

CoSafe Checklist



Date:

Exercise/Operation:

Name:

Organisation:

Role in the exercise:

Please provide details of 3 positive aspects of the exercise

1.

2.

3.

Please provide details of 3 aspects of the exercise that you feel did not work well

1.

2.

3.

1) Alarm response and on-site management

OK Improvement needed

Are the preparedness plans for major accidents adequate and up-to-date?		
Are there specific preparedness plans for this kind of accident?		
Is there an adequate response plan for major accidents?		
Can adequate alarm responses be mobilised at every time of the day?		
Is the storage of the equipment required for major accidents organised?		
Is the availability of the special resources needed (ATV's, diggers etc.) organised?		
Did the first rescue unit at the accident scene recognise that it was a major accident?		
Did the on-site managers have a sufficient background (training and experience) for managing the situation?		
Was the common operational picture adequate among the actors?		
Were the special resources needed for this accident called out successfully?		
Were special resources used in the best way at the accident scene?		
Did the preparedness for daily tasks remain while the major accident occurred?		
Had the actions required in major accidents been practised sufficiently?		

2) Communication

OK Improvement needed

Did the rescue personnel act according to the communication plan?		
Were enough applicable communication devices used?		
Were the communication devices in order?		
Is the use of communication equipment part of basic training?		
Is the use of communication equipment practised sufficiently?		
Are the responsibilities of the external communication organised?		
Did international communication among the actors work on site?		
Was communication among rescue workers and casualties successful?		

3) Emergency traffic and on-site logistics

OK Improvement needed

Have the drivers had continuous emergency vehicle driving training?		
Is there driving training for other vehicles in use (ATV, snowmobile)?		
Was the protection of own actions and possible expanding of the accident site planned on arrival at the accident scene?		
Was the material required by the situation planned within different authorities?		
Was the material required by the situation available?		
Was the logistics of the material required by the situation trained?		

4) Post incident actions

OK Improvement needed

Is psychological support available to personnel?		
Is the quality of the psychological support sufficient?		
Are there plans for storing special materials needed for major accidents?		
Do the authorities involved in co-operation have feedback meetings?		

5) Competency and work ability

OK Improvement needed

Are the work ability and health inspections of the rescue workers organized on a regular basis?		
Is the personnel aware of the safety risks involved?		
Are there any standard operating procedures for different rescue units for this kind of accident?		
Is the competence and availability of the volunteer workers identified?		

6) Casualty safety during accident

OK Improvement needed

Was casualty triage efficient and accurate?		
Was the transfer and placing of the casualty at the accident scene done properly?		
Were casualties properly protected from environmental hazards (rain, cold)?		
Was the preparation of casualties for moving to a hospital successful?		

Background

This checklist gives a structure for assessing actions, results and safety in a disaster exercise. Co-operation parties, such as rescue services, coast guard, border guard, alarm centre, police and emergency response, can use the checklist to improve common and individual actions in exercise.

Development process

The demand and need for this kind of product comes from the origins of the CoSafe project and Finnish experts. The checklist gives a structure to assess the exercise and its results.

This checklist was developed for managing disasters in cold and in sparsely populated areas. It is based on the Finnish risk assessment tool for rescue services, called PelastusArvi. The checklist was produced by experts from FIOH and Oulu-Koillismaa rescue services and other professionals including the Finnish Emergency Services College. The checklist was tested and assessed during the Taivalkoski SAR exercise. The international assessment from Iceland was completed in November 2010.

Results of the Taivalkoski SAR Exercise. Personnel were satisfied with the method. Some development ideas were exposed. The casualty safety, the communication during the situation and ensuring the on-site leader's role should be emphasized. The casualty safety and the safety of the safety personnel are strongly connected. Therefore the tool needed to be enhanced in part of casualty safety.



The CoSafe checklist is available in English and Finnish.

Product description

The CoSafe checklist is available in excel worksheet and paper formats. The two fold structure means that in page one you can find the checklist which contains six different areas to assess. In page two you can find room for developmental ideas. The assessment areas are:

1. Alarm response and on-site management
2. Communication
3. Emergency traffic and on-site logistics
4. Post incident actions
5. Competence and working ability
6. Casualty safety

Product benefit and dissemination

This tool gives co-operating authorities a chance for structured evaluation of the disaster exercise. It also includes the casualty safety which also enhances the safety of the rescue personnel.

Contact details

Finnish Institute of Occupational Health. Aapistie 1, FI-90220 Oulu. Finland

Jarmo Vorne, +35846 850 5085, jarmo.vorne@ttl.fi