

Compliance Evidence Pack

SFJ Awards Level 3 Award in Initial Incident Command in Fire and Rescue Services · version 1

1. Header

Participant and run

Organisation	Sample Fire & Rescue Service
Participant	Sample Participant
Journal pseudonym	—
Role level	Initial Incident Command (Level 1)
Scenario	Terraced House Fire, Persons Reported — Elm Street
Scenario id	6aa01892b06d8f57dceb4c49
Run id	6aa4311acc5dc0e6cf4a0a5c
Date	11 September 2026
Started	11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC
Completed	11 Sept 2026, 16:50 UTC
Duration	1 minutes
Posture	summative

Framework

Framework	SFJ Awards Level 3 Award in Initial Incident Command in Fire and Rescue Services
Version	v1 (6aa009472c702322a8ba0eae)
Publisher	not recorded
Edition	not recorded
Regime id	—
Units covered	sfj-incident-command-l3
Mode	strict (criteria imported verbatim)
Licence	licence cleared
Content hash	c2163b787df0e4f7 e523cb48ec88c500 129be4ef42c8775a c109aa340e1caab8
Pack status	signed
Rendered	14 Sept 2026, 09:41 UTC by Specimen render

2. Simulation conditions attestation

SFJ Awards Incident Command qualification handbook §5.5.6 — simulation conditions

#	CONDITION	STATUS	BASIS IN THE RECORD
1	The simulation provided a realistic contingency and environment.	To be confirmed by centre	Scenario "Terraced House Fire, Persons Reported — Elm Street" with authored briefing and 1 contingencies delivered; realism of the environment is for the centre to confirm.
2	Contingencies were not disclosed to the candidate in advance.	Asserted	1 contingencies were injected during the run by the platform; none are visible to the candidate before delivery.
3	The demands placed on the candidate were equivalent to those of real work.	To be confirmed by centre	Role level: Initial Incident Command (Level 1). Run duration: 1 minutes. Equivalence of demand is for the centre to confirm.
4	The simulation was planned and documented against the unit.	Asserted	The scenario is bound to the framework version embedded in this pack; the binding pre-flight checked every framework-required event against the scenario before it could be run.
5	The scenario was drawn from a rotated pool.	To be confirmed by centre	The platform does not yet record a scenario pool or rotation index; for the centre to confirm.

3. Criteria

SUMMARY	COUNT
Criteria in scope	50
Met	0
Partially met	0
Not evidenced	50

A criterion is met when every behavioural marker that evidences it reached its passing level and the evaluator cited journal evidence for those markers; partially met when some of those markers reached their passing level; not evidenced otherwise. Where the assessor has overridden a status, both the derived and the assessor's status are shown and the assessor's stands.

SOURCE ID	CRITERION AND EVIDENCE	STATUS	ORIGIN
1.1	Summarise the following areas of the Incident Command system: • Command skills • Organisation at an incident • Safety management	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
1.2	Explain the levels of command applied at operational incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
1.3	Explain the UK Fire and Rescue Service (UKFRS) Decision Control Process employed at operational incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
1.4	Describe the term 'major incident'	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
1.5	Describe the common framework under which Category 1 and 2 responders integrate at multi-agency incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
1.6	Describe the role of other agencies (Category 1 and 2 responders) within the Incident Command system	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
1.7	Describe the working principles and approaches that blue light responders have agreed to use at multi-agency incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
1.8	Explain 'operational discretion' within the Incident Command system	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
2.1	Summarise the role and responsibilities of the: • Incident Commander at Operational level • Sector Commander at incidents • Command Support	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
2.2	Describe the difference between the Operational Sector Commander and Support Sector Commander within the Incident Command Structure	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
2.3	Describe the progression of Command Support at an incident from initial attendance to the arrival of a dedicated command support vehicle	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
2.4	Explain responsibility for determining the cause of an incident	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
2.5	Describe the evidence that may be available at an incident and its preservation	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
3.1	Define the terms hazard, risk and control measure	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
3.2	Describe the categories of risk assessment used within the UK Fire and Rescue Service (UKFRS)	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
3.3	Define the UKFRS Firefighter Safety Maxim	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
3.4	Explain how the UKFRS Firefighter Safety Maxim is applied to the management of risk at operational incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document



