

DISASTER RESILIENCE STANDARD AND CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS WORKSHOP FOR COMMUNITY- AND FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

PROCEEDINGS

Convened by

Fritz Institute
San Francisco, California
&
CaliforniaVolunteers
Office of the Governor
State of California

February 18 – 19, 2009
Sir Francis Drake Hotel
San Francisco, California



FRITZ
INSTITUTE



Background to the Fritz Institute / CaliforniaVolunteers Initiative to develop a Disaster Resilience Standard and Continuity of Operations Planning Model

In 2006, several philanthropies¹ in the San Francisco Bay Region requested that Fritz Institute develop a training and development process that would eventually result in a collaboratively developed, consensus standard that could be used to measure and improve the disaster resilience of community- and faith-based organization direct service providers (hereafter CBOs). Although emergency management and business continuity standards developed by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP), the International Standards Organization (ISO), and the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) apply reasonably well to government agencies or large business entities, these standards do not establish realistic performance expectations or benchmarks for the CBO sector. During 2007 and 2008, Fritz Institute, through its research and the Disaster Resilient Organization (DRO) pilot program, developed conceptual standards and metrics as a set of milestones for use by twelve CBOs in San Francisco. This work now serves as the basis for the current effort to develop a preparedness standard for CBOs.

This effort parallels recent activity at the federal Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to create a national voluntary private sector accreditation and certification program, as mandated by the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53). While the 9/11 Act did not specifically reference private-nonprofit organizations or CBOs that provide safety net services to vulnerable and special needs populations, this sector serves as an essential participant in crisis response and recovery operations at the community level. On July 30, 2009, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) announced that the American National Standards Institute-American Society of Quality (ANSI-ASQ) would take the lead in this effort.

In 2008, Fritz Institute joined with CaliforniaVolunteers to initiate a series of workshops and collaborative discussions with community-based organizations, government agencies, and philanthropic organizations to refine the DRO milestones into a broadly accepted standard of preparedness and resilience for the CBO sector. Fritz Institute and CaliforniaVolunteers have participated in discussions with DHS/FEMA on the attributes that would best apply to the unique characteristics of the CBO sector.

Goal of the Workshop

This workshop represented the first formal step in a continuing collaborative effort by stakeholders to define and implement meaningful and achievable objectives for increased disaster resilience and service capacity in the CBO sector.

One of the most startling observations after the Loma Prieta Earthquake (1989), Hurricane Katrina (2005), and other recent large-scale disasters was the number of CBOs and neighborhood small businesses that could neither sustain their operations, nor serve their clients/customers, through the disruption caused by the disasters. While there was a high percentage of organizations that had to close their doors, resulting in their clients being left literally 'out in the cold,' there were also examples of organizations and businesses that survived and performed. There were best practices that these performing organizations followed that enabled them to continue to serve their communities, and these best practices can change the

¹ Walter and Elise Haas Fund, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, San Francisco Foundation, PG&E and S. D. Bechtel Jr. Foundation

outcome of how small businesses and CBOs respond to and recover from disruptions, thus making these agencies more resilient.

A preparedness standard, in a sense, represents a collection of performance metrics and best practices that enable sustained agency service delivery, and that prove to be acceptable to service providers, public and private funding agencies, and the community at-large. The term “standards” is oftentimes incorrectly considered synonymous with “guidelines” and “best practices.” *Standards* are what is expected to be achieved, *guidelines* are non-binding tools to help an organization implement the standards, and *best practices* are examples of how other organizations have addressed a component of a standard. For the purpose of the disaster preparedness standard development process being used by Fritz Institute and CaliforniaVolunteers, the term ‘standard’ will be used to describe the activities and actions that are to be accomplished that will indicate the capacity of organizations to respond to disasters and to recover -- defining ‘disaster resilient organizations.’

Most of the attributes of resilient agencies are simple and straight forward. They reflect the qualities of strategic planning that identify what the impact of a disaster would be on the organization and the clients served by that organization. Planning and resources can then be focused on core, critical services and developing the means of providing those services through disruptions that affect staff, facilities, and supply chains. These attributes, derived from social science research, assessments of disaster response by CBOs, and the Fritz Institute BayPrep DRO pilot program in San Francisco, were incorporated into the ‘Strawman Standard’ that was presented and critiqued at the Workshop (See Appendix I for Workshop Agenda).

