

---

## Appendix C

### Workshop Summaries

Workshop 1	Mount Macedon	May 2006
Workshop 2	Melbourne	July 2006
Workshop 3	Perth	July 2006
Workshop 4	Brisbane	August 2006
Workshop 5	Sydney	September 2006
Workshop 6	Adelaide	October 2006

## WORKSHOP 1 – Summary

Mount Macedon – Wednesday, 3 May 2007

The first ‘All-Hazards’ workshop was held at Emergency Management Australia’s Mount Macedon Conference Centre. The workshop brought together a range of participants from both Emergency Management Spatial Information Network Australia (EMSINA) and the Victorian emergency management community. The workshop agenda and copies of the presentations are attached to this document.

### Presentations:

- Introduction & Project and Workshop Objectives - Graeme Martin
- How did we get to this stage - Ian O'Donnell (Geoscience Australia / ICSM)
- Project brief – key tasks and deliverables - Graeme Martin (Spatial Vision)
- AIIMS ICS - Mark Chladil (Tasmanian Rural Fire Service)
- NSW EICU - Wayne Paterson (NSW Department of Lands)
- FDGC/ Homeland Security & NZ PoC Michael Black

### Discussion

Following the presentations, a discussion was held focusing on the implementation strategy for the project, priorities and quick wins, categorization and next steps.

### Discussion Points & Outcomes

The major discussion points and outcomes from the workshop were:

1. Mark Chladil emphasized the need to fully understand the terminology associated with all hazard symbolology. In particular, the use of the term a wider term Incident Management as a ‘broader’ term than Incident Command/Control. Mark recommended the use of the term Incident Management rather than Incident Command/Control in the context of symbolology. Mark also outlined the commitment of EMSINA to a nationally consistent symbolology set for Incident Management.
2. Discussion of the AIIMS ICS symbolology and its use in Fire Services. The Tasmanian and Victorian Rural Fire services are using consistent symbolology and NSW are also ‘very close’ in terms of symbolology. The use of consistent symbolology in other areas was also raised such as the agreed storm surge symbolology used in the Northern Territory, Queensland and Western Australia.
3. Need to concentrate on common issues – for example, road closures are universal across ESO and other organisations (Local Government).
4. Wayne Patterson outlined the progress made over the last 12 months in the NSW Symbolology project. Wayne emphasised the importance of definitions as a key component of all hazard symbolology. For example, consistent symbolology for staging areas and assembly areas must also be accompanied by consistent definitions of what these areas represent. Wayne also outlined the importance of symbolology related to supporting infrastructure (hospitals, nursing homes etc). Wayne also discussed the importance of scaleable symbols

5. Defence needs to be included as part of the consultation process. ICSM to advise of relevant contacts.
6. Although not specifically part of Incident Management, Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) is a part of the wider emergency management area. The need to keep the Australasian Computer Aided Dispatch User Group aware of the all hazards project was raised. ICSM to write to the Dispatch User Group to keep them informed of the project
7. In terms of the all hazards project, the potential initial focus areas where discussed with Bush Fires, Search & Rescue and Flood being the most common areas.
8. ICSM to write to FGDC to inform them of project. Spatial Vision will investigate the status of the FGDC symbology set in terms of formal certification. In addition, Spatial Vision will investigate the use of the FGDC symbology set both in the USA and in other jurisdictions.
9. Discussion of the importance of categorization of symbols with the workshop attendees broadly agreeing on the need for an All Hazard symbology set to be based on some form of categorisation. The FGDC symbol set used 4 major categories Incidents, Natural Events, Operations and Infrastructure and this was generally felt to be relevant to the Australasian scene, with the exception that Incidents and Natural Events were felt to be a single category. There was also general agreement on the need for sub-categories, although there was some debate on the terminology associated with these sub categories. In particular, the issue of the concept of 'themes' vs 'sub-categories' was discussed in detail with a number of workshop participants putting forward various points of view on this topic. The issue of categorisation will be fully explored in the upcoming series of workshops.
10. A discussion also took place with regard to the hierarchy to be applied to all hazard symbology. A number of methods for defining a hierarchy were discussed including by incident type (Fire, Flood etc), level (Strategic, Operational, Tactical etc) and others.
11. Spatial Vision outlined the proposed approach for 'symbol harvesting' involving a template (Word document) that would be sent to all agencies involved in the consultancy. Spatial Vision propose to use AIIMS ICS symbology as part of the template and will design form to minimise the amount of effort required by organisations when responding to the request for symbols.