3.5	Explain the Dynamic Risk Assessment flowchart employed at operational incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
3.6	Explain the tactical mode options available at incidents and how each influences tactical actions	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
3.7	Describe the hierarchy of risk control measures in relation to managing risks	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
3.8	Explain how cordons are an effective way of controlling resources and maintaining safety	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
4.1	Describe the lines of communication available at incidents in relation to an Incident Commander's span of control	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
4.2	Assess the impact of poor or inappropriate communication	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
4.3	Describe the methods of briefing crews at operational incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
4.4	Describe the standard model for sectorisation used by the UKFRS at operational incidents	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
5.1	Gather sufficient and appropriate information to gain an understanding of the incident Simulation observation. Did not gather sufficient and appropriate information to gain an understanding of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
5.2	Review information relevant to the known and anticipated risks to people, property and the environment	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
5.3	Apply a command structure as appropriate to the needs of an operational incident Simulation observation. Did not apply a command structure as appropriate to the needs of an operational incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
5.4	Determine in a timely manner an initial plan of action against available resources using the UKFRS Decision Control Process Simulation observation. Did not determine an initial plan of action against available resources using the UKFRS Decision Control Process. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
5.5	Develop objectives and priorities through a comprehensive assessment of the risks Simulation observation. Did not develop objectives and priorities through a comprehensive assessment of the risks. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
5.6	Share objectives and priorities of the initial response with relevant personnel Simulation observation. Did not share objectives and priorities of the initial response with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
6.1	Identify and share the significant findings of the risk assessment processes with relevant personnel Simulation observation. Did not identify and share the significant findings of the risk assessment processes with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document



6.2	Implement risk control measures	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
Simulation observation. Did not instigate measures to hand over control of an incident to an appropriate person, agency or authority. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7			
6.3	Record relevant risk control measures	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
6.4	Maintain on-going communication on planned actions to those involved in implementation	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
Simulation observation. Did not maintain on-going communication on planned actions to those involved in implementation. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7			
6.5	Deploy appropriate resources to meet the needs of the incident	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
Simulation observation. Did not apply a command structure as appropriate to the needs of an operational incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7			
Simulation observation. Did not deploy appropriate resources to meet the needs of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7			
6.6	Monitor the situation, plan and actions at regular intervals, adjust as appropriate and share with relevant personnel	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
Simulation observation. Did not monitor the situation, plan and actions at regular intervals, adjust as appropriate and share with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7			
6.7	Identify contingency measures in the event of an unplanned or uncontrolled event or escalation	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
Simulation observation. Did not identify contingency measures in the event of an unplanned or uncontrolled event or escalation. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7			



6.8	Identify signs of chronic and acute stress	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
	Simulation observation. Did not share objectives and priorities of the initial response with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not identify and share the significant findings of the risk assessment processes with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not maintain on-going communication on planned actions to those involved in implementation. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not instigate measures to hand over control of an incident to an appropriate person, agency or authority. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not complete handover using any required documentation including communication of identified hazards to the responsible person. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not conduct a post incident debrief. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not gather sufficient and appropriate information to gain an understanding of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not determine an initial plan of action against available resources using the UKFRS Decision Control Process. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7		
6.9	Implement actions to reduce the exposure to stress conditions on operational personnel and casualties	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
	Simulation observation. Did not gather sufficient and appropriate information to gain an understanding of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not determine an initial plan of action against available resources using the UKFRS Decision Control Process. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not maintain on-going communication on planned actions to those involved in implementation. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not conduct a post incident debrief. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not deploy appropriate resources to meet the needs of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not monitor the situation, plan and actions at regular intervals, adjust as appropriate and share with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7		
7.1	Instigate measures to hand over control of an incident to an appropriate person, agency or authority	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
	Simulation observation. Did not instigate measures to hand over control of an incident to an appropriate person, agency or authority. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7		