Purpose and Organization of the Workshop

On February 18 and 19, 2009, Fritz Institute and CaliforniaVolunteers convened a workshop of key stakeholders to provide input and seek consensus on a performance standard and continuity of operations planning tool for use by CBOs. Conveners sought the following outcomes from the workshop:

- A consensus on the elements of a proposed draft Standard with indicators of success, and suggested documentation of compliance;
- Formulation of recommendations for compliance assessment, certification, and dissemination within the government, CBO/FBO, and funder sectors; and,
- Recommendations for a CBO/FBO planning model to gain successful application and implementation of continuity of operations planning.

The more than 80 participants represented a broad spectrum of local, state, and national stakeholders including all levels of government, researchers, nongovernmental organizations engaged in disaster operations, CBOs, and philanthropic organizations. (See Appendix II for List of Attendees)

The workshop consisted of presentations, exercises, and group and table discussions to solicit input on:

- The concept and applicability of a preparedness standard for CBOs;
- Suggested elements of a preparedness standard;
- Indicators and measures of success towards meeting those elements; and,
- Methods for assessing and sustaining disaster resilience.

Presentations on CBO/FBO Disaster Preparedness and Resilience – Setting the Context

After welcoming messages by Karen Baker, California Secretary of Service and Volunteering, Lynn C. Fritz, Co-Founder and Board Chair of Fritz Institute, and Robert Sproul, CEO of Fritz Institute, the presentations began that set the context for the workshop and the standards development work that was to ensue. **Kathleen Tierney, Ph.D**, Director of the Natural Hazards Center at the University of Colorado, Boulder, delivered the initial presentation. Dr. Tierney described the social science research on CBO vulnerability to disasters, including the Loma Prieta and Northridge Earthquakes and Hurricane Katrina. Dr. Tierney then identified the essential elements of capacity exhibited by CBOs that successfully adapt and respond to disaster disruption. These elements or “dimensions of disaster preparedness” include:

- Strategic Management Direction and Control
- Knowledge of Potential Hazards
- Response Agreements with Peers and Government
- Ability to Cope with the Emergency and Restore Operations
- Property Protection and Risk Mitigation
- Life Safety Protection
- Supportive Resources and Logistics
- Ability to Initiate Recovery

Dr. Tierney continued with a presentation of her 2007 assessment of CBOs in San Francisco. The research surveyed a sample of the food, health and mental health, housing, social service, and multi-service providers. From the surveys, the research team developed profiles of the organizations’ characteristics, clients, perceptions of risk, and levels of disaster preparedness (see Appendix III for Dr. Tierney’s presentation).

Key conclusions from Dr. Tierney’s research include:

- CBOs in San Francisco are at risk of losing the functionality of their facilities because of the potential for collapse, nonstructural damage, lifeline/utility outages, staffing issues and supply chain disruptions;
- CBOs are under-prepared for the next major disaster and will be stretched beyond capacity when the disaster strikes;
- While a majority of CBOs have a disaster plan, plan quality and comprehensiveness vary; and,
- The lack of preparedness is a result of resource shortages, overwhelming demands on staff, and a lack of concrete preparedness guidance

The second presentation provided information on the BayPrep DRO pilot program in San Francisco by **June Gin, Ph.D**. Dr. Gin described the progress achieved in building or improving disaster resilience within the twelve CBO participants in the pilot program. Being “*Resilient*” means *an organization can rebound from the disruption resulting from a disaster and resume a limited set of pre-identified critical functions, in a defined time frame*. Dr. Gin pointed out that Dr. Tierney’s research identified organizational needs for disaster planning including having materials and supplies, technical expertise, plans and planning templates, and training in disaster response. Dr. Gin then described how the BayPrep intervention and support strategies were designed to address the research findings and the capacities of the DRO CBOs, including direct interventions, mentoring, technical assistance, and collaboration with peer organizations. Key elements of building disaster resilience, correlated to Dr. Tierney’s “dimensions of disaster preparedness” are illustrated in Table 1.

