OMB Control No.: XXXX-XXXX
Expirtation Date: XX/XX/XXXX

Addendum B: Response-Level Emergency Communications Evaluation Form

Instructions: Counties will use the web-based Response-Level Emergency Communications Form to address the following criteria for Goal 2 assessment.

Paperwork Reduction Act: The public reporting burden to complete this information collection is estimated at 5 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and the completing and reviewing the collected information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number and expiration date. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to DHS/National Protection and Programs Directorate/Cybersecurity and Communications/Office of Emergency Communications, Elisabeth Koren, ATTN: PRA [OMB Control Number].

Step 1: Background Information

Preparer Information	
Name:	Title/Position:
Telephone Number:	E-mail Address:
Agency:	
List all jurisdictions involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise covered by this evaluation:	
On what date and time did the incident, planned event, or exercise occur?	
In what county(s) and/or jurisdiction(s) did the incident, planned event, or exercise occur?	
List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:	
Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:	
List and describe all communications technologies used in the incident, planned event, or exercise covered by this evaluation:	

Step 2: Incident Selection Guidance

Use this checklist to decide if the incident, planned event, or exercise that you are considering is suitable for the demonstration of response-level emergency communications during routine events. To assure an accurate evaluation, answer carefully. Ideally, all the items should be marked "Yes." If not, consider whether other incidents, planned events, or exercises would be more suitable. Generally, the more "Yes" answers that you have, the more suitable the incident, planned event, or exercise is for determining if response-level emergency communications was demonstrated.

Guidelines	Yes ✓	No ✓
Incident Scope & Scale		
Did the incident, planned event, or exercise involve multiple jurisdictions?	Yes	No
If not, did the incident, planned event, or exercise involve multiple agencies?[1]	Yes	No
Did the incident, planned event, or exercise involve multiple emergency response disciplines?	Yes	No
Are incidents, planned events, or exercises of this sort routinely managed by the involved agencies? [Incident is not considered a significant event[2] as outlined in national planning scenarios.]	Yes	No
If so, was response to the incident, planned event, or exercise typical?	Yes	No
Incident Management		
Do written policies and procedures exist for establishing command responsibilities and authorities across jurisdictions, agencies, and disciplines?	Yes	No
Was the incident, planned event, or exercise managed under a National Incident Management System (NIMS)-compliant Incident Command System (ICS)?	Yes	No
Which one?		
Was there either a single or unified command?	Yes	No
Independent Validation & Verification		
Does an after-action report of some form exist covering the response activities of all involved jurisdictions/agencies?	Yes	No
If not, do individual agency reports exist?	Yes	No
Does an operational command chart illustrating the operational command structure exist?	Yes	No
Does an ICS 201 Incident Briefing form or similar record created by the incident management team exist that shows responder assignments and the communications plan covering at least the first hour of the response?	Yes	No
Do recorded or written radio logs exist for the dispatch, command, and primary operation channels used during the response?	Yes	No
Does sufficient documentation exist to provide for independent validation and verification of the adequacy of response-level emergency communications?	Yes	No

[1] Indented questions are dependent upon responses to the proceeding question.

[2] For more information on a significant event, please see Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8: National Preparedness (HSPD-8) which sets forth 15 National Planning Scenarios and highlights a plausible range of significant events such as terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies that pose the greatest risks to the Nation.

Step 3: Primary Evaluation Criteria

The following questions provide the initial response to whether response-level emergency communications has primarily been demonstrated.

Response-Level Emergency Communications		
Was the individual serving in the role of the ICS Operations Chief able to communicate with the Incident Commander (IC) or Unified Command (UC) within one hour of when the first report of the incident was received by a public entity?	Yes	No
Was this individual able to communicate similarly with first-level subordinates within one hour of the first report?	Yes	No
Did these first-level subordinates include the operational leadership of multiple agencies?	Yes	No

Step 4: Supporting Evaluation Criteria

Once a suitable incident, exercise, or planned event is selected for evaluation and a primary demonstration of response-level emergency communications is achieved, particular criteria can be examined. These criteria dive into aspects of emergency response that affect communications interoperability: Common policies and procedures, responder roles and responsibilities, and quality and continuity. Most are qualitative, asking for a judgment call on how well, or how often, something occurred. Others just seek to determine whether or not something happened.

A judgment call is necessary in choosing between "Some of the time" or "Most of the time." Without attempting to set an impractical degree of accuracy, consider "Half of the time" as the dividing line between those two options. If something did happen, but happened less than half of the time, choose "Some." If it happened more frequently, but not always, choose "Most."

Following each criteria, you have an opportunity to provide additional information supporting your responses. Please explain if there were, or still are, broader circumstances that influenced the results. Consider identifying success factors and challenges that led to your conclusions. These can be used subsequently in Step 6, "Initial Improvement Planning."

There are 32 supporting evaluation questions totaling 100 points. By assigning points to many of the Supporting Evaluation Criterion, a total can be created that provides a snapshot of response-level emergency communications demonstration. Indented questions are dependent upon responses to the proceeding question.

Criteria					
Common Policies & Procedures					
Evaluation Criteria #1 Interagency communications policies and procedures were common or consistent amongst all responding agencies.					
1.1 Did policies and procedures exist for interagency communications between the involved jurisdictions, agencies, and disciplines?	N/A (none exist)	In some cases	-	In most cases	In all needed cases
1.2 Were they written?	N/A (none exist)	In some cases	-	In most cases	In all needed cases
Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges					

Criteria

Evaluation Criteria #2
Established interagency communications policies and procedures were followed throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise.

