



Event Safety Working Group

ES1.2 - 202x, Planning, Management, and Major Incident

Public Review 1 Comment resolutions

Reference document: ES1.2 - 202x, Planning, Management, and Major Incident (Document number ES/2019-20011r1)

ANSI Public review period: 07 May through 26 July 2021

Question: In your opinion, do you think the requirements of *ES1.2 - 202x, Planning, Management, and Major Incident* (Document number ES/2019-20011r1) are reasonable, and adequately address the intended subject matter?

Please answer the question using one of the options below. Select “Yes”, “Yes, but...” (provide comments to support your opinion), or “No, with reasons” (the document’s requirements are unacceptable or unreasonable).

Responses:

| | |
|---|--|
| Robert Haycock (RH) | Yes, but... |
| Janet Sellery, Sellery Health + Safety (JS) | No |
| Jim Digby, Show Makers, Inc (JD) | Informal comments (not part of public review) – included at the task group’s request |

Individual Comments:

| No. | Commenter | Ref. Section | Comment | Resolution |
|-----|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| 1 | RH | General | This document often feels overly reliant on the use of uncommon acronyms (e.g. IMC, IMS, IMT, etc.). Please consider expanding many of these back to their unabbreviated form to increase clarity and readability. https://www.plainlanguage.gov/guidelines/words/minimize-abbreviations/ provides reasoning and recommendations on minimizing abbreviations. | Accept |
| 2 | JS | General | This standard would be clearer if it was separated into two standards: <i>Event Safety – Planning and Management</i> <i>Event Safety – Major Incident</i> | Reject – Although a reasonable suggestion and something that might be accomplished in a future iteration of the standard, the task group believes doing so at this time would significantly and unreasonably delay the publishing of this important standard. |
| 3 | JS | General | Throughout the document there are numerous instances where “shall/must” is questionable, and “should” should be considered, as mandatory requirements are indicated where force of law does not apply. | Accept |

| No. | Commenter | Ref. Section | Comment | Resolution |
|-----|-----------|--------------|--|------------|
| 4 | JD | General | <p>Please consider referencing The Project Management Institute (founded in 1969) existing published project management ANSI standards which set forth the globally recognized lexicon for project management. Reference ANSI/PMI 99-001-2021 & ANSI/PMI 99-001-2017.</p> <p>Steering future generations of event leadership to be knowledgeable of and rooted in the existing project management standards will serve to align the work of the event project manager with other industries, perhaps creating a path to survival should the event community encounter another global pandemic shut down.</p> | Accept. |
| 5 | JD | Introduction | <p>Page 8, please consider referencing FEMA IS-15b "Special Events Contingency Planning" using established, existing federally recognized guidelines. Consideration should be given to already defined terms and methodologies in use by the authority having jurisdiction to maximize an event producers' ability to communicate clearly in the event of a crisis where a handoff of incident leadership to the authority will be necessary.</p> <p>Please consider using the term "stakeholder" to describe all interested, responsible, and affected parties i.e., government stakeholders, first responder stakeholders, event stakeholders, etc. as opposed to using the words "everyone" and "all these entities". For example: <i>"The event safety management planning (ESMP) team shall include stakeholders who participate in the management of day-to-day safety practices, and/or play a role in the crisis response plan. In some instances, this team would include the event organizer, suppliers, contractors, subcontractors, venue operators, managers, and government agencies such as local, regional, and national law enforcement, fire, health, emergency medical, and emergency</i></p> | Accept |

| No. | Commenter | Ref. Section | Comment | Resolution |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p><i>management personnel. These stakeholders are an integral component part of producing a safe event and should be included in the planning considerations. A "RACI" matrix should be compiled to identify the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder in the plan, are they responsible, accountable, consulted, and/or informed."</i></p> | |
| 6 | RH | 1.5 | Correct the formatting of normative references to be consistent across entire list. | Accept in principle. The task group did the best it could to make the formatting of all of references consistent. |
| 7 | RH | Definitions | Is the inclusion of the definition sources and URLs intentional? Remove if not. [TSM note: source links will be removed from the published version] | Accept |
| 8 | JS | Definitions - General | <p>There are too many plans, especially for smaller events. Gather them together. Change to: <i>Each event should have an appropriate plan(s) and these are examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Emergency Action Plan (EAP)</i> <i>Emergency Operations Plan (EOP)</i> <i>Event Safety Management Plan (ESMP)</i> <i>Incident Action Plan</i> | Accept in principle. The removal of some definitions no longer used in the document addressed/resolved this comment. |
| 9 | JD | 2.11 Event phases | <p>Existing ANSI/PMI 99-001-2017 establishes five phases of project (event) execution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initiation - Project identification, vision and goal setting, baseline requirements for success, initial risk considerations, desired outcomes. 2. Planning - qualitative and quantitative risk identification, risk register, plan risk responses See ANSI/PMI 99-001-2017 chapter 3.18, 3.19, 3.20, 3.21, 3.22 for established standards in risk planning. Risk Assessments and Method Statements (RAMS) developed and shared. Communication management plan developed and agreed. 3. Execution - delivering the event. Processes of planed execution being followed. | Accept in principle. Although no specific revision was suggested, relevant information was added to the annex. |

