# Emergency Exercise Evaluation Tool

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Emergency exercise initiator**  |  |
| **Site operator**  |  |
| **Relevant DG licence number(s)** |  |
| **Location of exercise** |  |
| **Date and time of exercise** |  |
| **Nature of emergency exercise** |  |
| **Other participating stakeholders** |  |

| **No.** | **Item** | **Finding** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Y** | **N** | **NA = Not applicable NC = Not checked****PA = Partially addressed** |
| **1.** | **Documentation** |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | Has a documented emergency plan been used? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.2 | Is the emergency plan current? *Note the following key review drivers:** *review at intervals of not more than 3 years: r. 75(5)(d) of the Dangerous Goods Safety (Storage and Handling of Non-Explosives) Regulations 2007*
* *significant changes to on- and off-site inventory*
* *significant changes to process*
* *new risks including major incident scenarios*
* *changes to off-site land use*
* *on- and off-site population changes*
* *changes regarding incident response capability (including mutual aid).*
 | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.3 | Have pre-incident plans which directly relate to dangerous goods/major incident scenarios for the facility been used?  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.4 | Were relevant stakeholders consulted as part of the emergency and pre-incident plan development process?  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.5 | Have exercise objectives been clearly defined and documented? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.6 | Are exercise objectives relevant to managing dangerous goods/major incident scenarios? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.7 | Are the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the exercise clear and documented? *Consider the importance of delineation of command between internal and external personnel and the handover of incident control to the Department of Fire and Emergency Services.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.8 | Was use made of procedures to inform the community about actions to take for a dangerous situation/major incident?*Refer to Schedule 4 Cl. 4(3)(c) of the Dangerous Goods Safety (Major Hazard Facilities) Regulations 2007 for statutory requirements.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 1.9 | Was the information required to be provided to adjacent sites used? *This being information about:* * *the risk and what may happen in a dangerous situation*
* *what to do if a dangerous situation occurs*
* *what the operator will do if a dangerous situation occurs*
* *how occupiers of adjacent sites can contact the operator.*
 | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| **2.** | **Participant actions** |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Did emergency responders approach the incident scene and establish a control point with consideration given to the nature of the major incident?*Consider toxic gas releases, wind direction, thermal effects, overpressure and shrapnel effects, clear egress routes.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.2 | Was an incident management team or similar formed? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.3 | Did the incident management team suitably locate so as not to be adversely impacted by the major incident?*This location will need to be suitable for combined incident management team activities including external responders and their personnel.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.4 | Was consideration given to an alternative control point (e.g. in the event of changes in wind direction)?  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.5 | Were muster, evacuation, protect-in-place activities conducted as planned? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.6 | Was a designated person (e.g. incident controller) in place who demonstrated overall control of the incident? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.7 | Was access and egress to the site and incident zones suitably managed?*Consider the provision of escorts for receiving external support such as ambulances.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.8 | Were external stakeholders managed effectively? *The following items will usually require consideration:** *stakeholder briefings*
* *role delineation*
* *parking*
* *joint media front with emergency services*
* *accommodation, catering, toilets.*

*Note that the Department of Fire and Emergency Services, Police, Ambulance service, Department of Mines and Petroleum, neighbours, local government, Department of Environment, Water Corporation, Western Power, Salvation Army and others, could be involved.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.9 | Were decontamination measures taken and performed effectively and efficiently when and where required? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.10 | Have exercise participants demonstrated that they can carry out the activities for which they have responsibility? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.11 | Have exercise participants demonstrated that they know when emergency personnel are to respond and withdraw from an incident? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.12 | Did participants consider domino escalation effects? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.13 | Was the conduct of the exercise carefully recorded? *Positive and negative aspects should be captured.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.14 | Was exercise information clearly logged and displayed for the incident management team? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 2.15 | Was the use of terminology consistent with external agencies, especially the Department of Fire and Emergency Services? *This is particularly important regarding role titles in order to prevent confusion regarding who is the incident controller.*  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| **3.** | **Resources** |  |  |  |
| 3.1 | Were emergency responder resources sufficient and adequate?*Consider personal protective equipment (PPE), back-up crews, communications, leak control equipment, firefighting equipment, water, medical equipment, gas detection equipment.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 3.2 | Were external resources used in the exercise such as mutual aid, emergency services? *The site operator needs to be able to maintain an awareness of external resources and capabilities which it might rely upon.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 3.3 | Did the incident management team have access to necessary resources and information?*Consider communications, manifests, technical drawings, maps, emergency plans, plant operating conditions, location of personnel, gas detector readings.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 3.4 | Did resources function as required (e.g. alarms, detectors, cameras)? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| **4.** | **Communications** |  |  |  |
| 4.1 | Were off-site stakeholders promptly alerted? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 4.2 | Were effective lines of communication established and maintained?*Consideration needs to be given to:** *internet access*
* *location and coverage provided by mobile phone towers*
* *effective range of communication equipment*
* *use and awareness of emergency channels*
* *use of communications equipment in hazardous areas.*
 | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 4.3 | Was the required information communicated as planned?*Pre-determined message content is important to consider in terms of clarity, conciseness and content.*  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| **5.** | **Post-exercise actions** |  |  |  |
| 5.1 | Was a debrief session undertaken with exercise participants?  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 5.2 | Is an exercise review session to be held for site management, relevant exercise participants and observers? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 5.3 | Are resulting exercise action items to be allocated to responsible persons and tracked to ensure completion? *A suitable system to track items should be in place.*  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| **6.** | **Important exercise considerations** | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.1 | Did the exercise involve stakeholders such as neighbouring facilities and emergency services? *Note that emergency services (if involved) are to be engaged at the level of command that would apply for the scale of incident involved.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.2 | Did the exercise include joint arrangements such as the provision of mutual aid and the engagement of off-site resources? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.3 | Were off-site health professionals involved in the exercise?*Consider if local hospitals are aware of how to treat chemically affected patients based on the chemicals on-site.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.4 | Were plant/equipment activities (e.g. isolation, blowdown, shutdown) simulated as part of the exercise? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.5 | Did the exercise allow scenario development based on the actions taken by the participants, rather than leading them through the exercise? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.6 | Did the exercise consider impacts to people, property and the environment? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.7 | Were tactical, operational and strategic elements of emergency response covered during the exercise? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.8 | Was the recovery phase covered during the exercise?  | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.9 | Were documented exercise performance standards used? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.10 | Are exercises performed on a regular basis following a documented rationale?*Rationale should be developed in consultation with external agencies if they are to be involved. Synergies can be achieved with aligned exercise schedules.* | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.11 | Do exercises focus on testing and improving the effectiveness of emergency arrangements? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.12 | Have different types of exercises been conducted at the facility over time (e.g. discussion-based, tabletop, field deployment types)? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| 6.13 | Has consideration been made of how a real incident would be communicated during the exercise (i.e. ‘no duff’)? | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |

*Notes:*

*The following information sources have been considered in the development of this document:*

*(i) United Kingdom Health & Safety Executive (UK HSE): www.hse.gov.uk*

*(ii) United States Federal Emergency Management Agency (US FEMA): www.fema.gov*

*(iii) Australasian Inter-service Incident Management System (AIIMS)*

**Further comments**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Summary**

|  |
| --- |
|  |