## Attendees – Workshop 1

Name	Organisation
David Thomas	Bureau of Meteorology
Ian O'Donnell	Geoscience Australia
Gayle Young	Geoscience Australia
Yvonne Thompson	ESTA
M Garvey	CFA
Mark Chladil	Tasmanian Fire Service
Wayne Patterson	Dept of Lands (EICU)
Leon Bowers	QLD Rural Fire Service
James	ACT Emergency Service
David Blain	DSE - SII
George Mifsud	DSE - SII
Bill Keon	City of Melbourne
Ian Adams	Vic Police
Bruce Burke	NSW Rural Fire Service
Nicholas Cundell	SA Country Fire Service
Brendan Power	FESA WA
Stewart Hay	NSW Rural Fire Service
Stephen Walls	CFA Ballarat
Anthony Griffiths	DSE Fire
Roger Lye	EMA
Rees Bunker	NSW Fire Brigades

## WORKSHOP 2 – Summary

Melbourne – Thursday, 13th July 2006

### Discussion Points & Outcomes

The major discussion points and outcomes from the workshop were:

1. Symbol definition ideally should be able record dynamic features such as helicopters so need temporal aspect ie age or status and when.
2. Consider including North Point as standard symbol
3. Refer to Australian Building Code for emergency symbols
4. Refer to Allies Library network for EMA taxonomy
5. Refer to NFBA for Hazmat standard symbology
6. Other organisations to consult include:
  - a. EPA
  - b. DPI Animal Health
  - c. MAV
7. Discussed options for categorisation of symbology. Compared FGDC categories to those used by ACT and Qld fire services. Workshop participants developed their own version. See Table 1
8. Discussed requirements to be included in the documentation of the 'standard'. Workshop participants then rated their priority or level of importance of these features. See Table 2.
9. Risks to successful implementation of the symbology standard were identified by workshop participants, see Attachment 1.
10. Feedback on the workshop was provided by workshop participants, see Attachment 2.

**Table 1. Categorisation of symbols:**

FGDC	ACT/QLD	PROPOSED BY WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS
Incidents		Incidents
Natural Events		
Operations	Strategic & Tactical	Strategic & Tactical
	Logistics	Logistics
	Command & Control	Command & Control
Infrastructure	Assets	Assets
		Intelligence

**Table 2. Features to be included with Symbol standard and rating of importance:**

Aspect	High	Medium	Low	Rating
Custodianship	5	1		H
Change control	6			H
Adaptability	5	3		H
Support for all hazards		7		M
Multi-scale / scale defined		7		M
Colour/ black & white	6	2		H
Formal definitions	8			H
Cross jurisdictional	3	4		M
Categorisation/ hierarchy	3	4	1	M
Consistent with Aust NZ standards and practises	8			H
Consistent with International standards and practises	4	2	1	M
Guidelines for use and interpretation	5	2		H
Dynamic and temporal	2	5		M
Readily understood & interpreted	7			H
3D usability		2	6	L
Multi-agency	8			H
Compatibility with base mapping	1	6		M
Not unique across categories		5		M
Able to use with imagery	2	3	2	M

## Attendees – Workshop 2

Name	Organisation
Linda Anderson-Berry	Bureau of Meteorology
Bob Wilson	Bureau of Meteorology
Fernando Longo	Bureau of Meteorology
Kathleen Hirst	Bureau of Meteorology
Nicholas Cundell	Country Fire Service (SA)
John Chatfield	Victoria State Emergency Service
Jacqui Carter	Victoria Police
Matt Brown	Department of Human Services
Anthony Griffiths	DSE Fire
Andrew Matthews	DSE Fire
George Mifsud	DSE – SII
Alistair Colebatch	VicRoads
Yvonne Thompson	ESTA
Mark Garvey	Vic Country Fire Authority
Kristin Woolley	Metropolitan Fire Brigade
Greg Pearson	Metropolitan Fire Brigade
Jason Muller	Rural Ambulance Victoria

