

IP PDSW – Updated FAQ / Tricky Questions:

Question: How will a Person in charge (PIC) be identified on site?

Response: The PIC role is performed by either a COSS/SWL competent person. These are identified by the following:- COSS armband, SWL armband which are available from the established sources.

Question: What will a PIC brief their team on?

Response: The PIC will brief the team or teams on the risks associated with the task. This will include mitigation and control measures that need to be implemented. They will also brief the team or teams on operational risk (rule book duties) that affect delivery of the task.

Question: Does the planning PIC also have to be the implementation PIC?

Response: The 019 standard does not deal with this issue, but the IP Guide allows for “A” PIC to plan for another PIC as long as they hold the same capabilities and experience in the delivery of the planned activity. This approach must be agreed in advance during the planning stage and endorsed by the responsible manager.

Question: How far in advance of the shift does the SWP have to be accepted by the implementation PIC ?

Response: The PIC accepting and leading the work on site HAS to have had time to satisfy themselves that the SWP is suitable before work begins (minimum one shift in advance)

Question: What duties is an individual unable to perform whilst being a PIC?

Response: Rulebook duties have not changed. In all circumstances a PIC must NOT be a lookout / site warden’.

Question: Do Individuals Working Alone (IWA) need a COSS competence to become a PIC?

Response: No. The standard is clear that an IWA acts as a PIC when they are an IWA. An IWA cannot be a PIC for a team of people, in such case the PIC must hold COSS/SWL.

Question: When splitting a 4 person team to perform an isolation 2 staff will need to leave to carry out the isolation. Must they have an appointed SWP and PIC?

Response: Yes. The isolation activity will have a Nominated person who acts as the PIC and create and hold the SWP. They can delegate the Operational safety duties to a task leader who will be performing the isolation task, as long as it is pre planned and agreed with the RM.

Question: To enable Supplier to perform the role of PIC when undertaking work for IP and/or Route businesses, do we need to maintain COSS/ES/SWL competence’s?

Response: Yes.

When working for IP you have to hold the SWL competence

When working for Route Business you have to hold the COSS competence

Question: What information is required for 'first aid' in the new SWP?

Response: The first aid standard has not changed with the introduction of P&DSW.

Question: What information is required for 'welfare' in the new SWP?

Response: The welfare standard has not changed with the introduction of P&DSW. This provision should be based on the CP36 Welfare standard.

Question: What information is required for 'runaway' in the new SWP?

Response: A site of work shall be deemed at risk from runaways where all of the following conditions apply:

- a) site of work is on a gradient steeper than 1 in 100 or has a gradient steeper than 1 in 100 within 5 miles of the site of work;
- b) site of work is static;
- c) site of work is in or adjacent to a possession; and
- d) work is taking place on or near the line.

Controls shall be put in place where the risk of runaway has been identified.

When work is being planned, the responsible manager, person in charge and planner shall seek to eliminate the risk of a runaway before implementing mitigation measures.

Where available controls to prevent a runaway event reaching a site of work are not achievable, a secondary warning system shall be deployed.

A secondary warning system is the least preferred option and should be implemented as a last resort. A secondary warning system will not stop the runaway event; it does not prevent a track worker being exposed to a runaway risk.

Question: Is a SWP needed for walking on or near the line to a site of work?

Response: No. You are not required to have a SWP if you are walking on or near the line in order to join a team already at work, however it should be noted that where this happens the 'walking' person will be expected to sign into a SWP on arrival at the site where it is implemented.

Question: How do we de-conflict a worksite in IP?

Response: We will continue to utilise established IP documentation and processes (whiteboard meetings, construction meetings, integration meetings). The appointed PIC is responsible for leading these events.

Question: What information will the Person in Charge have available to brief task risk?

Response: The PIC will have the Task Briefing sheet with the risks identified, how to mitigate and implement.

Question: Can changes be made to a SWP on site?

Response: Yes. Changes can be made to the SWP at site, but this should be the exception rather than the normal. Adding additional task risk controls or going up the hierarchy can be done by the PIC without approval but must be recorded on the SWP.

