

# Review of: "Solving tensions within Technical Rescue in England and Wales"

Pawel Kroh<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pedagogical University of Cracow

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Author,

In MR in my country we have both professionalists and volunteers in one organization which is divided into regional groups. We have clear one training system, that have to be fulfilled by all members, whatever are they profs or voluntary members, and whatever former experience they have (mountain climbing, sport climbing, caving/pot-holing or just 'non-technical mountaineers').

In my opinion and experience as instructor of both, mountain rescue and climbing, training of mountain rescuer and training of climber are two different things. Climber is a person who goes to mountains for pleasure and sport, with one colleague who also do it for the same reasons. Climbing associations and instructors are training their trainees for such activity and eventually for self-rescue in small team. All activities are done for your own risk. Your mistakes cause your/yours partner death, not the third party. This is completely different perspective (ethic and juridical) when you organize rescue mission and victim's life lies on your competences. Exchange of knowledge between MR and other organizations (the Mountain Training Association, the Association of Mountaineering Instructors, the British Association of International Mountain Leaders, and British Mountain Guide) have to be continuous, but decisions of recommended rescue technics have to be done only by MR. The ICAR and the UIAA are two different bodies... Presenting of MREW problems and solutions is the interesting core of the paper and should be discussed. The results of these problems and solutions on safety and effectiveness – also.

But, to be honest, I do not understand mixing this organizational perspective with anchor building problems. Building the triangle anchor in climbing is a mistake, sometimes risky mistake. Building the triangle for technical rescue (with possible perspective of short dynamic load of medic+victim or even medic+rescuer+victim) is a critical mistake and it doesn't matter if you are climber, fire fighter, MRescuer, caver, volunteer, professionalist or whoever. It's not a 'way of doing sth', it's not a 'solution in our group', it's not a 'traditional way of doing' – it's a critical mistake. It doesn't matter in what organizational structure. Critical mistake is a critical mistake with nowadays knowledge in every training program. As well as clipping belay loop to the victim's leg loop. None of harness' producers would say, that one leg loop is dedicated for hanging/belaying even if one of the magazines have done some tests. That's why we have ICAR and its recommendations and annual meetings.

Every MRescuer have done critical mistakes during his trainings/missions. Every such mistake should be evaluated and

discussed from point of view 'how adapt our training to avoid such mistakes in future'. Every such a discussion should influence training program. I understands idea of the Author, of course. I understand that heterogeneity of MREW presented in paper do not make easy to have homogenous training program. But trying to create a link between perspective for running whole country association and perspective of one-element-training does not appeal to me. It could be, that my language skills are not good enough and I did not caught sense written between the lines, only literally text. If so, sorry for too severe evaluation.

Best regards,

Pawel

I do not have detailed comments for 'the anchor part' because it's not technical paper J. I cannot to have detailed comments for the 'organizational section', because I'm not British and I have just learned this structure from the paper. That's why I put only general comments on my review. See you in mountains ;-).