are outdated compared to the concepts that are being taught at S-520.
- Complex is one challenge, but the NWCG definition of strategy is also no longer applicable.
- Changing the glossary has a lesser impact than not being able to explain the term and its use.
- They have already done quite a bit of work within the data governance to define domain values in the system, but we need to make sure the standard matches.
- The deliberate decision to avoid numerical team typing and adopt term 'complex' was based on a need to have new terminology, not a type/term that already had meaning and connotation.
- Complexity levels should be revisited before discussing typing levels or numbers.
- IWDG has previously recommended moving to three levels of management (IA, Extended Attack, and Complex) but backed up timeframes realizing how much bigger the conversation was going to be and who would need to be engaged. Now is a good time to revisit.
- When discussing complexity levels, perhaps we should be looking at the complexity of the incident itself, as FEMA does, not the typing of the resource mobilizing to it.
- NIMSIC is steward of incident complexity level. Griffin will evaluate discussion for follow up.

Wednesday, October 18

Update: Incident Management Working Group

- Initial work session held in September to discuss standing up intergovernmental working group to establish connection between teams of all response types (USAR, all-hazard, etc.).
- The participants are developing a briefing paper with overview of discussion outcomes and proposed membership, along with communications outreach such as a website and newsletter.
- Ideally this group would act as a national body to recommend standards, assist in integration, promote consistency and interoperability in IMTs, and vet IMT processes for adoption.
- The group's next steps include deciding on a name, putting together a charter and introduction letter, identifying champions throughout the various organizations, and informing our three parent bodies on the intent to ensure they are fully supportive before moving forward with it.
- Incident complexity and resource typing are both potential work items for this group to focus on.

Update: Command and General Staff (C&G) Positions

- There is a desperate need for more ICs and the Incident Command Subcommittee (ICSC) wants to identify alternate pathways for leaders to become ICs. There are several highly skilled C&G that would excel as ICs regardless of whether they have an operational fire background as it's ultimately a leadership role.
- The ICSC built a survey yielding 49 responses out of which 25 thought ICT3 was needed for ICCI. As a result, there is not consensus to move forward with a recommendation.
- Finding pathways outside ICT3 would greatly benefit the entire fire program and increase the candidate pool while considering that not all ICT3s are prepared to become ICCIs.
- There should be a planned pathway through the ICT3 position but also have bridged options for other C&G positions to become ICs without having to go through ICT3 also.
- There was an original proposal to pilot four people utilizing an alternate pathway to IC. They were not opposed to completing ICT3 but ran into bottlenecks getting assignments for the task book.

- This group should be pushing for alternate pathways as an opportunity to fill C&G and IC gaps.
- The bridge option must be thorough enough to provide adequate foundational information to make up for the lack of operational experiences and not set anyone up for failure down the road.
- Consider a qualifications crosswalk between ICT3 and Prescribed Fire Burn Boss Type 2 due to their commonalities.
- Liability concerns have been raised but no solicitor opinion has been requested.
- The ownership in RPL is on the applicant and the strength of the portfolio to demonstrate experiences. The more this can be used to get people into ICT3 roles, the greater the pool will be.
- Using RPL, some candidates may surpass many of the current ICT3s with their experiences.
- ICAC previously made recommendations to NMAC on IC qualifications and AD ICs. There was no consensus and additional liability concerns. Discussion should be revisited.
- Survey was sent through ICAC. Greer and ICSC can reopen the survey, add a couple of questions, and send it out to a larger population, including IWDG and AA Subgroup members.
- The next step would be making recommendations to IPSC.

Update: Increasing Incident Support Capabilities Tasking

- Outcome 1: Support for Draft Response to Element 3
 - Identified about 28 non-traditional agencies/organizations to include in incident response.
 - Found that most groups don't recognize the qualifications of another; some don't use the NWCG standards or have different systems. Many don't recognize others' prescribed fire qualifications.
 - Smaller agencies limited in accessing IROC, IQCS, and other systems due to cost and licensing.
 - Communications are generally good internally but insufficient with outside agencies and personnel, causing blockages.
 - Presented draft memo and recommendations to NMAC with FMB and NWCG. High level of interest, questions, and engagement. Recognized connection with wildfire commission report.
 - The continued work to adopt and implement recommendations exceeds the capacity of this group and will be in FMB or NMAC's hands to continue.
 - Should partner with the group that gets tasked to implement recommendations from the Commission Report once they are identified to strengthen the position.
 - IWDG supports finalizing tasking response memo to NMAC.
- Outcome 2: Develop new timeline for Elements 1 and 2
 - Numerous responses received from SME groups recommending various team and module configurations in each functional area.
 - Next step is for task team to review the responses to identify key concepts and overlaps and gather any clarification from SMEs.
 - A draft response memo be sent to the SMEs for review before IWDG submits a final to NMAC.
 - Ideally, recommendation will identify several small pieces that can be implemented over time based on prioritization, rather than a recommendation that must be fully adopted all at once.
 - IWDG supports recommendation for next steps and revised response timeline of January 22nd.

Update: Incentives Recommendations Task Team

- Broke the recommendations from last fall's discussion into two categories: what is within agency purview and funding versus what will need legislation changes.
 - The briefing paper outlining agency purview incentives was presented to FMB this summer but not finalized because of difficult it is at this time for FMB to push everything being brought to them all at once. They are focusing on ongoing changes through BIL and other legislation.

