

CEN

CWA 16107

WORKSHOP

March 2010

AGREEMENT

ICS 13.200

English version

Emergency Services Capability Framework

This CEN Workshop Agreement has been drafted and approved by a Workshop of representatives of interested parties, the constitution of which is indicated in the foreword of this Workshop Agreement.

The formal process followed by the Workshop in the development of this Workshop Agreement has been endorsed by the National Members of CEN but neither the National Members of CEN nor the CEN Management Centre can be held accountable for the technical content of this CEN Workshop Agreement or possible conflicts with standards or legislation.

This CEN Workshop Agreement can in no way be held as being an official standard developed by CEN and its Members.

This CEN Workshop Agreement is publicly available as a reference document from the CEN Members National Standard Bodies.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom.



EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

Management Centre: Avenue Marnix 17, B-1000 Brussels

Contents

Page

Foreword.....	3
Introduction	4
1 Scope	5
2 Risk Assessment Process	5
3 Governance of Capability Planning	5
3.1 General.....	5
3.2 Integrated Major Emergency Management Response and Recovery	6
4 Capability Management.....	7
5 Environment.....	9
6 Stakeholder Values.....	9
7 Resources.....	9
8 Types of major emergencies	10
9 Training (Preparation)	16
10 Local Response (Response & Recovery).....	17
11 Regional Response & National Training (Response & Recovery).....	18
12 Transnational Training (Response & Recovery).....	19
13 Equipment	19
14 Personnel.....	19
15 Information	20
16 Concepts and Doctrines	20
17 Organisational Interoperability.....	21
18 Infrastructure.....	21
19 Logistics	21
20 Capability model	22
21 Emergency Impact Classification and Description.....	26
22 Terminology	27

Foreword

This CEN Workshop Agreement has been drafted and approved by a Workshop of representatives of interested parties on 2009-12-21, the constitution of which was supported by CEN following the public call for participation made on 2008-06-16/17.

A list of the individuals and organizations which supported the technical consensus are listed below :

Strathclyde fire and rescue, UK
 999 team org, UK
 European Emergency Number Association (EENA)
 World Association for Disaster & Emergency Medicine, (WADEM)
 Tjeter Ltd, the Netherlands
 Korps Landelijke Politiediensten (KLPD), the Netherlands
 International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM)
 Lane, Jefferies & Associates Ltd, UK

These organizations were drawn from Emergency Services area.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. CEN [and/or CENELEC] shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

The formal process followed by the Workshop in the development of the CEN Workshop Agreement has been endorsed by the National Members of CEN but neither the National Members of CEN nor the CEN-CENELEC Management Centre can be held accountable for the technical content of the CEN Workshop Agreement or possible conflict with standards or legislation. This CEN Workshop Agreement can in no way be held as being an official standard developed by CEN and its members.

The final review/endorsement round for this CWA was started on 2009-09-29 and was successfully closed on 2009-12-15. The final text of this CWA was submitted to CEN for publication on 2009-12-24.

This CEN Workshop Agreement is publicly available as a reference document from the National Members of CEN: AENOR, AFNOR, BSI, CSNI, CYS, DIN, DS, ELOT, EVS, IBN, IPQ, IST, HZN, LVS, LST, MSA, MSZT, NEN, NSAI, ON, PKN, SEE, SIS, SIST, SFS, SN, SNV, SUTN and UNI.

Comments or suggestions from the users of the CEN Workshop Agreement are welcome and should be addressed to the CEN-CENELEC Management Centre.

DG Justice, Law and Security has made the necessary funding available for this CEN Workshop Agreement.

Introduction

Emergency management seeks to promote safer, less vulnerable communities with the capacity to cope with hazards and disasters.

It is recognised that not all major emergencies are foreseeable but for those that are there is a statutory and moral obligation on the emergency services and other supporting organisations to determine the potential scale of the emergency and prioritisations of associated risks

Once the level of 'risk' is established emergency services have to consider their organisation's ability to provide a robust infrastructure and effective response. This is defined as capability. The purpose of this guidance is to provide a process for emergency services and other supporting organisations when considering their capability for responding to local, regional, national and transnational major emergencies.