Element of DRO Capacity (DRO Milestones)	Dimensions of Disaster Preparedness
Having a Disaster Mission Statement	Management Direction & Control
Continuity of Operations Planning	Emergency coping and Restoration
Staff Personal Preparedness Training	Life Safety Protection
Organizational Management Structure	Management Direction & coordination Emergency Coping and Restoration
Assess Physical Structures	Hazard Knowledge Property Protection Life Safety Protection

Table 1 -- DRO Milestones and Dimensions of Disaster Preparedness (Tierney)

Dr. Gin and several representatives from participating BayPrep DROs described the challenges and successes of participating in DRO pilot program. Participants identified critical elements of their successes as 1) participating with peer organizations in the preparedness process; 2) being provided mentoring, technical assistance and expertise to support planning and promote internal buy-in; 3) receiving financial support from funders to address preparedness gaps identified in the DRO process; and, 4) being recognized by their peers for their initiative and successes (See Appendix IV).

Eileen Baumgardner, Consultant to Fritz Institute, initiated the discussion on the structure, content and context for disaster preparedness standards, and presented a strawman standard for purposes of discussion (See Appendix V). Ms. Baumgardner defined a “*standard*” as a *model, established by general consent, to measure the quality of disaster resilience improvement*. The purpose of the standard is to set a target for developing and sustaining disaster preparedness activities and is built upon a consensus definition of what defines ‘preparedness’. It can serve as a tool for self assessment and measuring improvement and as an indicator of competency, resilience and reliability to others. In order to be accepted in the community, a standard must necessarily be created in an open environment, accessible and responsive to the requirements of all stakeholders, and receptive to input from parties that will be affected by the standard.

Ms. Baumgardner then presented examples of existing standards being applied to emergency management or service providers. These include:

- The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1600 Standard for Emergency Management, developed in the 1990s, based on business continuity models;
- The Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) standard that offers accreditation / certification primarily to state and local governments. The Emergency Management Standard by EMAP was based initially on the NFPA 1600 Standard and began under the aegis of the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA). EMAP is now a separate and independent standard, governed by an independent nonprofit ten member board, the EMAP Commission;
- The Joint Commission of the Accreditation of Health Care Organizations, whose mission is to improve the safety and quality of health care provided to the public through standards, assessments, and accreditation of health care facilities. Although this is a voluntary standard, accreditation may be required by state regulations; and,

- DHS/FEMA Voluntary Private Sector Preparedness Accreditation and Certification Program (PS-Prep), currently being developed by DHS. DHS's goal for the PS-Prep is to establish a voluntary private sector preparedness and certification process. This process will assess whether a private sector entity complies with one or more voluntary preparedness standards adopted by DHS. While intended for application across all of the different types of organizations comprising the private sector, the applicability of this program to small businesses and private nonprofits has not yet been demonstrated.

In closing her presentation, Ms. Baumgardner emphasized that a standard should be based on achievable goals, but, as such, should reflect more than the current state of preparedness in an organization, but not be so burdensome as to stymie progress.

Following Ms. Baumgardner's presentation on the context for a preparedness standard, the workshop focus shifted to a more detailed consideration of the strawman standard, derived from the research of Dr. Tierney, the practical experience derived from the BayPrep DRO pilot program, and selected elements from NFPA 1600 and the EMAP program. Each strawman element is based on a capacity gap identified in previous disasters.

The strawman disaster resilience standard for community- and faith-based organizations provided for discussion included the following elements (see Appendix VI for further detail):

1. The organization has defined its disaster mission and it is embraced by the organization leadership.
2. The organization has identified the hazards it faces and has assessed the impacts on the organization's operations.
3. The organization's facility(ies) and operations are disaster resilient.
4. The organization has developed and maintains Disaster Operations Plans which will enable the organization to safeguard employees and clients, carry out its disaster mission, and resume essential operations.
5. The organization has entered into formal agreements necessary to carry out the Disaster Operations Plans.
6. The organization has plans in place to accept donations and utilize volunteers, as necessary, to carry out its Disaster Operations Plans.
7. The organization trains employees and volunteers on the Disaster Operations Plans and exercises the plans on a regular basis.
8. The organization conducts client education on disaster preparedness and its disaster mission.
9. The organization is prepared to participate in long-term recovery for the organization and for the larger community.