## Feedback – Workshop 2

Location: Victoria

Date of Session: 13/07/06

Name/email (optional)	Organisation (optional)	How useful was this session to you: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	How well did the session meet its objectives: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	Best thing about the session?	Suggestions for improvement?	Other comments	Would you like to receive any further correspondence about the project?
	BOM	2	3	Breaking up into groups; the large group made it often hard to get points in; better if audit results were distributed before the workflow.	Weather xxxx unwmo symbology, but we also need to provide input into weather for fires; needs to be included in the audit		Yes
	BOM	3	3	Information about current status of symbology			Yes
Mark Garvey <a href="mailto:m.garvey@cfa.vic.gov.au">m.garvey@cfa.vic.gov.au</a>	CFA	4	3	All agencies in the session were committed to the project.	I would like the second session to have been clearer as to categories/hierarchies, and as to how the discussion could influence how these might be set up.		Yes



Name/email (optional)	Organisation (optional)	How useful was this session to you: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	How well did the session meet its objectives: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	Best thing about the session?	Suggestions for improvement?	Other comments	Would you like to receive any further correspondence about the project?
Andrew Matthews	DSE	5	4	Group discussion.	Categories discussion was a bit vague.	Keep up the good work.	
George Mifsud <a href="mailto:George.mifsud@dse.vic.gov.au">George.mifsud@dse.vic.gov.au</a>	DSE	4	4	Round table discussion about symbolology		Can this forum tie in with symbolology and product feedback for VICMAP topo and VICMAP book?	Yes
Todd Gretton <a href="mailto:todd.gretton@dse.vic.gov.au">todd.gretton@dse.vic.gov.au</a>	DSE-Fire& Emergency Management	3	3	Building the list of requirements.	Include a mix of technical and management staff; if technical staff aren't happy with result, the symbolology won't be adopted.		Yes
Anthony Griffiths <a href="mailto:Anthony.griffiths@dse.vic.gov.au">Anthony.griffiths@dse.vic.gov.au</a>	DSE-Fire& Emergency Management	5	5	Strong stakeholder participation and interest in symbolology, willingness to participate.	Timelines, i.e., timelines for completion, project milestones, including delivery of final report	Look forward to receiving project progress reports.	Yes

Name/email (optional)	Organisation (optional)	How useful was this session to you: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	How well did the session meet its objectives: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	Best thing about the session?	Suggestions for improvement?	Other comments	Would you like to receive any further correspondence about the project?
Yvonne Thompson <a href="mailto:Yvonne.thompson@esta.vic.gov.au">Yvonne.thompson@esta.vic.gov.au</a>	ESTA	5	5	Well prepared and structured; good balance of presentation and workshop activity; good demonstrations of examples.			Yes
Kristin Wooley and Greg Pearson <a href="mailto:kwoolley@mfb.vic.gov.au">kwoolley@mfb.vic.gov.au</a>	MFB	4	4	Gained a better insight into the project	It would be beneficial to have more of the diverse practitioners present (ADF, FP, Water Police, Red Cross).		Yes
Jason Muller <a href="mailto:Jason.muller@rav.vic.gov.au">Jason.muller@rav.vic.gov.au</a>	Rural Ambulance Victoria	3	4	Representation from broad range of agencies.			Yes
Nicholas Cundell <a href="mailto:Cundell.nicholas@cfs.org.au">Cundell.nicholas@cfs.org.au</a>	S.A. Country Fire Service	4	3	Interaction with other jurisdictions; better understanding of the project.	Some copies of Power Point presentations to present back in State	Web site to refer to and to spread information within the State.	Yes

Name/email (optional)	Organisation (optional)	How useful was this session to you: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	How well did the session meet its objectives: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	Best thing about the session?	Suggestions for improvement?	Other comments	Would you like to receive any further correspondence about the project?
John Chatfield <a href="mailto:John.chatfield@ses.vic.gov.au">John.chatfield@ses.vic.gov.au</a>	VIC SES	3	3	It engaged discussion on a topic that so far has had recognition but little progress.	May be useful to show participant example of symbol survey to assist in gaining better understanding.	Must see results from project – often these initiatives fall away after initial enthusiasm.	Yes

## WORKSHOP 3 – Summary

Perth, 27th July, 2006

The major discussion points and outcomes from the workshop were:

1. Key issues of interest to WA police include:
  - a. Command and Control points
  - b. Staging Areas (including definition)
  - c. Access and escape routes
  - d. Location of Key Incidents

Kim Sadlier (WA Police) indicated that WA Police were very interested in the project and are keen to adopt the outcomes

