



Exercise CANTERBURY TRITON

11 November 2012

FINAL REPORT

Introduction

The Canterbury Police District major marine search and rescue exercise (SAREX) for the 2012-13 year was held at Christchurch on the 11th of November 2012.

The exercise involved over 40 people from 7 Coastguard units and police from Christchurch.

Objectives

The objectives of the SAREX were:

- a) *To enhance multi-agency and inter-group coordination between the New Zealand Police, Coastguard and LandSAR and their support agencies and personnel within the area in the event of a marine search and rescue incident.*
- b) *To provide all participants the opportunity to refresh and practice their search and rescue incident management knowledge and skills during a full scale operational exercise and to identify gaps in training and knowledge, procedures and areas that need further development.*
- c) *To ensure value was delivered to all participants.*

Scenario

The SAREX was designed to test the incident management team in responding to a significant incident, but at the same time to allow them time to focus on their planning. Because of this the initial scenario was that a large vessel had been abandoned off the Waimakariri River mouth in a storm, but conditions were too severe for the first two hours to allow and response to be attempted. This allowed the managers time to set up an IMT and to conduct planning.

The exercise was also designed to allow the various Canterbury Coastguard units to practice operating together under one command structure on a large operation.

Police funding

Police supplied catering for the exercise [REDACTED] and also provided funding for fuel for Coastguard vessels and aircraft, [REDACTED].

Monitoring report

The SAREX was reviewed at a management level by Janelle Mackie, Emergency Rescue Programme Coordinator at Emergency Management Training Centre in Christchurch; and also by Sergeant Craig Prior from the Christchurch Police Search and Rescue Squad.

Coastguard personnel from outside Christchurch also reviewed the performance of the individual assets; with Tony Lister from Timaru assessing on board *Blue Arrow*, John

McPhail from Kaikoura assessing on board *Canterbury Rescue*, and Doug Griffin assessing on board *Kaiapoi One*.

All the reports are attached as appendices.

Lessons learnt

1. Coastguard and Police would benefit from a full day or full weekend IMTEX, similar to what LandSAR have been running, to further cement systems and to clarify planning/intelligence role and handovers.
2. Coastguard need to develop a standard tasking form as a matter of urgency.
3. Managers must concentrate on managing, not doing.
4. There is a need to focus on writing clearly understandable taskings and to confirm crew understanding of these taskings.
5. Having large screens to display Tracplus was very beneficial.
6. Having the computer system to display communications between operations and communications was very beneficial.

NZSAR funding

The funding was applied as follows:

<i>Travel & accommodation costs Evaluator's report</i>	██████████	██████████
<i>Travel costs Evaluator's report</i>	██████████	██████████
<i>Travel costs Evaluator's report</i>	██████████	██████████
<i>Exercise planning and management</i>	████████████████	██████████
<i>Total</i>		██████████

Effect of funding

The funding has enabled a comprehensive assessment of the SAREX to be made. As we get very few major marine SAR operations in Canterbury, it is critical that we exercise these scenarios so that we can respond effectively when they happen.

It is also the only opportunity that the Coastguard units get to practise a large scale response together.

Over the last few years the use of this additional NZSAR funding has enabled us to monitor our progress in incident management and design the exercises to more effectively target our operational needs and training gaps. Great progress has been made in the implementation of CIMS and in our incident management overall, although there is still clearly some way to go, particularly in the planning and intelligence area.

The funding has enabled us to identify that we would benefit from additional IMTEX training to further develop the planning and intelligence capability and formal search management.

I am confident that within the next 12 months we will be able to make considerable progress towards achieving high standards in this area.

Customer Invoice Note

A customer invoice note is being prepared and will be forwarded separately.



