



National Wildfire Coordinating Group Incident and Position Standards Committee

IPSC-2022-05

Date: 28 April 2022
To: Shane McDonald, Chair NWCG Executive Board
From: Jim Shultz, Chair, Incident and Position Standards Committee
Subject: IPSC Response to TM-22-001 2022 through 2024 Implementation of Complex Incident Management – April deliverables

Purpose: This memorandum outlines IPSC's response to Executive Board Tasking Memo 22-001 and provides two broad Complex Incident Management (CIM) Command and General staff (CG) position standards for consideration.

Alternatives:

These alternatives are provided with the following assumptions and factors influencing the Incident and Position Standards Committee (IPSC) alternatives:

1. The position standards are expected to be in use for three to five years at which time the Systems Improvement efforts are expected to produce analysis which may provide recommendations for an updated or revised standard.
2. There may be modifications to the standard prior to the three-to-five-year timeline based on the AAR identified in the tasking, training updates identified in the tasking, regular position steward reviews and updates. IPSC will manage these updates as part of the committee's regular business, or through tasking specific process.
3. IPSC provides these options as a group of subject matter experts on qualifications management and NWCG standards. Constituent perspective was discussed but was largely excluded from alternative development. The tasking memo and in-brief were used to determine sideboards for providing alternatives.
4. Type 2 and Type 1 qualifications must remain active in the qualifications systems at least through the transition period. There are several key factors which necessitate retaining these positions. Historic information in the qualifications system requires that the positions stay active. Also, Type 2 positions must remain active as some responders may choose not to become CIM qualified. These responders could still be utilized under a CIM CG position on an incident in a branch capacity. Type 1 positions can likely be deactivated at the conclusion of the transition period, or as soon as existing Type 1 qualified responders are granted a CIM CG position. The AD pay plan may have an influence on when Type 1 positions can be removed from responders' records as an active qualification. All legacy positions will be removed from the position catalog and as a potential qualification path upon approval of a CIM standard.
5. All options for transition rely on the principle of allowing discretion by the home unit certifying official to accept the proposed standard or require additional development to meet the standard.

The alternative summary below each have two transition plan options provided for consideration. In all cases the transition plan period is recommended to be open through **December 30, 2023**. The current pathways to Type 2 CG positions are retained as CIM CG position pathways.

1. CIM position taskbook and S-520 or CIMC, position specific requirements.
2. CIM position taskbook and S-420/L-481, position specific requirements.

See attachments for position specific information and transition plan options.

Process:

IPSC identified four criteria based on the tasking, broad intent of CIM efforts and real-world need for effective incident response in an increasingly complex incident environment. The criteria were used to give an indication of overall viability of an alternative. IPSC did not weight the criteria given the short timeframes available to complete tasking work. The criteria are described as follows:

1. Speed to competence – this element considers an alternatives ability to decrease the time it takes to develop qualified CIM CG positions. It is based on the existing training and qualifications system models in place.
2. Ease of transition – this element describes the effort or number of processes required to move existing Type two qualified CG to CIM. It directly relates to the transition plan.
3. Ease of implementation describes the effort it would take for NWCG programs and committees to implement an option. This is a time limited level of effort associated with implementation.
4. Level of competency and skill development describes how well a given option prepares responders to perform as a CIM CG member.

The table below represent IPSC’s scoring of each option based on the criteria. A discussion of each option’s score is found below.

	Alternative 1:	Alternative 2:
	Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICS-400 • S-520 or CIMC Experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 C&G or Unit leader • Complex PTB 	Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICS-400 • S-420/L-481 Experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 C&G or Unit Leader • Complex PTB
*Ease of Transition (responders) 1-easy 5-hard	2/3	3/4
Speed to competence 1-fast 5-slow	3	2
Ease of implementation (Capacity in NWCG committees and Programs) 1-easy 5-hard	5	2
Level of competency and skill development (Fit for job requirements) 1-Strong 5-Weak	1	4
*Summary score Lower is better	11/12	11/12

*Split scoring denotes transition plan differences.