2.1 Were established interagency communications policies and procedures followed throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?	N/A (none exist)	None of the time	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
2.2 Did established policies and procedures exist between responding agencies for request, activation, accountability, deactivation, and problem resolution of deployable interagency communications resources, such as mobile communications centers, gateways, and radio caches?	N/A (none exist)	-	In some cases	In most cases	In all needed cases
2.3 If so, were they followed? [Information only]	None were	Some were	Most were	All were / N/A (none needed)	-

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Evaluation Criteria #3
Interagency communications policies and procedures across all responding agencies were consistent with NIMS.

3.1 Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS?	N/A (none exist)	-	Some were	Most were	All were

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Evaluation Criteria #4
A priority order for use of interagency communications resources was followed as established in standard operation procedures or plans, such as the Tactical Interoperable Communications Plan (TICP).

4.1 Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)?	No	-	-	Yes	-
4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?	None of the time	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time / N/A (none needed)	-

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Evaluation Criteria #5
A primary interagency operations talk path was clearly established by procedure or communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise.

5.1 Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise?	No	-	-	-	Yes
5.2 If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?	No	-	-	Yes	-

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

6.3 Did any communications problems arise amongst other response-level emergency personnel during the incident, planned event, or exercise due to a lack of common terminology?	Yes	-	-	-	No
Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges					
Evaluation Criteria #7 Clear unit identification procedures were used.					
7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership?	None of the time	-	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
7.2 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?	None of the time	-	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time
Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges					
Evaluation Criteria #8 Common channel names were used for designated interoperability channels.					
8.1 Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels?	None of the time	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time / N/A (no such channels used)	-
8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels?	None of the time	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time / N/A (no such channels used)	-
Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges					

Criteria

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

Evaluation Criteria #9
Multiple organizations with inherent responsibility for some portion of the incident, planned event, or exercise were present and joined in a unified command with a single individual designated with Operations Section Chief responsibilities.

9.1 Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period?	No	-	-	-	Yes

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Evaluation Criteria #10
Span of control was maintained amongst the primary operational leadership: The Operations Section Chief and first-level subordinates.

10.1 Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	Yes	-	-	-	No
10.2 Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	In all cases	In most cases	In some cases	In no cases	-

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Evaluation Criteria #11
Communications Unit Leader (COML) roles and responsibilities were carried out by the IC/UC or designee.
- Necessary communications resources were effectively ordered using documented procedures.
- A communications plan was established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise.

11.1 Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise?	No	-	-	-	Yes
11.2 Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee?	None were	-	Some were	Most were	All were
11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities? [Narrative response]					
11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?	None were	Some were	Most were	All were / N/A (none needed)	-
11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?	None were	Some were	Most were	All were / N/A (none needed)	
11.6 Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?	No	-	-	-	Yes
11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary operational leadership? [Information only]	Yes/No				

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Criteria

Quality & Continuity

Evaluation Criteria #12
No more than one out of 10 transmissions was repeated amongst the primary operational leadership due to failure of initial communications attempts.

12.1 Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership?	Yes	-	-	-	No

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Evaluation Criteria #13
Upon failure or overload of any primary communications mode, a back-up was provided.

13.1 Was a back-up resource available for communications amongst the primary operational leadership in case of failure of the primary mode?	No	-	-	-	Yes
13.2 Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only]	Yes/No				
13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?	No	-	-	Yes	-

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Evaluation Criteria #14
Primary operational leadership communicated adequately to manage resources and make timely decisions during the incident, planned event, or exercise.

14.1 Overall, was the primary operational leadership able to communicate adequately to manage resources during the incident, planned event, or exercise?	None of the time	-	Some of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

Analysis: Success Factors & Challenges

Step 5: Determining the Level of Demonstration

Upon completion of Steps 3 and 4, the degree to which response-level emergency communications was demonstrated can be determined.

Did you respond "Yes" to all three Primary Evaluation Criteria?	Yes/No
What are the total points achieved from Supporting Evaluation Criteria?	

A successful demonstration requires a "Yes" response to each Primary Evaluation Criterion and achievement of greater than 60 points on the Supporting Evaluation Criteria. Answers consistently indicating the criteria elements were met "Most of the time" during the evaluated incident, planned event, or exercise will result in achieving over 60 points.

Do you demonstrate response-level emergency communications?	Yes/No

Step 6: Initial Improvement Planning

In order to best evaluate how well this incident, planned event, or exercise reflects the response-level emergency communications capabilities of your city, locality, jurisdiction, or region, please discuss activities underway and planned that will improve problem areas that you noted in the evaluation form. Consider questions such as the following:

- Is there an Urban Area Working Group committee or similar body developing common policies and procedures for interagency communications?
- Is a Statewide Interoperability Governing Body (SIGB) guiding training for ICS Communications Unit Leaders?
- Are backup communications resources for responders maintained and tested?

When responding to this section, consider reviewing the responses you have already provided in the analysis sections of the evaluation criteria form. This analysis justified the degree to which response-level emergency communications was demonstrated at the incident. Initial improvement planning will take this one step further and provide evaluators with an opportunity to identify actions that will lead to improvement within the three evaluation criteria categories.

Each evaluation criteria category is divided into two sections. In the first section, evaluators are asked to identify three success factors that need to be continued if the current level of response-level emergency communications is to be maintained. In the second section, evaluators are asked to identify three areas of their response-level emergency communications capabilities that need to be addressed by future improvement plans, grant applications, and/or statewide and regional strategic planning for communications interoperability.

Initial Improvement Planning
Common Policies & Procedures
Discuss Three Success Factors
1. 2. 3.
Discuss Three Areas of Improvement
1. 2. 3.
Responder Roles & Responsibilities
Discuss Three Success Factors
1. 2. 3.
Discuss Three Areas of Improvement
1. 2. 3.
Quality & Continuity
Discuss Three Success Factors
1. 2. 3.
Discuss Three Areas of Improvement
1. 2. 3.