The large group broke into smaller groups to discuss each proposed standard element. The workshop was structured to engage representatives from government, academic, CBO/FBO and philanthropic sectors in a discussion and assessment of the proposed "Elements of the Strawman Standard," and program activities that would indicate organization disaster response capabilities. Care was taken to assure that each small group included representation from all of the stakeholders participating in the workshop. Participants discussed, evaluated, and ranked each element. In addition to offering specific comments on elements and indicators, participants also voted on their preferences for inclusion in a final standard. The voting produced both a preference for inclusion, as well as a ranking of importance. Small group report outs were scheduled for after the lunch break.

Luncheon Speaker

David Bonowitz, Structural Engineer and Facility Resilience Consultant working with Fritz Institute, delivered a lunchtime presentation discussing effective facility resilience in a post-disaster environment (See appendix VII). He addressed the issue of facility resilience in terms of delivery of post-disaster services in addition to life, safety, and occupancy issues.

After a review of the conventional method for determining performance objectives for a facility – immediate occupancy, life safety, or collapse prevention – Mr. Bonowitz presented the concept of engineering for resilience. Integral to that concept is that the Disaster Mission, defining the disaster role of the organization, also defines the *purpose* and *role* of the organization's building(s) and facilities and establishes the criteria for how the buildings need to perform in a disaster. A 'resilience performance statement' would define what damage or disruption would be acceptable, how long it would take to reoccupy the structure, and the how long it would take to restore the structure from an austere state to its pre-disaster capability. That is, by knowing what services the organization is most likely to deliver in the post-disaster environment, the role and necessity of the building in the delivery of those services is better understood. Then, the demands that will be placed upon the facility and the priority in securing the building so that it remains operable become clearer. This will, in turn, help to educate as to the extent in which the facilities need to be secured in disaster preparation and mitigation of damage.

After his presentation, the participants engaged in a discussion and asked questions around facility resilience and the means for securing their facilities. Concerns were expressed as to the need for technical assistance to determine the level of facility safety and structural capability. There were also questions raised regarding the number of organizations that do not own their physical structures and the influence that the organizations have with the building owners to further secure the structures.

Bonowitz offered some ideas and resources to help CBOs to secure their buildings and facilities. Many of those suggestions are provided at a cost. A group suggestion was that structural engineers who work with government agencies should pool their resources to help CBOs and nonprofit service providers to secure their structures. The discussion centered primarily on the need for assistance and obstacles to structural resilience rather than the role of the structure in the determination and delivery of the organizations' disaster missions.

Feedback on the Strawman Standard and Potential Indicators

Following the luncheon speaker each of the small groups reported out on their impressions of the strawman standard in general and each element in particular. Generally, the CBO participants found the package of standard elements and potential indicators somewhat overwhelming. There was general concern expressed that the wording of the standard elements was formal and sort of "government-speak." It was suggested that "guidelines" or "milestones" for achieving disaster resiliency may be more readily embraced than a more structured "standard". Several participants noted that without the system of technical assistance and support provided through the DRO program, the nine elements might seem totally overwhelming. It was a clear consensus of the group that successful implementation of the standard would require technical assistance.

Overall impressions of the individual standards were reported by the small groups. Feedback is summarized below.

1. The organization has defined its disaster mission and it is embraced by the organization leadership.
 - The organization's Disaster Mission is the foundation and directs/supports all other elements of preparedness.
 - The Disaster Mission should reflect what is appropriate to the CBO; therefore, the element should recognize that each CBO would have a unique Disaster Mission tailored to the CBO's capacity, its community's needs and its contextual role in disaster response.
 - It should be clear that the CBO's Disaster Mission is separate from and not a simple reiteration of the agency's' day-to-day mission.
 - Some agencies may not have a Disaster Mission, but define their disaster role as supporting other agency's response.
2. The organization has identified the hazards it faces and has assessed the impacts on the organization's operations.
 - This element received lukewarm reception as participants commented that the task of considering "all" potential hazards to the organization and organizational responses may be overwhelming and unachievable without specific technical assistance. Maybe the standard should focus on "what" could happen, rather than "why."
 - Considering specific hazards is difficult as different types of hazards require different types of planning – e.g. the difference between the planning approach for pandemics and other public health emergencies vs. disasters affecting the physical environment.
 - The resources of the academic, NGO, and government sectors need to be brought to bear in supporting the CBO sector.
 - Many hazards are external to the organizations, but would impact supply chains and the ability of agencies to provide services.
3. The organization's facility(ies) and operations are disaster resilient.
 - Although the importance of having resilient facilities was recognized, many facilities are not owned by the CBOs and, as such, they have little influence on the maintenance, repair, and retrofit decisions by the owners.
 - CBOs expressed serious doubts that they have the ability to improve the disaster resilience of their facilities.
 - Participants noted that they need technical assistance to assess the resilience of their facilities before a disaster and to determine the safety of their facilities for occupancy and use after a disaster.
4. The organization has developed and maintains Disaster Operations Plans which will enable the organization to safeguard employees and clients, carry out its Disaster Mission, and resume essential operations.