2. The ability to hand draw a sub set of symbols, and especially those used in operational response was identified.
3. International search and rescue symbology (SAR) was identified as a potential international standard that could be relevant to the project.
4. Key areas that were identified as benefiting most from consistent symbology were State Control Centres (SCC), Regional Control Centres (RCC) and Incident Management Teams (IMT).
5. Major challenges to implementation expected to include:
  - a. Getting broad acceptance of new symbols and adoption
  - b. Getting software vendors to adopt the symbols in their products
  - c. Pleasing everyone in the EM community
  - d. Updating existing systems and map products
6. Discussed options for categorisation of symbology. Participants broadly agreed with proposed categories of Operations, Incidents and Infrastructure.
7. Levels (or hierarchy) were identified as being important to the concept of symbol use. Two specific levels that were identified were command/control (strategic/tactical) and incident level (operations).
8. The concept of a damage level was also discussed with general agreement that level of damage should only be applied where relevant (e.g. unaffected, partial and destroyed)
9. Annotation (Map text) was identified as important to the symbology standard– especially with respect to time and date stamping of features, and sectors/control areas etc
10. Discussion was also held in relation to the early results of the audit and example from CALM, FESA and City of Swan. A brief outline of the SLIP project was also provided. Areas of SLIP that are of most interest to the All-Hazards project are hazardous material incidents, search and rescue and bush fires.
11. In addition, discussion was held in relation to the use of FGDC adapted symbols within FESA.
12. Importance of symbology for lifeline agencies (power, water, telecommunications etc) was also identified. WA water has tried to align symbology with other Australian standards for engineering.
13. General agreement that the All-Hazards Symbology Standard must include definitions, sources, usage notes and appropriate levels of use.

## Attendees – Workshop 3

Name	Organisation
Brett McGregor	FESA
Brendan Power	FESA
Tony Ferguson	Water Corporation
Mark B Fitzhardinge	Water Corporation
Craig Carpenter	CALM (DEC WA)
Nathan Eaton	CALM (DEC WA)
Jack Green	CALM (DEC WA)
Kim Sadlier	WA Police
Dave Gossage	Serpentine Jarrahdale Shire
Andrew Mugge	City of Swan
Leo Clifford	Shire of Busselton
Grant Boonzaaier	Shire of Busselton
Simon Wahl	Shire of Swan
Gayle Young	ICSM
Mark Taylor	FESA
Grant Olsen	FESA
Chris Hudson	FESA

## Feedback – Workshop 3

Location: Perth, Western Australia

Date of Session: 27/07/06

1 NAME	2 EMAIL	3 ORGANISATION	4 USE	5 OBJ	6 BENEFIT	7 IMPROVEMENT	8 OTHER	9 UP-DATE S
Ferguson, Tony	<a href="mailto:tony.ferguson@watercorporation.com.au">tony.ferguson@watercorporation.com.au</a>		4	4	Gaining an understanding of the need for a common symbology. Meeting the 'players' firsthand.			Y
Carpenter, Craig	<a href="mailto:craig@calm.wa.gov.au">craig@calm.wa.gov.au</a>	CALM	3	3	Good to see the symbology used by other agencies			Y
Eaton, Nathan	<a href="mailto:nathane@calm.wa.gov.au">nathane@calm.wa.gov.au</a>	CALM (DEC)	4	4	Information provided		Went well; presenters (Michael and Graeme ) were patient and objective	Y
Green, Jack	<a href="mailto:Jackg@calm.wa.gov.au">Jackg@calm.wa.gov.au</a>	DEC	4	4	Group involvement discussions,		Works well; sessions weren't too long.	Y

1 NAME	2 EMAIL	3 ORGANISATION	4 USE	5 OBJ	6 BENEFIT	7 IMPROVEMENT	8 OTHER	9 UP-DATE S
Hudson, Chris	<a href="mailto:chudson@fesa.wa.gov.au">chudson@fesa.wa.gov.au</a>	FESA	4	4	Discussion within the group	Pre-workshop brief, explaining in more detail what is the goal, and what specific information is being sought		Y
McGregor, Brett		FESA	4	3-4	Lunch/ Scones	Nicer day	Well done	Y
Power, Brendan	<a href="mailto:bpower@fesa.wa.gov.au">bpower@fesa.wa.gov.au</a>	FESA	4	4	Fast paced. Discussion.	Whiteboard for discussion		Y
Taylor, Mark	<a href="mailto:mtaylor@fesa.wa.gov.au">mtaylor@fesa.wa.gov.au</a>	FESA	4	4	Getting a few different organisations, EM agencies, local governments, and utilities to see and hear combined issues, needs		Suggest making contact with NCTC National Spatial Information for National Security (NSINS) Working Group. (Contact me if you need further information about this.)	Y