- The task team agreed that incentivizing IMT personnel should include all response personnel, not just those in primary fire positions. Goal is to decrease obstacles for people wanting to participate and go out on incidents as well as increase agency awareness of the opportunities.
- Changes that are currently in progress with congress include potential incident premium pay incorporated in the budget, the new fire series, and a new fire pay scale.
- Changes at work through FMB and NMAC include 7 days of unavailability and 3 days of R&R after assignments.
- We need to err on the side of taking care of personnel, including utilizing days off as an incentive as well as monetary incentives.
- Propose a sliding scale for R&R days based on length of assignment as well as incentivize getting resources demobilized from incidents once they're no longer needed.
- There are many supporting recommendations in the commission report, but the agencies must figure out how to implement those.
- Don't want to lose focus on incentives, it needs to continue to be a topic of conversation.
- Thompson will continue to be the point of contact for incentive recommendations and bringing to FMB's attention that the group is still engaged and sharing the desires of the fields.
- Ensure we keep focus on all intergovernmental and interagency partners.
- Greer will send hotshot review report to Bender for IWDG distribution and review.

Thursday, October 19

Update: Geographic Area Standardization Tasking

- Tasking from NMAC to CGAC this summer looked at four distinct areas for standardization:
 - PL Criteria: All GAs had three consistent components: activity, fire danger, and resources, though the degrees varied.
 - NMAC will task CGAC and NCCM to standardize criteria and include in mob guides.
 - Drawdown Levels: Current processes are variable despite not having many discrepancies between drawdown levels.
 - Priority Trainee Programs: The management and assignment of trainees to incidents is highly variable across GAs. Most have a plan to assign Complex trainees to CIMTs as well as prioritization of critical shortage positions.
 - NMAC will task CGAC to work with the GATRs to extensively review plans to ensure similarities and clear expectations, especially for cross-GA mobilizations.
 - CIMT Roster Negotiations Process: Task team recommended no third-party involvement in IC and AA negotiation discussion. They did note that California planned to test the process. Uncertain whether that occurred or how it went but will follow up through CGAC.
 - AA Subgroup recommends a third party, such as a regional ops person, unit FMO, representative from the coordinating group, or someone else at the regional level.
- Bender will draft the taskings for CGAC review prior to NMAC issuance. CGAC will discuss on next call and plan topics for January meeting in Boise.

Update: Geographic Area CIMT Transition Plans

- All but three GA transition plans have all been submitted.
- Some GAs put much more thought and detail into the plan than others.
- Once last three plans are submitted, NMAC will compare all the plans and determine commonalities as well as components some GAs are doing that others should follow.
- NMAC is looking for a means of accountability and to also ensure there are no red flags in any of the plans that need to be addressed before full CIM implementation.

Update: Data Collection and Analysis

- Current incident assignment data includes all T1 and T2 IMTs, CIMTs, NIMO, and T3 IMTs.
 - Compiling T3 data needs to be a standard moving forward. For assignments, it requires manual review and follow up phone calls for clarifications on incident rosters and standing teams.
- The roster data set captures unique people so there aren't duplicates counted.
- In most GACCs, out of GACC IMTs are assigned well under 50% of the time.
- CA hosts one IMT selection and should be combined as one data column, not two GAs.
- Based on the data, the average number of people mobilizing with IMTs per assignment is about 61, speaking directly against the use of 90-100 person rosters.
- ADs, supplemental fire departments, state, other local governments, and agency personnel are all included in the IMT composition staffing analysis, which reviews master roster data.
- In CA, the ADs are signed up with state and local governments due to higher earning potential.
- Some functional areas rely more heavily on ADs than others.
- Agency proportions of IMT membership differ greatly from one GA to another.
- There is no way to differentiate cooperators as they are identified by the provider.
- When ICAP is functional, it needs to collect the same data points to be consistent with what GAs have been providing manually for past three years.
- Bender will replace last year's data on the website and StoryMap with the new data and share.
- 2023 incident assignment data will be compiled and added this winter.
- Standardized team naming conventions would be beneficial and help differentiate IMTs.

Discussion: Future of IWDG

- Outcome: Begin Considering Future Efforts, Initiatives, Membership, etc.
 - Next year's AAR after CIM is fully implemented will be extremely robust.
 - IWDG should continue identifying experts that are needed as members or liaisons as we work on additional efforts, such as we did with FEMA.
 - The group should consider if the charter is still accurate based on what IWDG thinks we should continue versus what the parent groups want IWDG to be working on.
 - The next year will be key to CIM, and maintaining stable IWDG membership is critical, rather than making abrupt membership changes that could cause lost momentum and traction.
 - This groups takes a lot of time and investment so ensuring our membership is capable of the commitment and engagement to make the recommendation decisions is important as well.
 - Consider what an additional dedicated IWDG position would do.
 - IWDG's role next year will be as important as ever based on the expected products being implemented. This group will need to help identify and problem-solve the anticipated concerns.

Upcoming Meetings and Scheduling

- Need to identify a new vice chair.
 - Haydon has done an excellent job and has added a lot of value to IWDG and field. With his retirement, need to identify a replacement and determine appointment time for vice chair role.
- Next Joint Meeting with FMB, NMAC, and NWCG is in January.
- Bender will send out a poll for the next meeting date (combining November and December).
- Support maintaining the same monthly day and time for scheduling meetings for 2024.