- There were numerous comments that while worthy, the achievement of this element would require a commitment of technical assistance to CBOs.
 - Many participants believed that passive, “fill in the blank” templates would not result in meaningful planning.
 - Plans must be relevant to the realities of disasters and consistent with the objectives of life safety, reestablishing operations, and sustaining operations.
 - Element 4 (Disaster Operations Plans) is linked to Element 5 (Disaster Specific Agreements) to the degree that the successful implementation of DOP and COOP needs to address collaboration and partnerships—CBOs cannot plan in a vacuum.
 - In addition to technical assistance in developing plans, CBOs would need assistance to identify resources necessary to implement a plan.
5. The organization has entered into formal agreements necessary to carry out the Disaster Operations Plans.
- The wording of the element suggests that this is the responsibility of CBOs. Many CBO participants felt the element should be re-worded to indicate that this is a multi-faceted process in which government, CBOs, and philanthropy share responsibilities. CBOs/FBOs need more than agreements. They need to be at the planning table during training and in the local government’s emergency operations centers (EOCs) during response to ensure coordination.
 - You cannot fulfill this element with ‘handshake agreements,’ although disaster agreements need to be flexible to account for the uncertainty of disaster needs.
 - Agreements need to be accompanied by communications protocols and systems to allow for their implementation.
 - Nonprofit partners and peers need to be included.
 - A standard Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) would facilitate the agreement process. However, it should be flexible and not overly restrictive.
 - This element should focus on building relationships and collaboration rather than just on formal agreements.
6. The organization has plans in place to accept donations and utilize volunteers, as necessary, to carry out the Disaster Operations Plans.
- Organizations need to identify and articulate their potential needs for volunteers to volunteer centers and/or government agencies on a pre-incident basis. There is little or no consensus on the role of government in the management of volunteers.
 - Organizations need to separate the issues of monetary donations, donated goods and services, and volunteer management, and address each with a distinct plan.
 - There were concerns that some CBOs, due to the nature of their missions, could not readily use volunteers.
 - The issue of donations and volunteers needs to be integrated with a media strategy that can articulate the organization’s needs, particularly with regard to averting unwanted material donations or routing spontaneous volunteers through appropriate channels.
 - Organizations need to anticipate and plan for non-requested and unneeded volunteers and material goods.
7. The organization trains employees and volunteers on the Disaster Operations Plans and exercises the plans on a regular basis.

- Some participants felt that the client communication addressed under Element 8, should be re-characterized as client training or education under this training element.
 - If the organization anticipates using them, there is a need to train spontaneous volunteers on the operation of the agency when they arrive (“just in time” training).
 - Participants felt that the highest priority should be placed on personal preparedness and employee training to ensure staff is available and able to perform when disaster strikes. Individual CBOs should coordinate and collaborate with peer organizations on training -- share training resources and build collaborative relations to support response.
 - Government agencies should seek to involve CBOs in exercises on a regular basis. Participants recognized challenges associated with this objective due to the large numbers of CBOs and the lack of funding to support such activity.
 - Individual CBOs should not be burdened with exercising and training with local government, unless the local government explicitly relies on the organization for a critical response function.
 - CBO staff should be cross-trained for disaster response roles and training should be provided to Board of Directors (BoD) members to increase their awareness and knowledge of disaster-related roles and responsibilities.
 - Training could be graduated and scaled to need. Everyone would have awareness and personal protection training. Staff would be trained to fulfill their disaster roles, BoD would be trained on their role in policy level issues.
 - Scenario driven tabletop exercises prove to be particularly cost-effective and useful in illustrating disaster roles and responsibilities and gaining executive buy-in at CBOs.
 - Questions remain regarding who needs to be trained, frequency of training, and the types of training that should be offered.
8. The organization conducts client education on disaster preparedness and its Disaster Mission.
- Many participants felt that while client education is a positive thing, this element is not well defined. What does ‘client education’ mean? Is the client / community the individual or larger neighborhood? What is the particular importance of the client understanding the Disaster Mission?
 - This element does not fall within the mission of many CBOs and is not feasible for many organizations to undertake.
 - This is more appropriately a role of local government and should not be a element of a standard for CBO preparedness.
 - Whatever an individual organization does under this element, it should be coordinated with local government disaster education programs and NERT/CERT activities.
9. The organization is prepared to participate in long-term recovery for the organization and for the larger community.
- This appeared to be the most complex element of the standard. Many participants believed that this element was not directly within the power of the CBOs to control.