Local Government/Authorities and the business sector may be involved particularly at the pre-planning stage to minimize the risks, improve defense and aid or to provide useful support to emergency services.

Emergency management protects communities by coordinating and integrating all activities necessary to build, sustain, and improve the capability to mitigate against, prepare for, respond to, and recover from threatened or actual natural disasters, acts of terrorism, or other man-made disasters.

Principles

Emergency management must be:

1. Comprehensive – emergency managers consider and take into account all hazards, all phases, all stakeholders and all impacts relevant to disasters.
2. Progressive – emergency managers anticipate future disasters and take preventive and preparatory measures to build disaster-resistant and disaster-resilient communities.
3. Risk-driven – emergency managers use sound risk management principles (hazard identification, risk analysis, and impact analysis) in assigning priorities and resources.
4. Integrated – emergency managers ensure unity of effort among all levels of government and all elements of a community.
5. Collaborative – emergency managers create and sustain broad and sincere relationships among individuals and organizations to encourage trust, advocate a team atmosphere, build consensus, and facilitate communication.
6. Coordinated – emergency managers synchronize the activities of all relevant stakeholders to achieve a common purpose.
7. Flexible – emergency managers use creative and innovative approaches in solving disaster challenges.
8. Professional – emergency managers value a science and knowledge-based approach based on education, training, experience, ethical practice, public stewardship and continuous improvement.

1 Scope

This document provides guidance for Emergency Service Management when considering integrated operational response to a major emergency. This guidance will enhance an organisation's ability to determine their existing operational capabilities for being able to respond to a major emergency. The ability for the emergency services to provide a co-ordinated, effective and sustained response to major emergencies, providing acceptable levels of protection for both emergency responders and the citizen is directly dependent upon the level of capability and preparedness within individual organisations.

This guidance identifies the key elements that should be considered by the emergency services and supporting organisations when determining their ability to respond to a major emergency. The overriding aim within pre-planning is to determine the potential scale of individual major emergencies and ensure that preventative measures are introduced and that integrated emergency management plans are in place to enable a co-ordinated and positive response.

Once the scale of a major emergency is determined consideration can then be given to the existing resource capability, on a risk based approach, in terms of providing an effective response. This pre-planning exercise will produce a gap analysis highlighting, where appropriate, additional resource implications for providing an effective response. This leads naturally to a cost benefit analysis that will determine the practical resource requirements for protection of emergency responders and the citizen.

Apart from the emergency services, this involves local Government/Authorities and the business sector, responsible for the care or safety of people/citizens within their charge or care.

There is a need to consider capability of emergency response management in responding to local, regional, national and transnational major emergencies. Any emergency response must be fit for purpose in terms of timeliness, effectiveness, inter-operability, independency, sustainability and recovery.

2 Risk Assessment Process

Due to the sheer size and scale of major emergencies, even those dealt with at local levels, a multi-agency response from different emergency response units will be required to deal with the initial emergency response. Other support organisations will become involved in the post and recovery phases of the incident.

NOTE CEN TC 391 Societal and Citizen Security have identified possible further work in the area of Risk Critical Information. Proposals are with DG Justice, law and Security for funding further work

In order to provide an effective response to a major emergency it is essential that the emergency services work together to initially determine the type and scale of incident that they are likely to be faced with. The risk assessment process establishes a number of elements including vulnerability and resilience. Without making these initial planning assumptions it will prove almost impossible to determine an effective and meaningful level of response.

3 Governance of Capability Planning

3.1 General

In order for the emergency services and other supporting organisations to respond effectively to major emergencies there is a requirement to formalise governance of capability. The model in Figure 1 highlights one method for capability governance. It is considered essential that a formalised system of governance is in place that is representative of those emergency services and other supporting organisations likely to be required to respond to a major emergency. Without a formalised approach the emergency response at best will be disjointed and at worst could be catastrophic.