Alternative 1:

Ease of transition was given a two for transition plan option 1 due to minimal effort on the part of the transitioning responder and the home unit to attain a CIM qualification as compared to option 2. There is relative clarity for both a certifying official and responder as to what category of responder they fall into and what actions need to be completed to become qualified. A weakness in this option is the lack of information made available in an organized package for a certifying official to determine the quality of a responder's experiences as Type 2 CG which may contribute to a home unit requirement to gain additional experience as a Type 2 CG. *Ease of transition* for option 2 was given a three due to the requirement on the responder to compile an recognition of prior learning (RPL) package including a written narrative. Additionally, qual card committees/certifying official would be responsible for reviewing the material and providing a recommendation on certification. The comprehensive package would however provide all of the information needed to make a well-informed certification decision.

Speed to competence was given a three due to the current model of S-520 and CIMC delivery. Under the current model, delivering one to two sessions of each course would likely serve as a barrier to becoming qualified as a CIM CG. This could be changed by pushing delivery to geographic areas and/or developing additional Cadre capacity for each of these courses.

Ease of implementation was given a five due to the need to greatly expand deliveries of S-520 and CIMC. This may require development of additional cadres and/or take significant time from the S-520/620 and CIMC steering committees to deliver multiple courses.

Competency and Skill development were given a one as the S-520 and CIMC courses are designed to ensure attendees have the knowledge and ability to handle highly complex incidents. Combined with a position taskbook this is a highly effective methodology to ensure individuals have the confidence to function in their roles on our most complex incidents.

Alternative 2:

Ease of transition was given a three for transition plan option one due to potential limited availability of evaluators to complete the CIM evaluation form and that there is not a path which allows attending the training only to qualification whereas qualification standard alternative one has a training only option. Transition plan option two was given a four due to the much smaller evaluator pool available. Transition plan option two is intended to be transitional in scope, it's likely that the coaching and evaluation guide developed by the S-520 and CIMC cadre would need to be refined over the course of the FY 22 fire season. By limiting the evaluation team to the current and past cadre members will allow for that document to be evaluated by the developers to ensure its accuracy and effectiveness before being released for wide use by other evaluators that have either a Type 1 or CIMT qualification.

Speed to competence was given a two based on the current availability of S-420 and L-481 courses. These courses are delivered geographically and are widely available minimizing wait times to attend these courses. All other elements of this pathway are identical to option one.

Ease of implementation was given a two due to the availability of S-420 cadres and vendor for delivery of L-481.

Competency and Skill development were given a four due to the current curriculum content of the S-420 and L-481 courses not addressing strategic planning and other drivers of incident complexity.

Other Considerations/Recommendations:

1. Recommendation from IPSC to IWDG and Geographic Coordinating Groups is to manage all CIM trainees through Geographic Priority Trainee programs. Through this approach, trainees have a better chance of having at least one assignment on a highly complex incident, which, in the CIM model is not guaranteed. This also affords more opportunities for assignments in different geographic areas and exposes trainees to different trainers and team processes.

Background and Coordination:

Input for this response was received from all Command and General Staff position stewards, S-520 and CIMC steering committees and IWDG in addition to IPSC standing advisors from IQCS, IQS and the GATR's. Questions can be directed to Jim Shultz, Chair IPSC, jim_shultz@nps.gov.

Attachments:

- Alternative 1- S-520
- Alternative 2 – S-420 or L481
- Draft CIMT Faculty Guide for Field (S-520/CIMC Field Evaluation)

Distribution:

Michael Froelich, IPSC PMS 310-1 steward

Michelle Woods, IPSC Support Staff

Deb Fleming, NWCG Coordinator

Eric Fransted, Chair Risk Management Committee

Dave Burley, Chair, Incident Business Committee

Tina Boehle, Chair Communication, Education, and Prevention Committee