- Clearly this is not the sole responsibility of CBOs. State and local government agencies and philanthropies need to come to the table to support disaster operations by CBOs. Local agencies need to take the lead in drafting MOUs with CBOs.
- There is a need for technical support to CBOs about government eligibility rules and documentation and accounting requirements necessary to secure government funding. Tools and workshops should be developed to assist CBOs.
- Organizations should think about liability and insurance issues as it relates to volunteers, particularly Good Samaritan provisions.

Workshop Ranking of the Strawman Standard Elements

Participants were asked to express their preferences for which elements should be included in a final standard. The voting produced both a preference for inclusion, as well as a ranking of importance.

While eight of the nine draft elements received overwhelmingly positive votes, participants from the CBO sector questioned their responsibility for owning Element 5, Disaster Specific Agreements; Element 8, Client and Community Education; and, Element 9, Post-Disaster Financial Stability. With regard to Element 5, CBO participants suggested that the responsibility for the relationship between their sector and government was shared with government, and that the onus of initiation and maintenance of the link between government and the CBO sector should not solely rest, as suggested by the strawman standard, on the CBO sector.

CBO participants responded similarly to Element 9, Post-Disaster Financial Stability. Participants noted that the CBO sector was not financially independent and able to control the post-disaster funding environment; whereas, that environment was, to a great degree, the responsibility of government and the philanthropic sector. While CBOs were willing to engage in establishing contractual relationships for delivering post-disaster services with government and philanthropy, they felt the initiative was not in their sector, but at the discretion of government and philanthropy.

Element 8, Client and Community Education, received virtually no support. Workshop participants stated that they believed public disaster education was the responsibility of the broader government community and was not within the scope or resources of the CBOs.

The following were the results of the ranking of importance of the strawman standard elements. No votes were recorded for including Element 2, Hazard Identification, or Element 8, Client and Community Education, in the standard.

Rank 1	Standard Element 4: Disaster Operations Plans
Rank 2	Standard Element 7: Training and Exercises
Rank 3	Standard Element 1: Disaster Mission
Rank 4	Standard Element 9: Financial Stability
Rank 5 (tie)	Standard Element 3: Post-Disaster Facility Resilience
Rank 5 (tie)	Standard Element 5: Disaster Specific Agreements
Rank 7	Standard Element 6: Donations and Volunteers

Standards Implementation Strategy Options

To open the second day of the workshop, **Dale Rose, Ph.D.** presented a set of alternative strategies for implementing a program of standards and managing the process for assessing and certifying organizational disaster response capacity - compliance with the standard (See Appendix VIII). Dr. Rose noted that the benefit of establishing a standard -- increased capacity to serve client groups after a disaster -- results from a structured process of assessing compliance with the standard, and certification or attestation that an organization met established criteria (indicators of capacity). Assessments as well as certification can take a variety of forms that reflect the nature and type of the established standard. All of the processes, outlined below, assume the formal establishment of an accepted standard of performance, and credible indicators of capacity and compliance, as well as an organizational structure for administration, maintenance, or ownership of the standard.

Assessment can take three basic forms: Self-assessment, referred to as first party assessment; customer, purchaser or funder assessment, referred to as second party assessment, or Independent or peer assessment or external audit, referred to as third party assessment.

Self- Assessment can comprise the entire evaluation process or the First tier in a more rigorous second or third party assessment process. It can serve as a baseline statement of capacity against which gaps to full standard compliance can be identified. It is the least onerous and invasive; the nature of self-assessments, however, often results in a less objective evaluation of an organization's compliance with standards.

