



International Commission for Alpine Rescue

## ICAR Membership Survey 2017 Results

I. Total Respondents: 73

II. Membership Type:

Type A	31
Type B	25
Type C	6
Honorary	6
Unknown	<u>5</u>
Total	73

III. Countries: 28  
Continents: 6

IV. Average Time: 7m55s

V. Results:

1. Should direct operational involvement in mountain rescue be the main criteria to be a voting member of the ICAR?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
37.5%	34.72%	8.33%	12.5%	6.94%

2. Should mountain rescue organizations representing national or nationally significant services have an increased number of votes versus those that do not?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
27.4%	31.51%	13.7%	13.7%	13.7%

3. Should ICAR members that perform only support services, such as training, have a vote in ICAR decisions?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5.48%	31.51%	26.03%	23.29%	13.7%

4. Should ICAR members that are Alpine/Mountaineering Clubs or academic institutions have a vote in ICAR decisions?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5.48%	26.03%	27.4%	23.29%	17.81%

5. Should ICAR members that exclusively operate within the area of one or two ICAR commissions, or only in a defined season of the year, have less votes than those that operate in all or most of the ICAR commission areas, or operate in all seasons?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17.81%	21.92%	21.92%	30.14%	8.22%

6. Should equipment manufacturers or retail providers have a vote in ICAR decisions?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.37%	2.74%	2.74%	36.99%	56.16%

7. Should equipment manufacturers have increased opportunity to present their products at ICAR Congresses?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10.96%	53.42%	21.92%	6.85%	6.85%

8. Should equipment manufacturers be offered demonstration times in the Practical Day at ICAR Congresses?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15.07%	63.01%	10.96%	9.59%	1.37%

9. Should ICAR members that have the potential of financial or commercial gain declare such and abstain from voting on any ICAR decision that may be beneficial to them?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
35.62%	41.1%	16.44%	2.74%	4.11%

10. Do you have concerns over the widening ICAR membership and the current voting structure?

Yes	No
40.3%	59.7%

10. (cont.) Comments (Yes Votes):

1. I think the paragraph 3 of the statutes as appropriate.
2. Direct operational involvement in mountain rescue should be the main criteria to be a voting member of the ICAR. The exchange of experience between such organizations is unique to the ICAR and should define the framework of the annual meetings. Specialists/academics should be invited to inform and shed light on intriguing practical questions without having the privilege to conclude. The practical work day in the mountain is an important opportunity to enhance the sharing of experience. Work in smaller groups, preferably in groups speaking their mothertonge
3. Too many members without pure mountain rescue experience and too many votes with commercial gains.
4. Too many members and too many votes of members / organisations with commercial gain.
5. Based on the questions asked within this survey, I would state that those who face the risk (mountain rescuers) should be the ones who have to manage it, and this risk management at all levels: be it on the mountain during a rescue, or in the development of organisational capability or standards nationally or internationally; should not be disrupted or unbalanced by governance arrangements that disturb the focus of mountain rescue, which is the preservation of life. Enfranchising other prerogatives should not be entertained, especially when it comes to setting out recommendations within the REC series. Thanking you
6. It seems as do that admission criteria are not as strict as they should be and that different services are able to deceive ICAR in what they do. For example, Red Cross form Serbia that does not practice rescue in Serbia (Mountain Rescue Service Serbia does) or Mountain rescue organization of Federation Bosnia and Herzegovina who are practicing it as do it is a hobby of theirs. It seems as do that some services have financial interest in being a ICAR member in a way that they can use that membership to gain some financial assets in their countries and not the development and growth of a service and that the current criteria for admission are not able to recognize that.
7. I am more concerned about the conflicts of interest at ICAR that go completely unchecked rather than the dilution of votes. Voting on the right questions is more of an issue than who votes. Side note - The Avalanche Commission has been struggling for several years and warrants attention from the executive.
8. As we restart our activity in ICAR this year (hopefully) after five years, I'm not on the latest update about the ICAR. But we think that ICAR members have

the same rights, but also the same duty.

9. We have concerns about the widening ICAR membership, since B-members are entitled to vote at the delegates assembly and may not have the necessary technical and practical skills.

10. You should not change the current system that A-members have more votes than B-members and that C-members have no vote. There are some A-members that shouldn't be an A-member. The difference should be done more consequentially.

11. ICAR shouldn't become a wider, sort of a UN organization for everybody that has something to do with rescue and disaster relief. The major benefits from ICAR membership is to be able to discuss the narrow and specific technical rescue topics among the members of the ICAR organization in a focused and unpolluted manner.

12. Item 6: differentiate between organizational matters (no) and technical matters (yes) Item 9: declare commercial interest or gain, but do not abstain from vote Item 10: definitely needs an update

13. For the widening of ICAR the new members should primarily be focused on mountain rescue, education and prevention tasks. A voting on AoD of ICAR seems to be the delegates abstaining from voting. A suggestion has been made that delegates could only vote yes/no at the general assembly.