Any changes that weaken the SWP i.e. going down the hierarchy, removing task controls or delegating COSS responsibilities needs to be approved in advance by the Responsible Manager or on call Manager and will require an authority number. Any changes to the Task Brief on site need to be in accordance with the PC's company arrangements.

Question: When individuals are signing a SWP briefing, what are they agreeing to?

Response: On signing the SWP, individuals are indicating that they have received a briefing on the work being undertaken, the risks and mitigating controls and they are happy to undertake the work being proposed. The new SWP explicitly includes a section on the proposed controls to mitigate the risk of injury from conducting the task i.e. the risk from working at height.

Question: The 019 standard does not give clear guidance as to who takes the lead in multiple and complex worksites take the lead

Response: The lead organisation for all worksites are identified by the route planning team and agreed with all parties during the possession planning meetings.

Question: Safe work leader and person in charge does not consider the safe work manager and the fact they do not need to be a COSS

Response: SWL references in 019 are cover-all and refer to SWL1, SWL2 and SWM. SWM is a unique role that will only be undertaken by IP and this is why it is not specifically documented in 019. SWM is documented and referenced in the IP "How to" guide.

Question: Relating to 019 section 5.3 it does not refer to the role safe work manager.

Response: SWL references in 019 are cover-all and refer to SWL1, SWL2 and SWM. SWM is a unique role that will only be undertaken by IP and this is why it is not specifically documented in 019. SWM is documented and referenced in the IP "How to" guide.

Question: Where there is a requirement for staff to go on or near the line outside protecting signals etc. how will these arrangements be recorded? E.g. SSOW pack and as per rule book now or SWP and separate SWL for each instance?

Response: A Safe Work Pack is required.

Question: In the Protection controller scenario: Who employs the protection controller? Do they have a SWP or similar?

Response: Protection Controller is a rule book competence and there is no change to this role. There is the option to have the PC stand-alone (undertaking rule book duties) or one of the SWL1 staff can undertake the additional duty of PC if they are trained and competent to do so. A PC will have a SWP (similar to the SSOWPs pack they get today).

Question: Task leaders are introduced which essentially are COSS's but there is no explanation as to who employs them and their role.

Response: Task Leaders are COSS/SWL competent but they can also be the 'technical expert' for the task they are undertaking in the worksite.

Question: In a complex possession managed by the SWM, what paperwork do they hold?

Response: In this scenario the site is managed by a SWM. They are responsible for creating the site SWP, the pack is used by both the SWM to brief all affected parties and the ES for operational duties.

Question: How do we manage infrequent users to the railway infrastructure?

Response: We are currently working with ISLG to produce an infrequent users guide

Question: in a non IP lead worksite at what level will the PIC work?

Response: Each work activity will have planned their work task independently and the PIC will have been selected by the Responsible Manager, the PIC will work at task level.

Question: Must a PIC have COSS certification and Task Risk Knowledge.

Response: Yes, a PIC must hold minimum of COSS Competence and will be appointed by the Responsible Manager on their ability to manage the work activity planned and have an understanding of the risks

Question: Does the PIC need to be directly employed by the main contractor.

Response: No, but they do need a contract of employment and be primary sponsored by a PCL/RCC/NR.

Question: What is a contract of employment for the basis of PDSW?

Response: A contractual arrangement between two organisations to utilise a named individual to act as a PIC.

Question: Can a PIC discharge his duties to another COSS.

Response: The COSS duties can be delegated to another COSS as long as this is detailed in the planning stages, but the PIC must brief the Task Risks.

Question: When do we nominate the SWL 2 and where is this captured?

Response: You can nominate your SWL2 when you know who they will be. This can be published in PPS in either General Remarks or Additional Information depending on the route team.

Question: If the Task leader doesn't have to hold SWL1 in order to carry out his duties in a worksite, then who creates the SWP in advance of submitting it to the SWL2 (PIC)?

Response: A task Leader will have to hold COSS but ideally also SWL1. This is to allow suppliers to get their PICs up to the correct competency levels required, which are outlined in the 019 standard.

Question: Non-possession - How many tasks can one PIC look after, plan for, and does he need to remain on site for the duration of the work, or can he be site based but be in the office?