Ryan O'Rourke
Sergeant H438
SAR/DVI Coordinator - Canterbury
12 December 2012

EXERCISE CANTERBURY TRITON 2012

IMT ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

Janelle Mackie (ECAN)

Sergeant Craig Prior (Christchurch Police)

- The IMT was established in a timely manner and roles were assigned quickly.
- IMT team leaders (Police) were effective due to their experience. It was apparent some others were still learning their roles in the IMT.
- The ICP was well laid out with good separation of roles using physical barriers.
- An IAP was being prepared for the next operational period.
- A Safety Officer was appointed early on.
- Planning/Intel section were completing taskings that were too detailed. This should have been left to Operations section. However overall, the Planning/Intel section was well managed.
- The Planning/Intel section began to plan for the next operational period with some guidance, but could have been more proactive in this area.
- Lost Person Behaviour and the Subject Profile were completed well.
- Towards the end of the operational period objectives were being set for the next period.
- It was a good multi-agency setup.
- Additional personnel were needed in Planning/Intel. The P/I manager should not have been writing the IAP.
- At one point taskings were being written up in multiple places (Ops and P/I).
- Some of the exercise parameters needed to be injected earlier.
- It would be helpful to have coloured armbands for the different section members so they are readily identifiable.
- Coastguard need to develop a standard tasking form as a matter of priority.
- Managers should concentrate on managing, not doing.
- Managers should keep their own log of actions within their section and decisions made, including factors leading to those decisions.
- Management meetings need to be held regularly, need to have minutes taken or meeting recorded, and need to have responsibilities assigned to an individual.

- Radio and computer system was good and kept information flowing between comms and ops.
- It was very helpful to have Tracplus displayed.
- It would be helpful to have a full day IMT exercise to clarify planning roles, planning/ops interaction and handovers.



SAREX Practical Assessment Sheet

Date: 11/11/2012

Location/ Name of SAREX: Triton Canterbury

Vessel: Canterbury Rescue

Assessment sheet

Masters Name:	Chris Astell	Masters Sig:	
Assessors Name:	John Macphail	Assessors sig:	

Main Objective: • To assess and review a Masters performance and his/her crew during a planned Search and Rescue Exercise in a controlled environment. Identifying good practises or gaps in training and knowledge, procedures and areas that need further development.

Overall Scenario for the exercise: Tuhoë survivor search.	
Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)	Remarks Assessor
<p>Crew Safety: Did the Master maintain safety throughout the Exercise? Give some examples?</p>	Safety was emphasized all through out.
<p>Pre Launch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were pre launch checks carried out? how thorough was it? Was anything missed out? Was a Risk Management form completed prior to departure and again during the exercise? Was the crew involved in the Risk Management? How did they manage risk? Was a full brief given prior to departure? what briefing format was used? Did the Master confirm that everyone understood the briefing? Were Muster stations (crew positions allocated prior to departure? What were they? Were they appropriate to the task? Did the Crew wear and have the correct PPE and equipment for the task? Give examples? Could they have been dressed different and why? 	<p>Pre launch checks carried out</p> <p>70 - Risk Management carried out by Matt. revised to 110 when on scene</p> <p>Yes briefing was given at each tasking ^{changes}</p> <p>crew given positions and changed during the exercise.</p> <p>Yes all crew in coastguard overalls and had grab bags with more equipment available</p>
<p>Mission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the Master in charge throughout? Was closed loop Comms used? give examples? Did everyone understand their crew position and role in the Mission? Did everyone know what the objectives were that were given by the IMT? Was a SAP (Stop Assess Plan) carried out? How well did this go? Was it appropriate to the task? Did the Master get consensus decisions or agreement from the crew to the plan? Give example? Did they achieve their Mission? Why was it achieved? Explain? Did the Master ID the strengths weakness in the crew and utilise skills? give examples? Could the crew / Master have done it differently? 	<p>Yes - Comms stressed from 107</p> <p>Yes. Crews positions changed a</p> <p>Confusion over search task as misunderstood should have checked for confirmation.</p> <p>Yes Chris asked for input when he felt the need re. Tuhoë boarding & search patterns.</p> <p>Mission was achieved crew shared jobs and performed well.</p>
<p>Post Launch / Recovery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was recovery carried out safely and competently? Give example? Did the Master hold a hot debrief? How did this go was it thorough? Did everyone get the opportunity to feedback? Did anyone hold back? Is the vessel fully prepared to be re deployed? Give example? 	<p>Recovery was completed, safety ramp busy with pleasure boats</p> <p>Hot debrief held on route to Sumner for debrief, everyone participated - Assessment was read to the crew as well.</p> <p>Yes Vessel was washed down - refuelled.</p>