14. Due to the distance from South Africa to Europe, and the costs of full membership, we are Type C members, with no vote. Therefore, I find it strange and worrying that a single Alpine club can have voting rights, but a national rescue organization such as the Mountain Club of South Africa (with 5 rescue teams, nationally) and a regional rescue body such as the Wilderness Search and Rescue in Cape Town, comprising about 20 professional and volunteer organizations, cannot get a vote. We are the biggest and best organized rescue organizations in Africa, but due to resource constraints, we cannot become full members. That should not count against us contributing meaningfully to decisions that may involve the expansion of ICAR in Africa, that may not prove popular with Alpine rescue teams that may then vote against any proposals for growth of rescue resources in Africa. Rescue teams from low and middle income countries should be encouraged to join (as we have) and become FULL members, encouraged to contribute to the discourse around wilderness rescue (as we have). Thank you for this survey!

15. The more a national/international organisation is directly involved or is direct support for S&R the more votes it should have, not dissimilar to the current structure but expanded - this keeps ICAR managed by those national organisations that are practitioners or are direct support services Most often national/international

organisations often represent a specific group of practitioner organisations and provide leadership, direction and standards for them but are not directly S&R organisations in their own right

16. We think it is good that the members who understand the main point or the purpose of ICAR will join the ICAR congress, but as for the voting right, we don't think it is necessary to expand it.

17. We would like to welcome the members, who understand the main point or the purpose of ICAR, will join the ICAR congress, but, as for the voting right, we don't think it is necessary to expand it for them.

18. It could be that commercial or special interests, not within the purpose of ICAR will influence the organization.

19. ICAR has plenty of room to grow. Being closed minded is a bad idea for growth. This question pertains to the above, second part of question #1. It's clear that National Leadership is key, but not at the cost of stifling other organizations who have something to offer. Perhaps some consideration of what the goals of ICAR are should be considered more when the term "widening" is used. MRA teams are only a portion of the teams and entities involved in alpine rescue worldwide, but are a higher percentage in the USA, for example. It's important to stay focused on the mission statement of ICAR, and not our own.

20. Organizations covering less than a whole nation (or at least a U.S state or Canadian province) should have less or no votes. If each relevant U.S state have several membership organizations with one vote each, there will over time become a shift of the power of decisionmaking in ICAR.

21. This is actually two questions in one. In the first part, it is unclear what is meant by 'widening ICAR membership'. It can be interpreted as increasing the size of the members or can be interpreted as the criteria that would qualify an organization to become a member of ICAR. In the second part, the current voting structure seemingly does not reflect the type of organizations that are uniformly applied.

22. The ICAR should remain a neutral and unbiased institution. Recommendations serve the security of rescue forces regardless of commercial interests.

23. We believe the voting structure utilised by EAWS (assignment of a fixed amount of votes to each country) should be considered by ICAR. Other comments: ad pt 2 - national services are not always active in mountain rescue in various countries, thus it not always appears as sensible to provide them with advantage in voting. ad pt 7 - expansion of exhibition space as well as further presentations of manufacturers' products appear as acceptable, whereas taking up

vital congress time (commissions) is unacceptable. ad pt 8 - allowing manufacturers supplementary presentation space during Practical Day appears as sensible, yet core of Practical Day should be composed of workshops created and hosted by rescue organisations.

24. Its important that voting members are involved in mountain rescue. This is to provide objectiv decisions whitout people or organizations that will make earnings if they participate. Its also high time, that ICAR form a nomination committee. Thats the normal way to appoint participants to the ICAR board. Under the current circumstances, the ICAR board members, do this work themselves. Thats not satisfactory, It should be a objectiv nomination comittee.

25. Voting membership within ICAR should be well defined. This should be operational groups that do mountain rescue. Support groups that provide training should be a resource (and encouraged to attend) but should not have voting status. Training providers should not be voting members.

26. Suggest link the voting membership to commitments, e.g. provision of statistics about frequencies of fatalities, accidents, rescue missions etc. It is sad that ICAR is not able to collect basic data about its own activities. National rescue organizations that represent the main area within a country should be given more votes.

27. ICAR real rescue organizations are becoming marginal in the voting structure. Increase the votes for the real rescue organizations.

28. In our organisation, should decide only mountain rescue structures, who fulfill their duties all over the year and in all manners.

29. ICAR and the world of Mountain Rescue should of course also bring in other areas of knowledge into the organizations as for an exemple Snow Science, Prevention and Educations/communication strategies.

30. As the delegate for an academic center and B member, I agree that having 1 number of vote can be considered as disproportionate as even the biggest and most important organizations have a maximum of 2 votes. The option of 1 (or 2) vote per organisation per commission is attractive. In my case for example I could have 1 vote as my organization will be active only in the medical comission. We could imagine that a medical member of an A organisation in the medical commission would have 2 votes. A member A which would be active in the medical, avalanche and terrestrial commission would have  $3 \times 2 = 6$  votes. Me as a B member only active in the medical commission would only have 1 vote. I think this way to do would allow for a gentle transition without conflicts. Thank you for your work.