7.2	Manage the preservation of potential evidence identified at the incident Simulation observation. Did not gather sufficient and appropriate information to gain an understanding of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not determine an initial plan of action against available resources using the UKFRS Decision Control Process. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not maintain on-going communication on planned actions to those involved in implementation. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not conduct a post incident debrief. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
7.3	Identify any unresolved hazards and associated risks at close down of the incident Simulation observation. Did not identify any unresolved hazards and associated risks at close down of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
7.4	Take action to minimise any unresolved hazards and associated risks within operational constraints Simulation observation. Did not identify any unresolved hazards and associated risks at close down of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not secure the availability of resources for further deployment at the earliest opportunity. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not conduct a post incident debrief. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
7.5	Complete handover using any required documentation including communication of identified hazards to the responsible person Simulation observation. Did not complete handover using any required documentation including communication of identified hazards to the responsible person. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
7.6	Secure the availability of resources for further deployment at the earliest opportunity Simulation observation. Did not secure the availability of resources for further deployment at the earliest opportunity. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
8.1	Conduct a post incident debrief Simulation observation. Did not conduct a post incident debrief. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document



8.2	Measure performance against agreed standards relevant to defined roles Simulation observation. Did not identify any unresolved hazards and associated risks at close down of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not secure the availability of resources for further deployment at the earliest opportunity. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not conduct a post incident debrief. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not gather sufficient and appropriate information to gain an understanding of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not determine an initial plan of action against available resources using the UKFRS Decision Control Process. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not maintain on-going communication on planned actions to those involved in implementation. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
8.3	Identify opportunities to improve future personal, team and organisational performance Simulation observation. Did not share objectives and priorities of the initial response with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not identify and share the significant findings of the risk assessment processes with relevant personnel. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not maintain on-going communication on planned actions to those involved in implementation. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not instigate measures to hand over control of an incident to an appropriate person, agency or authority. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not complete handover using any required documentation including communication of identified hazards to the responsible person. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not conduct a post incident debrief. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not identify any unresolved hazards and associated risks at close down of the incident. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7 Simulation observation. Did not secure the availability of resources for further deployment at the earliest opportunity. 11 Sept 2026, 16:49 UTC · sim +0:02 · journal seq 4, 5, 6, 7	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document
8.4	Record the review process	Not evidenced	parsed from the source document

4. Behavioural markers

Grading profile	competence (met / not met)
Grading severity	not recorded
Overall	NOT PASSED

#	MARKER	LEVEL AWARDED	PASSING LEVEL	RESULT	AMENDED
1	Situational Awareness	Not met (1)	2	Not passed	no
2	Decision Making	Not met (1)	2	Not passed	no
3	Communication	Not met (1)	2	Not passed	no
4	Teamwork	Not met (1)	2	Not passed	no
5	Leadership	Not met (1)	2	Not passed	no
6	Personal Resilience	Not met (1)	2	Not passed	no

4.1 Situational Awareness — Not met (below passing level)

Evaluator rationale

The participant did not gather sufficient information or apply a command structure. No initial plan of action was determined, and no objectives or priorities were developed.

What would have met the marker

You should have gathered information from all available sources, including the BA team, paramedics, and police. Establish a command structure by clearly assigning roles and responsibilities. Develop an initial plan of action using the UKFRS Decision Control Process, considering the resources at hand. Set clear objectives and priorities based on a risk assessment.

Evidences 6 criteria: ac-5-1, ac-5-3, ac-5-4, ac-5-5, ac-6-5, ac-7-6

4.2 Decision Making — Not met (below passing level)

Evaluator rationale

The participant did not determine an initial plan of action or develop objectives and priorities. No significant findings were shared, and no contingency measures were identified.

What would have met the marker

You should have formulated an initial plan of action and shared it with your team. Regularly monitor the situation and adjust plans as needed, communicating changes to all relevant personnel. Identify potential contingencies for unexpected events.

Evidences 6 criteria: ac-5-4, ac-5-5, ac-6-1, ac-6-6, ac-6-7, ac-7-6

4.3 Communication — Not met (below passing level)

Evaluator rationale

The participant did not share objectives or findings, maintain communication, or conduct a handover or debrief.