Response: One PIC can look after more than one task as long as it is safe and they are comfortable in delivering more than one task on site. They can delegate the COSS responsibilities but must carry out the briefing of the risks associated with each task. They will need to be on site but how they managed that is up to each supplier.

Question: At the moment a person that signs in with a SWL2 (the equivalent of an ES) is termed a "Task Leader". What will this be beyond September?

Response: This will still be the same in September; Task Leader will be the role with COSS being the competence.

Question: Need clarity within IP of who the responsible manager will be (NR or Contractor).

Response: Contractor for the work being undertaken on behalf of IP

Question: Who is the planner?

Response: Who the responsible manager appoints and must have the correct planning competence (SSOWP).

Question: Define the timeline of when things need to happen?

Response: There is no current changes to the planning process in your own functions/Route today.

Question: Do we still have Protection Controllers when using multiple SWL1's?

Response: Yes, but just to undertake rule book duties requirement. SWL will still be accountable for the individual tasks

Question: How do other client type organisations work within IP

Response: As they do today, if they are working on behalf of IP they must be SWL Trained and briefed.

Question: There is currently no matrix to identify which level of SWL/PIC is required to undertake works. This could lead to confusion and/or result in not enough people trained to the correct level of SWL.

Response: There is a clear defined process for SWL1 works which are carried out in Open Line scenarios. The decision on whether a Worksite should adopt SWL2 or SWM remains with the contractor who is leading the worksite within a possession and should be undertaken using a risk based approach. This decision should take cognisance of workload on the PIC, machine, train, and RRV movements, numbers of Task Leader/COSS's who are carrying out work within the worksite itself.

Question: There is currently no defined 'template' for a Safe Work Pack. If companies are permitted to create their own packs there could be potential for packs to lack the detail required.

Response: The minimum requirements for the population of a Safe work Pack are clearly documented in Std 019. Companies are free to add materials to the Packs if they feel this would be of benefit.

Question: There is a lack of resource currently available to undertake Primary Sponsorship of these individuals

Response: Primary sponsorship of individuals has been known about for some time. NR have also released the training materials for SWL1 and SWL2 conversion training to be undertaken by the larger rail training community. This should make it easier to get more staff trained and increase the resource pool available for primary sponsorship.

Question: Currently the size of a 'worksite' is determined by the NR access planning team and in some cases can be large (20 miles is normal). A de confliction exercise for such a large worksite would be challenging.

Response: Worksites should be kept as short as possible (Rule Book requirement). The fact that worksites are 20 miles in length suggests that better planning rigor is required. This is similar to what happened in East Midlands whereby historically worksites were large. Since the implementation of the P&DSW programme and better planning processes in place has resulted in the shortening of worksites allowing for more detailed and accurate planning with a smaller number of work activities utilising a smaller worksite.

Question: There is currently no Proscient Planner training available to allow contractors to undertake works in the East Midlands (new contracts awards)

Response: The training will be made available, but this training will be managed by NR Training. Contact Helen Lewis on Helen.Lewis@networkrail.co.uk for all Proscient training availability.

Question: There is currently no recertification course for existing SWL trained staff which could result in loss of competence

Response: All SWL competencies have been extended by 2 years to allow time for the recertification courses to be developed.

Question: It is difficult to plan works effectively using the GZAM process as the decision if a Line Blockage is granted isn't taken until 24 hours before the event.

Response: We acknowledge there is Route variations and NR doesn't have a specific standard for LBs. There is no current date to change this process at present

Question: What are the arrangements when Net Ops are required to work inside an IP led worksite? How will the Net Ops team plan their works?

Response: Network Operations are expected to comply with the requirements of Std 019 the same as IP and its supply chain. This means they must appoint a PIC and create a SWP in sufficient time so that it can be discussed as part of the DE confliction process. If they are unable to do this then their works should be cancelled until such times as they are able to undertake the requirements.

Question: When Network Operations are leading a worksite we believe that it will be challenging for them to undertake the role of PIC for the worksite due to the reactive nature of their works. How will they manage this?