1 NAME	2 EMAIL	3 ORGANISATION	4 USE	5 OBJ	6 BENEFIT	7 IMPROVEMENT	8 OTHER	9 UP-DATE S
Young, Gayle		Geoscience Australia	5	5	The 'real' contribution from each individual			Y
Gossage, Dave	<a href="mailto:dgossage@sjshire.wa.gov.au">dgossage@sjshire.wa.gov.au</a>	Shire	3	3			Would like to be kept involved with the process	Y
Booryaouier, Grant		Shire of Busselton	3	4				
Clifford, Leo	<a href="mailto:leoc@busselton.wa.gov.au">leoc@busselton.wa.gov.au</a>	Shire of Busselton	3	3	Insight of proposed national standards for emergency mapping symbology			Y



## WORKSHOP 4 – Summary

Brisbane Friday 24th August

### Discussion Points & Outcomes

The major discussion points and outcomes from the workshop were:

1. Issues supporting need for standard symbol definition, include:
  - a. Currently EM GIS officers develop symbols for events like Cyclone Larry from available resources
  - b. Staff turn-over, when staff members leave lose ability and understanding of how they generated their style for symbols
  - c. Need ability to be able trade maps with external agencies
  - d. Want ability to be able to provide accredited training of EM officers to work across agencies and events
2. Major challenges to implementation expected to include:
  - a. Getting broad acceptance of new symbols and adoption
  - b. Getting software vendors to adopt the symbols in their products
  - c. Pleasing everyone in the EM community
  - d. Updating existing systems and map products
3. Discussed options for categorisation of symbology. Participants agreed with proposed categories, see Table 1.
4. Discussed need for ratings for symbology types eg. level of damage to an asset, or level of significance of an event. The AIIMS symbology set does not cater for ratings, the QFRS OpsMaps system does not include a rating either. The need for ratings was agreed as this information would be typically recorded at the SOCC as a note on the central whiteboard. Participants accepted SV proposed three class rating, examples of use: Hot, cool, cold; L,M,H; No damage; damaged; Incapacitated.
5. Discussed broad mapping requirements for different levels of incident management from national down to IMT. Clearly at high levels (national and state) point locations of incidents is primary need; then at regional and IMT level, specific area level of mapping is primary. See Table 2.
6. Risks to successful implementation of the symbology standard were identified by workshop participants, see Attachment 1.
7. Feedback on the workshop was provided by workshop participants, see Attachment 2.

**Table 1. Categorisation of Symbols:**

FGDC	ACT/QLD	SV PROPOSED
Incidents		Incidents
Natural Events		
Operations	Strategic & Tactical	Operations
	Logistics	
	Command & Control	
Infrastructure	Assets	Infrastructure

**Table 2. Broad Mapping Requirements At Levels of Incident Management:**

Control Centre	Strategic Objectives	Broad Mapping Requirements
National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic oversight.</li> <li>• Commitment of national resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incidents (points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ nature, severity, time</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Ability to access state level detail</p>
State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource coordination for Regional CC</li> <li>• Coordination of logistics</li> <li>• Information to National Reps, State Ministers and media</li> <li>• Interagency coordination</li> <li>• Provision of information and intelligence to regional CC</li> <li>• Aerial resource coordination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incidents (points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ nature, severity, time</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Operations inc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Regional CC</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ personnel, equipment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hazards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Weather</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Infrastructure (high level)</li> </ul> <p>Ability to access regional level detail</p>
Regional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure IMT resourced effectively</li> <li>• Coordination of planning, operations and logistics</li> <li>• Provision of tactical information and products to support IMT</li> <li>• Capture of data</li> <li>• Provision of information to State CC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incidents (area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Extent, nature, severity, time</li> <li>◦ Affected area and movement</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Operations inc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sectors, IMT, staging areas</li> <li>◦ Control zones</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ personnel, equipment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hazards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Weather</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Infrastructure and assets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Critical infrastructure</li> <li>◦ EM assets</li> <li>◦ Transport routes and status</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
IMT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incident control and operations</li> <li>• Requests for planning and logistic support</li> <li>• Provision of incident information, operational status and resource deployment to Regional CC</li> <li>• Briefing and coordination of response team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incidents (area) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Extent, nature, severity, time</li> <li>◦ Affected area and movement</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Operations inc <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Sectors, IMT, staging areas</li> <li>◦ Control zones</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ personnel, equipment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hazards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Weather</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Infrastructure and assets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Critical infrastructure</li> <li>◦ EM assets</li> <li>◦ Transport routes and status</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Attendees – Workshop 4

