

Interagency Incident Management Team (IMT) Incident Evaluation

Purpose: This evaluation documents the performance of an interagency IMT on an incident assignment, evaluates consistency with the Delegation of Authority and Letter of Expectations/Leader's Intent, provides a summary of team's strengths and weaknesses, and suggests areas of possible improvement.

Who is responsible? This evaluation should be completed by the Agency Administrators (AA) who signed the delegation of authority. It should be delivered to the Incident Commander (IC) and discussed prior to the IMT's demobilization.

How should it be delivered? Honesty, clarity, and thoroughness are essential. Discussion should include how well we did as a team, the AAs and the IMT together. Written comments and the evaluation discussion are the most important parts of the process.

What happens with this evaluation? The IC is responsible for utilizing this evaluation with their team for continuous learning and improvement. Once complete, the AA will send the evaluation to the Geographic Area Coordinating Group (both for the incident and the IMT, if different) and the national Complex IMT (CIMT) Coordinator for any interagency CIMT assignments.

AA Name(s) / Title(s):

Agency Administrator(s) Contact Information:

Incident Commander(s)		Incident Type	
Incident Name		Incident Number	
Assignment Dates		Total Acres	
Host Agency		Evaluation Date	
Administrative Unit/Sub-Unit		Participating Agencies	

Please rate on a scale of 1 to 3 and provide comments for each question.

1 = Does not meet expectations. Any rating of 1 must have comments supporting *why* the IMT did not meet expectations.

2 = Meets expectations. A comment is encouraged but not required.

3 = Exceeds expectations. Any rating of 3 should have comments supporting *how* the IMT exceeded expectations.

Rating	Category	Comments
	<u>Command and Leadership</u> 1. The IMT was professional in assuming command of the incident. <i>Consider: quality of coordination with the outgoing organization, IC's effectiveness as a leader, function of Command and General Staff (C&G), professionalism of IMT</i>	
	2. The IMT was adequately prepared for the complexity of the incident and anticipated and responded to changing conditions. <i>Consider: timely communication and requests for assistance as needed</i>	

Rating	Category	Comments
	3. The IMT's actions aligned with the leader's intent described in the Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS) decision, Delegation of Authority, Leader's Intent document, and/or AA in-briefing. <i>Consider: values at risk identified and planned for, tactics commensurate and communicated; satisfactory progress towards objectives given the circumstances</i>	
	<u>Incident Management and Strategic Planning</u> 4. The IMT provided the appropriate level of management and support for assigned resources on the incident. <i>Consider: logistical challenges were addressed, feedback was accepted and utilized, coordination with adjacent incidents or units, use of shared and remote resources, initial attack support, use of local resources, trainees, and closest available forces</i>	
	5. The IC communicated appropriate staffing adjustments according to the changing complexity of the incident. The IC and C&G took actions to scale up or down as needed.	
	6. The IMT worked effectively with AAs to assess, communicate, and address risk.	
	<u>Cost</u> 7. The IMT effectively managed the cost of the incident in alignment with leader's intent and stated agency objectives and followed agency incident business operating guidelines. <i>Consider: adequate information for cost share agreements and other agency requirements</i>	
	<u>Communications and Relationships</u> 8. The IMT provided effective public and/or cooperator meetings.	

Rating	Category	Comments
	<i>Consider: frequency, quality of briefings, inclusion of appropriate staff in the scheduling, location, and presentation</i>	
	9. The IMT created a common operating picture for assigned resources, AAs, partners, and cooperators. <i>Consider: effective dialogue established to address concerns or issues such as altered strategies, significant events, and increased cost thresholds in a timely manner; multi-jurisdictional incidents with diverse stakeholder engagement</i>	
	10. The IMT anticipated and responded to natural, cultural, environmental, social, and political issues or concerns. <i>Consider: communications and coordination with partners, Resource Advisors, communities, and other agencies</i>	
	11. The IMT interacted effectively with other teams on or adjacent to the incident. <i>Consider: Buying Teams, Burned Area Emergency Response, Unified Command, etc.</i>	
	12. The IMT created a positive and inclusive work environment, including effectively communicating expectations of resources during briefings. <i>Consider: response to any human resources issues, demonstration of duty, respect, and integrity</i>	
	<u>Transition</u> 13. The IMT effectively and efficiently transitioned information and command to the next IMT, organization, or local unit, and the entire team remained engaged until the transfer of command was complete. <i>Consider: documentation, issues requiring further actions, priorities, long-term strategy, and resources and logistics</i>	

Rating	Category	Comments
	14. Overall rating of the IMT. <i>This should equal an average of the scores of each element unless one element was so significant as to result in a diversion from the average.</i>	

Additional Comments:

Signatures

Incident Commander	Date
Agency Administrator	Date
Agency Administrator	Date
Agency Administrator	Date
Agency Administrator	Date

Routing

Coordinating Group Chair or Representative (Incident)	Date
Coordinating Group Chair or Representative (IMT)	Date
NMAC CIMT Coordinator* (nicc.cimt@firenet.gov)	Date

*For interagency CIMT assignments only.