Response: We believe that generally IP will lead most worksites themselves with Network Operations signing in. When this is not the case we would expect Network Operations to meet the requirements as documented in Std 019 whereby they must lead and DE conflict the worksite.

Question: When will full training courses for new SWL's be available?

Response: Currently no proposed date for full courses.

Question: Person in Charge (PIC). The requirement for a PIC to hold a COSS certificate when large number of supervisory personnel do not currently hold this competence. Given the timescales for initial training through assessments/mentoring this is a potential risk in relation to resources.

Response: The supervisor can work with an operational competent person to produce a SWP. When on site the supervisor can delegate the operational duties so long as it is agreed at the planning stage, the PIC and the operational competent person planning the job must also implement the SWP on site. This arrangement must be approved in advance by the Std 019 owner with an accepted Temporary Non Compliance.

Question: Where Alliances are formed if there are multiple PC Holders within that project then any of the NOPs can supply SWLs at any level on behalf of the project and project PC Holder

Response: ISLG review group WIP

Question: There is concern that there is no formal evidence that the standard has taken into account the potential overall risk increase created by combining the operational and task roles to one person.

Response: This process was created on the outcome of a RAIB investigation where it was deemed if the PIC was involved in both the operational and planning stages this could have been avoided.

Question: Pre-requisite requirements for SWM include:

Recognised safety qualifications IOSH / NEBOSH (National Examination Board) in Occupational Safety and Health – Desirable.

Recognised Project Management qualification – (with Professional Accreditation) – Desirable.

Educated to Degree or similar qualification where it can be demonstrated that safety management was a core module – Desirable.

In terms of 'desirable' – can you seek clarity and guidance on the actual requirements?

Response: Essential course pre-requisites

- PTS holder
- Proven experience in managing a complex worksite from planning through to delivery
- Proven experience and/or a qualification in site risk management
- An understanding of the principles underpinning CDM (Construction Design Management) either through experience, a qualification or evidence of training
- Experience of managing teams and multiple activities
- Approval for SWM training by a senior manager, confirming delegate suitability including a review of the appropriate non-technical skills and evidence of these prerequisites.
- Written confirmation to be provided by each delegate and their line manager on the attached questionnaire

Question: Are we using person in charge for IP until September, when SWL 1, 2, & Manager are implemented?

Response: PIC is a capability which will be fulfilled from 03/07 by COSS and ES competent person. From 23/09 the PIC capability will no longer be fulfilled by a COSS or ES person on IP worksites it will be fulfilled by a competent SWL / SWM.

Question: When is the training course to be released for SWM?

Response: The training packs are now available on the training toolbox kit for approved training organisations to use as required.

Question: If a safe work manager is in place does the Engineering Supervisor (ES) need to hold the SWL2 competence as well as his rule book associated competencies.

Response: No

Question: Can the SWL1 person delegate duties out, as a COSS can do today?

Response: No

Question: Is there a diagram describing how the Network Ops Person in charge and the SWL process are integrated describing hierarchy in a worksite)

Response: A Route Business PIC would lead if Route Business are in charge of the worksite. There is a diagram in the IP how to guide to show this.

Question: Need better worked examples / scenarios - still not 100% clear on what is required.

Response: Noted. We can provide further examples as required. We can also arrange site visits if you wish to discuss real-life examples within your workplace.

Question: Provide a SWP template so we know what good looks like.

Response: We can provide example copies of a SWP produced as per the minimum requirements of 019. Suppliers are free to add relevant information as required as long as the minimum standard requirement is achieved.

Question: 019 - specific clarification required regarding the minimum designation of competency for PIC. Is it COSS or ES as the standard is unclear.

Response: Minimum requirement for a PIC is COSS competence as per 019. IP has an aspiration to meet the spirit of the original programme by introducing the 'single controlling mind' concept so there will be occasions when the PIC will hold a higher level of competence.

Question: The guidance note must clarify the interim definitions which apply between 3rd July and September, including permitted delegations.

Response: Interim definitions are now not required as IP have decided to hold with version 08 of 019 and implement version 9 of 019 and SWL on the 23rd September.