SAREX Practical Assessment Sheet

What went really well?

Remarks Assessor

The Master Chris Astell showed a clear and concise style of leadership. The crew had a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Communication was open with little chatter. Decision making was by consensus. For example the task to search the Tuhoe in Lyttelton for survivors was planned and discussed by the crew before being carried out. Safety was at the forefront of decisions. The crew worked as a team with good backup of each other and constant checking on them by Chris to get their status and input.
Risk Management process working - well integrated into operations

What aspects need further training or support?

Remarks Assessor

Communication on the vessel was excellent with close loop being in operation, however because of the poor radio calls and indecisive instructions coming from IMT close loop comms was not good on the radio. i.e. Tasking for a search at Waumak was misunderstood and not repeated back for clarification. This caused a delay as the vessel went on a different task. On a large search such as this comms are vital otherwise operators onshore or offshore get frustrated and make assumptions to avoid trying to go through a stressed out IMT operator.

Can you identify some best practice examples?

Remarks Assessor

- Risk assessment being carried out as standard practise
- Crew management, team work, rotation of roles. Communication
- Search techniques & object recovery. Once an object was spotted a flotation devise was used to mark spot, dan buoy use was also good to work from a defined point. - If electronics failed there was still a visual reference.
- Crew had equipment and clothing appropriate for the role refreshments & food important on a long duration operation

SAREX Practical Assessment Sheet

Date: 11 November 2012 Location/ Name of SAREX: Canterbury Triton 2012

Vessel: KAIAPOI 1

Coastguard Waimakariri - Ashley

Assessment sheet

Masters Name:	Kim Chapman-Taylor	Masters Sig:	
Assessors Name:	Doug Griffin	Assessors sig:	

Main Objective: • To assess and review a Masters performance and his crew during a planned Search and Rescue Exercise in a controlled environment. Identifying good practises or gaps in training and knowledge, procedures and areas that need further development.