Name	Organisation
Leon Bowers	Queensland Fire and Rescue Service
Richard ??	Queensland Fire and Rescue Service
Giles Brouwer	Natural Resources, Mines and Water
David Couper	Dept Emergency Services
Darren Gould	Queensland Police Service
Jeremy King	Dept Emergency Services
Bruce Budge	Dept Emergency Services
Peter Gersekowski	Office of Economic and Statistical Research
Enrico ??	Gold Coast City Council
Nik Van't Hof	Gold Coast City Council
Naomi Toy	Gold Coast City Council

## Feedback – Workshop 3

Location: Queensland

Date of Session: 25/08/06

1 NAME	2 EMAIL	3 ORGANISATION	4 USE	5 OBJECT-IVES	6 BENEFIT	7 IMPROVE-MENT	8 OTHE R	9 UP- DATES
Couper, David		DES	4	3	Exchange of information in an open manner	I would appreciate being kept informed of the ESTA Emergency Location Marker Project		Y
Brouner, Giles	<a href="mailto:giles.brouner@nrm.qld.gov.au">giles.brouner@nrm.qld.gov.au</a>	Natural Resources, Minerals, and Water	2	4				/
Bowers, Leon	<a href="mailto:lbowers@emergency.qld.gov.au">lbowers@emergency.qld.gov.au</a>	QFRS	4	4	Surprised at the contributions of other agencies; was afraid it was going to be a DES chat fest.	I didn't think to ask some agencies. Further suggestions to other workshop organisers would help them (Health, etc.)		Y
King, Jeremy	<a href="mailto:jcking@emergency.qld.gov.au">jcking@emergency.qld.gov.au</a>	QLD Emergency Services (EMQ)	4	4				Y
Gould, Darren	<a href="mailto:gould.darren@police.qld.gov.au">gould.darren@police.qld.gov.au</a>	QLD Police	4	5	Education, discussion between agencies			Y
Gersekowski, Peter	<a href="mailto:Peter.gersekowski@treasury.qld.gov.au">Peter.gersekowski@treasury.qld.gov.au</a>	QLD Treasury	4	4	Learning more about issues with emergency response and use of mapping and symbology			Y

## WORKSHOP 5 – Summary

Sydney – Monday 18th September

### Discussion Points & Outcomes

The major discussion points and outcomes from the workshop were:

1. EICU developed 'Battlemap' symbology for Mercury 05 but parked any further development pending outcomes of this project.

EICU have been developing EICU Database for distribution to EM community. The EICU Database includes a defined data model and symbology for a broad range of infrastructure related datasets. The EICU data model and symbology has been developed through consultative process with EM representatives; a draft will be circulated in October prior to ratification. The EICU data model and symbology will be made available to the ICSM for the All-Hazards project.

2. Experience with Battlemap and the EICU Database has highlighted the need for font files to work in both in MapInfo and ESRI GIS. Also, the issues with developing symbols that work on paper and digitally.
3. A three tier hierarchy for information including mapping was discussed. The hierarchy includes: Strategic; Tactical and Operational. The role of map products for each tier were identified, see Table 1. Participants agreed that the geometry and scale of a feature should determine the symbology type at the scale or level of hierarchy ie to depict polygons, lines and points. Participants did not want the level of hierarchy to dictate the symbology type.
4. Discussed options for categorisation of symbology. Participants agreed with proposed categories, see Table 2.
5. Discussed proposed frame shapes for categorisation of symbology. Participants agreed with proposed frame shapes, see Table 3.
6. Discussed need for ratings or status for symbology types eg. level of damage to an asset, or level of significance of an event. The AIMS symbology set does not cater for ratings, however, the need for ratings was generally agreed. Participants identified that status level needed to include features where the status is not known. Implementation of the status level needed to be supported by a clear definition of the meaning of the status or rating. That the definition for each feature (symbol) should include a guide to how ratings may be applied. In general, a rating is temporal and this needs to be considered, possibly as annotation. Also, there may be technical challenges to representing status.
7. Risks to successful implementation of the symbology standard were identified by workshop participants, see Attachment 1.
8. Feedback on the workshop was provided by workshop participants, see Attachment 2.