What would have met the marker

Clearly communicate your objectives and priorities to your team. Share significant findings from risk assessments and maintain ongoing communication about planned actions. Ensure a proper handover to the incoming incident commander and conduct a debrief to review the incident.

Evidences 10 criteria: ac-5-6, ac-6-1, ac-6-2, ac-6-4, ac-6-6, ac-6-8, ac-7-1, ac-7-5, ac-8-1, ac-8-3

4.4 Teamwork — Not met (below passing level)

Evaluator rationale

The participant did not deploy resources, monitor the situation, or conduct a debrief.

What would have met the marker

Deploy resources effectively to address the incident's needs. Regularly monitor the situation and adjust plans as necessary, keeping your team informed. Conduct a debrief to discuss the incident and identify areas for improvement.

Evidences 4 criteria: ac-6-5, ac-6-6, ac-6-9, ac-8-1



4.5 Leadership — Not met (below passing level)

Evaluator rationale

The participant did not identify unresolved hazards, secure resources, or conduct a debrief.

What would have met the marker

Identify any unresolved hazards and take action to minimize risks. Ensure resources are available for further deployment if needed.

Conduct a debrief to evaluate performance and identify opportunities for improvement.

Evidences 6 criteria: ac-7-3, ac-7-4, ac-7-6, ac-8-1, ac-8-2, ac-8-3

4.6 Personal Resilience — Not met (below passing level)

Evaluator rationale

The participant did not gather sufficient information, determine a plan, or maintain communication. No debrief was conducted.

What would have met the marker

Gather comprehensive information to understand the incident fully. Develop and communicate a clear plan of action. Maintain communication with your team throughout the incident and conduct a debrief to reflect on the response and identify stressors.

Evidences 11 criteria: ac-5-1, ac-5-4, ac-6-4, ac-6-5, ac-6-6, ac-6-8, ac-6-9, ac-7-2, ac-7-5, ac-8-1, ac-8-2



5. Decision log

TIME	SIM CLOCK	DECISION POINT	OUTCOME	METHOD / PROMPT STATE	SEQ
No decision points in this framework.					

6. Assessor

AI-generated content in this pack is evidence compiled from the exercise. The judgement of competence is made by the named assessor.	
Decision	confirmed
Assessor	Sample Assessor
Signed	11 Sept 2026, 16:51 UTC
Declaration	I confirm that I have reviewed the evidence record for this session in full, that any amendments I made are recorded with my reasons, and that the assessment outcome recorded here is my own determination.
IQA sampled	No
Signed content hash	7127cd150a1550c0 88093730f4ff30b1 af336f76d2758c49 6afc245617beda9a
Chain head at signing	seq 12 · 4ce24ceff147f768 a7f1fc1da32bd2b3 1fd28103b8a64f4d d270d72e32be5199

Amendments to marker levels

MARKER	FROM	TO	REASON
No amendments.			

Criterion overrides

SOURCE ID	DERIVED	ASSESSOR	REASON
No overrides.			

Comments

WHEN	SCOPE	COMMENT
No comments.		

Assessor signature

Date

Internal quality assurer (if sampled)



7. Provenance

ITEM	VALUE
Framework	sfj-incident-command-l3 · v1 · 6aa009472c702322a8ba0eae
Framework content hash	c2163b787df0e4f7 e523cb48ec88c500 129be4ef42c8775a c109aa340e1caab8
Framework schema	1.0.0
Intake	import · parser sfj-incident-command
Evaluator model	gpt-4o-2024-08-06
Evaluator prompt hash	13dc78c6bc9e70e9 802129add498abbb 2e87f2610db634b6 fe22600c84c99944
Evaluator schema / build	1.1.0 · dev
Sealed bundle	fb15e1ca5ab884b5 ece2bd8b156f4fd1 c0c82df1a0eca901 df3e16ca876aa660
Bundle format / sealed at	1.0.0 · 11 Sept 2026, 16:51 UTC
Engine	dev
Pack schema	1.0.0