Second Party Assessments refers to an evaluation of compliance with the standard by a customer or funder and may involve a document audit or review, assessment of procedures and capacity, an audit of a self assessment or self assessment; and a site visit to verify documentation. A second party assessment can be conducted by an association of sector members (peer) or by a collaboration of funders.

Third Party, Independent Assessments would be conducted by an independent entity having no direct exchange relationship with the agency being evaluated. Third party assessments are usually initiated with a self-assessment and documentation of compliance effort, followed by an in-depth site visit, document review, and interviews with stakeholders, and it might be undertaken by associations within a sector or by independent auditors. The assessment of the emergency management function in government agencies typically falls into this category of review.

The third party assessment is generally considered the most objective and credible, but also the most costly in staff time and for fees that are typically paid for assessment, evaluation and certification. This type of assessment would also require an organizational framework and independent entity to maintain the standard and sustain the assessment and certification process, elements that do not exist now.

Using a Maturity Model for Standard Implementation, Assessment, and Mentoring

Initiating a standards process necessitates recognizing that there will be a ramping up to the point of acceptance and organizations meeting an evolving standard. Affected organizations will need a reasonable amount of time to transition into a process to comply with standard elements. Most workshop participants agreed that the most appropriate approach would be the adoption of

a maturity model that would provide for gradual, stepped levels of compliance, recognizing and rewarding incremental performance improvement. Further, most felt that there would be little or no benefit to the CBO sector by employing a pass/fail compliance model in which organizations would have to comply with all elements of the standard for initial recognition. For example, in lieu of full compliance with a standard, an organization could be deemed to be in partial or conditional compliance with a standard either as a whole, or with specific elements of the standard.

A maturity model recognizes that preparedness is achieved in stages. Such a process would provide a threshold for compliance and acknowledge less than full compliance as a level of maturity of compliance. Initial recognition of an agency's achievement could describe compliance in terms of a percentage of fulfilling a standard element. A maturity model would recognize where an organization is in the compliance process and serve as an ongoing assessment of capacity for improving performance. This approach also encourages the use of mentoring and organization interventions to assist and guide the standard compliance process.

A maturity model with structured peer mentoring and technical assistance may be the most appropriate approach in initiation of a preparedness standard process in the CBO sector, and is currently being considered by the DHS PS/PREP program as the most appropriate approach for small businesses and the nonprofit sector.

Workshop participants broke into small groups to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each type of assessment.

Self –Assessment and Certification of Compliance (First party)

- Pro – self-empowering; good first step; engages organization; minimal cost; feedback allows for modifications to standard; educational tool
- Con – internal not external (e.g. assessment of plays well with others); can overstate compliance; may not be possible for all standard element (e.g. facility resilience); agency may not have technical expertise to complete the assessment; rose-colored glasses; difficult to know what should be measuring against

Peer-assessment and certification; or funder compliance assessment (Second party)

- Pro – adding another party adds something to standard; more objective; builds relationship with assessing party; provides another perspective; those doing this assessment maybe closer to the organization being assessed – empowering; already being approached in health care community in grant process
- Con – builds compliance-based mood; work for consultants; rely on outside expertise; philanthropy wants to know but if organization feels won't do well may be unwilling to participate; potential adversarial role; who is able to do this

Assessment and certification by an independent organization (Third party)

- Pro – community- and peer-based (for community that has enough peers to participate); subject matter expertise to support efforts; strengthens capacity of organization (if part of organization process rather than pure certification); experience with EMAP – more palatable if peer team is constituted of individuals that you know (if not personally than by jurisdiction) – regional model; perceived validity

- Con – costly, burdensome; less flexible; requires infrastructure; scary; potential punitive; expensive, time-consuming, who is qualified to do this; documentation burdensome; some may not be able participate; expensive, time-consuming, who is qualified to do this; documentation burdensome; some may not be able participate

Participants suggested that a combination of the various assessment methodologies would be most beneficial and achievable. They also thought that some standard elements, such as Disaster Mission, were most logically self-assessed, where as others, such as the adequacy of a plan may be better assessed by someone from outside of the organization. It was also suggested that regional collaboration on implementing and assessing the standard would be desirable. The group also overwhelmingly preferred approaching standards implementation through a maturity model rather than a pass/fail approach.

Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) and COOP Tool

After discussion of the options for implementing a CBO preparedness standard, the workshop shifted to a discussion of a specific component of the strawman standard, specifically having an organization continuity of operations plan (COOP). Eileen Baumgardner gave an overview of a proposed COOP tool. She stated that the draft COOP presented was based on work that being done by Deloitte in the Washington, DC area and in Southern California.

She said that COOP provides a framework for the resilience effort and can help CBOs continue essential operations during a variety of situations, from the very localized event to a region-wide catastrophic disaster. A COOP can help by addressing succession of leadership, reducing or mitigating disruptions to essential operations and protection of essential assets (including personnel, data, and facilities). Many of the steps needed to develop a COOP are similar to the elements of the standard -- identifying a COOP planning team, defining the organization's essential functions, and identifying hazards and vulnerabilities. She said that after organization's have identified these hazards, they must determine what resources they need to carry out each essential function (key personnel / chain of command, decision making authority, facilities) in the face of that hazard. Ms. Baumgardner added that they must also identify alternatives for each resource that they need in order to carry out essential functions. The COOP, when completed, should be supported by procedures and checklists and by a training and exercise program.

Sharron Leao, Director Disaster and Preparedness, CaliforniaVolunteers delivered remarks regarding future implementation of the COOP planning tools. The draft tool provided for discussion at the workshop was just that, a discussion draft. CaliforniaVolunteers' objective was to solicit the participants' input on what tools will be helpful to CBOs in implementing COOP. Ms. Leao said that whatever the group determines is the appropriate tool is the tool that will be used. She said that her team has based the COOP document off of a good model that others are using. She encouraged participants to offer all feedback such as, "Do we take it in phases?" "Does it come all in a package?" "If you were to invest funding into a tool, or tools, what would it be?"

Participants then broke into small groups to discuss the document. Workshop participants noted that:

- A simpler (or scalable) tool would be helpful for smaller organizations;
- The steps should be tiered or prioritized, so that the most critical items are addressed first;

- Instead of 'list all' for tool elements (e.g. 'list all essential functions'), that the tool focus on the top three or top ten; and,
- It was difficult to determine which elements should be in the COOP, in the Emergency Operations Plan, or both (or the option of a combined plan).
- The usability of the tool would be improved if it were written using language familiar to the CBO community, rather than 'government speak.'
- There are existing CBO COOP templates, such as that developed in Santa Clara County, that could be used as a model.
- The draft tool seemed to focus on filling in the boxes rather than developing a process and interaction between planning team members.

Participants expressed a desire for hands-on technical assistance and additional funding to complete the COOP process. Sector-specific workshops were suggested as a way to provide technical assistance and share information while at the same time building alliances that could be reflected in the COOPs. They also thought examples of best practices - such as a good phone tree, paper-based financial tracking procedures, sample MOUs, or vendor stand-by agreements - would be helpful for those that did not already have these procedures or job aids in place.

It was suggested that COOP-related training focus not only on the process and implementing a specific plan but on developing skills, such as strategic decision making, quickly shifting gears, necessary to carry out a COOP. They also thought a one-page business case for COOP would be useful in selling a Board of Directors on supporting the process. It was also mentioned that, for some organizations, there may be resistance to the entire topic of COOP or disaster preparedness due to cultural sensitivities or superstitions. A different marketing and communications process may be needed to reach these populations.

APPENDICES

- I. Workshop Agenda
- II. Workshop Attendees
- III. Kathleen Tierney, Ph.D., University of Colorado, Boulder, *How Do We Measure Disaster Preparedness -- And How Do San Francisco CBOs Measure Up?*
- IV. June Gin, Ph.D., *CBO Disaster Resilience, Lessons from the San Francisco Disaster Resilient Organization (DRO) Process.*
- V. Eileen Baumgardner, *Disaster Resilient Standards*
- VI. Strawman Standard Elements and Indicators
- VII. David Bonowitz, Structural Engineer, *Resilience: A New Basis for Earthquake Engineering*
- VIII. Dale Rose, PhD, *Assessment, Compliance and Certification*

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS AND PRESENTATIONS PROVIDE TO WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

- VIII. Eileen Baumgardner, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS, COOP and Organization Resilience
- IX. Eileen Baumgardner, *Background Paper for the Development and Application of Disaster Resilience Standards for Community and Faith Based Organizations*
- X. *Glossary of Terms*