**Table 1. Role of Map Products to Support Control Hierarchy:**

Level	Role of Mapping
Strategic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide strategic oversight</li> <li>• Broad overview for interagency, multi-agency, national – state coordination</li> <li>• Aggregated view at state or national level</li> <li>• Depict operational support outside auspices of combat agency</li> </ul>
Tactical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of area of responsibility for number and location of incidents</li> <li>• Generalised view or district level map</li> <li>• Combination of symbology determined by level / scale</li> <li>• Represent operational support activities t support incident management teams</li> </ul>
Operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information to assist tactical planning</li> <li>• High level resolution, large scale mapping of details covering area of concern or incident</li> <li>• Easy to understand information for non-technical people</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Categorisation of Symbols:**

Proposed Categories	FGDC	ACT/QLD/NSW
<b>Incidents</b>	Incidents	
	Natural Events	
<b>Operations</b>	Operations	Strategic & Tactical
		Logistics
		Command & Control
<b>Infrastructure</b>	Infrastructure	Assets

**Table 3. Frame Shapes:**

Proposed Frame Shapes	FGDC	ACT/QLD/NSW
<b>Incidents</b> 		
<b>Operations</b> 		Strategic & Tactical 
		Logistics 
		Command & Control 
<b>Infrastructure</b> 		Assets 

## Attendees – Workshop 5

Aberl, Claudia	Rural Fire Service NSW
Blake, Bryan	Road and Traffic Authority NSW (TMC)
Buttigieg, Dennis	NSW Maritime
Conserdyne, Shane	Dept Lands - EICU, NSW
Cowdery, Alex	NSW Police
Day, Michael	NSW SES
Dickinson, Robert	NSW Police
Madsen, Jeff	Department of Energy, Utilities & Sustainability, NSW
O'Donnell, Ian	Geoscience Australia
Patterson, Wayne.	NSW EICU
Simmons, Elliot	State Emergency Services, NSW
Sleigh, Tony	Dept Lands - EICU, NSW
Smith, Greg	Road and Traffic Authority, NSW
Stanley, Megan	Rural Fire Service NSW

## Feedback – Workshop 5

Location: New South Wales

Date of Session: 15/09/06

1 NAME	2 EMAIL	3 ORGANISATION	4 USE	5 OBJECTIVES	6 BENEFIT	7 IMPROVEMENT	8 OTHER	9 UPDATES
Madsen, Jeff	<a href="mailto:Jeff.Madsen@deus.nsw.gov.au">Jeff.Madsen@deus.nsw.gov.au</a>	Department of Energy, Utilities & Sustainability, NSW	5	4	Knowledge of different symbology sets that are being used			Y
O'Donnell, Ian	<a href="mailto:ian.ODonnell@ga.gov.au">ian.ODonnell@ga.gov.au</a>	Geoscience Australia	5	5	Extremely satisfying to see the way the material acquired is coming together		Need to include RTA. They clearly have special needs.	Y
Conserdyne, Shane	<a href="mailto:shane.conserdyne@lands.nsw.gov.au">shane.conserdyne@lands.nsw.gov.au</a>	NSW EICU	5	4	Agencies well represented; good consensus across agencies to develop/ implement a standard			
Patterson, Wayne.	<a href="mailto:wayne.patterson@lands.nsw.gov.au">wayne.patterson@lands.nsw.gov.au</a>	NSW EICU	4	4	Participation of attendees			Y
Buttigieg, Dennis	<a href="mailto:dennis@maritime.nsw.gov.au">dennis@maritime.nsw.gov.au</a>	NSW Maritime	4	5	Exposure to the project		A worthwhile project	Y
Cowdery, Alex	<a href="mailto:Cowd1ale@police.nsw.gov.au">Cowd1ale@police.nsw.gov.au</a>	NSW Police	4	4	User input and examples; risk management framework		Sample set of symbology for use in the field would be appreciated	Y