Overall Scenario for the exercise: tasked to search for survivors in the water from the Waimakariri River Bar North out to 4nm.	
Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)	Remarks Assessor
<p>Crew Safety: Did the Master maintain safety throughout the Exercise? Give some examples?</p>	<p>The master was in charge at all times throughout the exercise and safety was paramount. He gave a very detailed brief on actions to be taken by crew as the vessel crossed the bar and actions to be taken if the crossing became difficult in any way. He continually checked on the welfare of the crew during the day and rotated the crew through the various roles of helm-nav and searchers.</p>
<p>Pre Launch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were pre launch checks carried out? how thorough was it? Was anything missed out? Was a Risk Management form completed prior to departure and again during the exercise? Was the crew involved in the Risk Management? How did they manage risk? Was a full brief given prior to departure? what briefing format was used? Did the Master confirm that everyone understood the briefing? Were Muster stations (crew positions allocated prior to departure? What were they? Were they appropriate to the task? Did the Crew wear and have the correct PPE and equipment for the task? Give examples? Could they have been dressed different and why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rescue vessel was already launched as it had a task before the SAREX – but the Master ensured all relevant checks of the vessel were carried out before departure. Yes this was conducted before departure and re- assed before crossing the bar with full participation of all the crew and myself. Yes this was carried out in the boat shed prior to going on the vessel – this briefing also included shore crew who would remain at the boatshed. Confirmation of understanding by the crew was confirmed by the Master asking relevant key questions. Yes – this was carried with regards to the SOP's for the vessel – Nav – Helm Deck Crew (I assumed the role of deck crew at times during the voyage allowing the Master to concentrate on the search etc) I was also given a spare safety brief as it was the first time on the vessel for me. Yes correct PPE was worn by all crew – extra warm clothing was taken on board as well a appropriate food – hot and cold drinks
<p>Mission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the Master in charge throughout? Was closed loop Comms used? give examples? Did everyone understand their crew position and role in the Mission? Did everyone know what the objectives were that were given by the IMT? Was a SAP (Stop Assess Plan) carried out? How well did this go? Was it appropriate to the task? Did the Master get consensus decisions or agreement from the crew to the plan? Give example? Did they achieve their Mission? Why was it achieved? Explain? Did the Master ID the strengths weakness in the crew and utilise skills? give examples? Could the crew / Master have done it differently? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes the Master was fully in control at all times and displayed fully that he had very good situational awareness. The closed loop communication was one area which did not go well – at times it did then at other times not all the crew participated. The mission was understood by all the crew and the Master encouraged full participation from the crew during the discussions and planning of the search pattern etc. SAP was used when on station at the start of the allocated search area – there was time for this as the IMT were sorting out tasking's etc Good discussion was held several times during the search and ideas from the crew such as putting out a floating datum to asses drift was carried out. Yes their mission was achieved with the recovery of two victims – the location of the victims was assisted by Canterbury CAP – The Master and crew demonstrated a good knowledge of working with aircraft. The master obviously knew his crew and gave each crew member every chance to participate at all times – the crew were very confident and proactive Over all a very well run mission

SAREX Practical Assessment Sheet

<p>Post Launch / Recovery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was recovery carried out safely and competently? Give example? • Did the Master hold a hot debrief? How did this go was it thorough? Did everyone get the opportunity to feedback? Did anyone hold back? • Is the vessel fully prepared to be re deployed? Give example? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the end of the exercise I was taken back over the bar and transferred to a IRB as I had a plane to catch and the vessel and crew were requested to go to Sumner for a debrief. • At the end of exercise while we were waiting for further instructions the crew participated in a hot debrief aided by a hot drink and a snack – a general discussion was held especially with regards to how the weather change dramatically better during the search and how that effected what was seen or not. All the crew participated and I felt that they felt fully confident that they could raise a issue good or bad.
---	---

What went really well?

Remarks Assessor

There was good command and control by the Kim at all times – when he did make a mistake he was very quick to put his hand up and readjust what was required.

Kim ensured that all the crew knew exactly what was happening, what he was doing and what was expected of them

The crew were given every opportunity to participate and once a plan was formed the understanding of the plan by all crew was reinforced by relevant questions.

The crew demonstrated that they had a good understanding of what was required of them as they rotated between jobs.

Not having been over the Waimakariri bar I was given a full brief on not just what to expect from the vessel but also the makeup of the bar and the decision points they have when crossing the bar

I was impressed that without any prompting from Kim that the crew quickly identified there was some equipment incorrectly stowed and this was sorted before departure. To me this demonstrated that the crew were competent

When I arrived at the boatshed Kim was taking the crew for their usual training and I was invited to participate which I did – this gave me a small insight into how Kim trains his crew and also for the crew to quickly find out that I was not all that sharp on first aid. One drill they did was once blindfolded they had to find the key parts of their life jacket such as the self inflator and whistle etc

What aspects need further training or support?

Remarks Assessor

The only real issue on the day was the lack of effective closed loop communications – there was some but there is room for improvement

Can you identify some best practice examples ?

Remarks Assessor

Coastguard Waimakariri – Ashley demonstrated good boat handling skills and good seamanship throughout the day

The master maintained good situational awareness and made an effort even though he was also busy sorting search patterns and contending with at times hard to understand messages from the IMT to ensure the welfare of his crew by constantly asking them relevant questions and making sure they were involved.

His briefings were clear and precise