| No. | Commenter | Ref. Section | Comment | Resolution |
|----------|-----------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>4. Monitoring and controlling - ensuring that the planned safety practices are happening, that the plans are communicated and shared with all stakeholders, response plans monitored against triggers.</p> <p>5. Closure - post project reporting, lessons learned, suggested improvements, incident report filing, organizational process assets filing.</p> | |
| 10 | RH | 2.11 through 2.11.3 | Un-nest these definitions and reorder and renumber definitions as necessary | Reject. The task group believes having all three event phase definitions in close proximity to each other makes it easier for a comprehensive understanding of the concept. |
| 11 | JD | 2.11.2 Event phase 2 | Please consider that an event producer in an established venue is typically not "responsible" for the venue, the venue principal stakeholders maintain the responsibility for the venue. While the event-project is a temporary impression on the venue, the event manager is responsible for the activation "within" the venue while adhering to the venue requirements. In the instance where an event site is temporary, and established in a non-traditional location, it could be true that the event producer then carries the responsibility of the venue. | Accept |
| 12 | JD | 2.13 ESMP team | Please consider using the established definitions in IS-15b page 1-2 and page 1-3. | Accept |
| 13 | JD | 2.14 Event safety meeting | Please consider using the established description for stand-up meeting as defined in ANSI/PMI 99-001-2017 page 364 paragraph 3. | Accept in principle. The term "stand up meeting" was incorporated into the definition of an "event safety meeting" so as to clarify the type of meeting an event safety meeting should be, and a definition of a stan-up meeting was added to section 2. |
| 14 | JS | 2.20 Incident | Resolve duplication with 2.29 Major incident and 2.31 Minor incident | Accept |
| 151 6 | JD | 2.27 Load-in | Please consider aligning this language as the "construction phase", doing so will help to establish the OSHA construction standards as the leading safety principals for the event load in. As a reminder, it is the OSHA construction principals which one would be judged by were there to be a harm-causing incident during this phase and the load-out phase. Helping to bring the event sector more in alignment with OSHA is a need. | Accept in principle. "Construction phase" is not a term commonly used in the live event industry. But it is true that in the United States, OSHA construction regulations (29 CFR 1926, Safety and Health Regulations for Construction) apply during load-in (build) and load-out (strike), and the industry should be more aware of this. To clarify this position, "construction" has been inserted parenthetically at appropriate locations throughout this standard. |
| 17 | JD | 2.28 Load-out | Please consider aligning this language as the | Accept in principle (see above). |

| No. | Commenter | Ref. Section | Comment | Resolution |
|-----|-----------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | | "construction phase", doing so will help to establish the OSHA construction standards as the leading safety principals for the event load-out. Same as above | |
| 18 | JD | 2.30 mass gathering | Please consider using the established FEMA definition for Mass Gathering in IS-15 page 1-1 continued on page 1-2 | Accept. |
| 19 | JS | 2.45 Staff | Delete; not needed | Accept |
| 20 | JS | 3.1 | Add to the bulleted list: <i>Risk Assessment</i> <i>Written plan such as an Event Safety Management Plan (ESMP)</i> | Accept |
| 21 | JS | 3.2 | Move this into 4.8 <i>Risk assessment</i> so all information is together. | Accept |
| 22 | JS | 3.3 | Move this into 4.5 <i>Event safety management plan</i> so all that info is together. | Accept |
| 23 | JS | 4.5 | Change to: <i>Written plan such as an event safety management plan (ESMP)</i> | Reject. This section is specifically relevant to the event safety management plan (ESMP) and everything listed may not apply to other plans, written or not. |
| 24 | RH | 4.7.1 | This clause implies a difference between first-aid and emergency medical services. This difference is not defined or explained in the draft document. Recommend replacing "[...] facilities for first-aid services, and possibly Emergency Medical Services (EMS), [...]" with "[...] facilities for medical services[...]", consider reflecting this change in 4.7.2 as well. | Accept |
| 25 | JS | 4.8 | Move this section before 4.5 written plan such as an Event safety management plan because it "...is a <i>first critical step in developing...</i> " the plan | Accept in principle. The reordering and revision of sections of the draft standard have addressed the concerns described in this comment. |
| 26 | RH | 4.8.4.1 through 4.8.4.5 | Parentheticals in these clauses seem like internal task group editorial notes. Remove or clarify purpose. | Accept |
| 27 | RH | 4.9.12 | I am unable to discern what the intent of this clause is. Please reword for clarity. | Accept (section removed) |
| 28 | RH | 4.9.14 | This document provides no definition or explanation of what "social losses" are. Please clarify or reword. | Accept (section removed) |
| 29 | RH | 5.2.1 | Split "Emergency medical services" and "load-out schedule" to separate bullet points. | Accept |
| 30 | RH | 5.2.4 | Change the "is" in the first sentence to must be, shall be, or should be to clarify whether this is a | Accept |

| No. | Commenter | Ref. Section | Comment | Resolution |
|-----|-----------|--------------|---|---|
| | | | requirement or recommendation. | |
| 31 | RH | 6.1 | The phrase "At a time convenient for all attendees [...]" creates ambiguity between event attendees and participants in the post-event meeting. Recommend "At a time convenient for all affected event personnel [...]" or similar. | Accept in principle. Replaced with the phrase "At a time convenient for stakeholders...." |

Informal comments were submitted by Jim Digby, outside of the public review process. Those comments were distributed to the working group at the April 2023 working group meeting. They are included herein at the task group's request.