1 NAME	2 EMAIL	3 ORGANISATION	4 USE	5 OBJECTIVES	6 BENEFIT	7 IMPROVEMENT	8 OTHER	9 UPDATES
Dickinson, Robert	<a href="mailto:dick2rob@police.nsw.gov.au">dick2rob@police.nsw.gov.au</a>	NSW Police	4	3	Open discussion work shops	Greater degree of workshop opportunities. Workshops that seek objectives, create higher participation and foster a creative, lateral approach		Y
Day, Michael	<a href="mailto:michael.day@ses.nsw.gov.au">michael.day@ses.nsw.gov.au</a>	NSW SES	4	4	Attendees got an under-standing of where the project is at and where it is headed		Job well done on the project thus far	
Simmons, Elliott	<a href="mailto:elliott.simmons@ses.nsw.gov.au">elliott.simmons@ses.nsw.gov.au</a>	NSW SES	4	4	The proposed/ recommended categories, status, etc.	Delivery of draft symbology set to participants in TTF/.style format		Y
Blake, Bryan	<a href="mailto:bryan_blake@rta.nsw.gov.au">bryan_blake@rta.nsw.gov.au</a>	Road and Traffic Authority NSW (TMC)	4	4	Openness, and roundtable discussion without too much conflict	More case studies. What is Europe doing about this?		Y
Smith, Greg	<a href="mailto:gregory_smith@rta.nsw.gov.au">gregory_smith@rta.nsw.gov.au</a>	Road and Traffic Authority, NSW	4	4	Knowledge of the process	Case studies		Y

1 NAME	2 EMAIL	3 ORGANISATION	4 USE	5 OBJECT-IVES	6 BENEFIT	7 IMPROVEMENT	8 OTHER	9 UP-DATE S
Aberl, Claudia	<a href="mailto:claudia.aberl@rfs.nsw.gov.au">claudia.aberl@rfs.nsw.gov.au</a>	Rural Fire Service NSW	4	4	Interesting thoughts from wide range of industries; good feedback and exchange of information	Printed copies of PowerPoint's and copy of audit (so as to see wide range of symbols)	I would be interested in receiving spreadsheet and draft report	Y
Stanley, Megan	<a href="mailto:megan.stanley@rfs.nsw.gov.au">megan.stanley@rfs.nsw.gov.au</a>	Rural Fire Service NSW	5	4	Having a chance to combine our service symbols with other agency symbols, and to discuss a standard approach	Having a look at hard copy spreadsheets on status of matrix comparisons, even just to check that our agency symbology is there	Great approach and effort towards a standard symbology, etc.	Y

## WORKSHOP 6 – Summary

Adelaide - Tuesday 3rd October 2006

Table 1. Attendees at Workshop

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Charlotte Morgan	Department for Environment and Heritage
Trent Daly	Department for Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation
Tim Groves	Department for Environment and Heritage
Sergio Rossi	Department of Primary Industries and Resources
Peter Schar	South Australian Police
Bob Stevenson	S A State Emergency Service
Nicholas Cundell	SA Country Fire Service

## 1. Risk Management Framework

<u>Likelihood</u> of risk occurring without treatment	L = low; M = medium; H = high
<u>Impact</u> of the risk, if it did happen	L = low; M = medium; H = high
<u>Mitigation action</u> to either minimise the threat occurring or to minimise the impact of the risk	
<u>Who</u> should be responsible for implementing the action is identified	

Risk description	Likelihood (LMH)	Impact (LMH)	Mitigation Actions	Who
<b>A (Product)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Symbols too complex or irrelevant</li> <li>❖ Terminologies</li> <li>❖ No clearly identified custodian</li> <li>❖ Initial symbolset is incomplete</li> <li>❖ Not enough symbols</li> <li>❖ True Type Fonts</li> </ul>	High	High	All Agencies involved in testing/feedback Engagement of all users at design stage	Spatial Vision
<b>B (Users)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Non Acceptance in South Australia</li> <li>❖ Non Acceptance nationally</li> <li>❖ Agency State/National take up</li> <li>❖ Lack of education and training program</li> </ul>	Low	High	Support from project sponsors Education and Training	Agencies
<b>C (Feedback/Maintenance)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Maintenance of symbol sets</li> <li>❖ De-brief of mapping products with users</li> </ul>	High	High	Formal, regular review at a national state and thematic level	Custodian
<b>D (Advocates)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Custodianship –feedback</li> <li>❖ No national/State ‘champion’ per theme               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fire, flood, animal health etc</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Low	High	Emergency management GIS user group to be formed in the State	(SA Police * SA Country Fire Service) EMSINA