Question: Clarity needed on the interface with the Routes for planning and DE confliction within the planning phase (timescales, venues etc).

Response: Route teams will be expected to attend all de-confliction type events when IP are leading a worksite. Likewise IP Suppliers are expected to attend de-confliction sessions when route are leading. These sessions will be performed differently by route.

Question: Provide more clarity on the relaxation of the Primary Sponsor mandate - relaxed until April 2018.

Response: There is no relaxation on the Primary Sponsor mandate for staff who are appointed as PIC.

Question: Please can NR confirm the applicability of the standard to ASSPRO works and how it is envisaged to be implemented within these works.

Response: ASPRO works are managed by the Route organisations and not IP, consequently we would expect works to be delivered with use of COSS/ES rather than SWL.

Question: Please confirm the medical level required for PIC

Response: Medical level for a COSS is level 3 (For a SWL it is Level 1).

Question: 'A complex worksite is any worksite where either or the Responsible Manager or the Person in Charge believe the undertaking of both task and operational risk control measures by one person increases the overall risk.'

Response: The decision as to what deems a site SWM or SWL is a decision taken by the lead contractor in the planning stage. If the question is in reference to the materials in the guide, these materials are guidance and not mandatory. The level of PIC should be risk based decision.

Question: In the implementation guide that has just been issued in the definition relating to employment status it mandates that the SWL1/2/M must be “under a contract of employment and is exclusively working for the employer”; we have a number of contracted staff embedded into our projects, primary sponsored and working to our SMS that do not have a contract as they are not employed. Can this requirement be reviewed / reconsidered?

Response: A contract of employment can be as simple as a PO between two contracting organisations. All SWLs have to be primary sponsored by either NR, PCL or/and RCC. If a SWL is working for the PCL Holder they must be Primary Sponsored by them to carry out the duty of SWL.

Question: We believe there needs to be 2 levels of SWP, a task plan as we see it in 019 as it stands and a Worksite plan for SWM and SWL2. The Worksite SWP is noted on some of the diagrams however it is not clear what it should contain. What is clear is that if there are more than one or two work groups the SWM / SWL 2 should not be just given a bundle of Task SWP’s, this would not fulfil our legal duties as we must be ensuring that the information we provide is suitable and concise for them to be able to fulfil their duties. We see the Worksite SWP being an overview document that captures the information from the planning process and white board meetings in order to manage the access and interface risks of each of the work groups. It should not have any specific task details unless they could affect any of the other work groups.

Response: This is correct. We do not expect the worksite SWP to be full of the work task SWPs. The worksite SWP should document the agreements made with the work parties from an interaction and interface perspective (as well as the operational requirements) as agreed at the de-confliction event(s). Task SWPs are for each work party to document THEIR risks in their task.

Question: There is no pre-requisite for a SWM to be a COSS and the SWM can be the PIC – therefore either clarity is needed or a derogation stating that the PIC when undertaken by a SWM does not need to possess COSS competence

Response: SWM is an IP only competence and due to its high level of site management requirements, the operational duties associated with the role will be delegated to an ES.

Question: The agreement in principle with IP is that any PCL holder in an alliance can supply SWLs but the detail will need to be agreed locally within each alliance. IP is willing to review any proposals submitted by an alliance.

Response: Agreed. Proposals will be reviewed on a case by case basis.

Question: Page 4&5 section 3 Definitions and Abbreviations: The role of Person in charge (PIC) is not clearly defined in the table

Response: Noted and the How to guide has been amended.

Question: Page 4&5 section 3 Definitions and Abbreviations: The introduction of new roles (task leader and technical expert) these terms appear to have been imported from the East Mids PDSW related code of practice NR/L3/OHS/133 and appear to import extra layers/ potential to confuse into the situation. Suggest the role of PIC / SWL already covers these requirements and there is no real need for the other definitions.

Response: Task Leader and Technical expert terms are required as we will only ever have one SWL in a worksite who will act as the PIC. The How to guide has now been updated to cover this.

Question: Page 7 Table 3 – Roles and supporting competence:

Task Leader:

- Assists with the creation of a SWP
- Lead representative in a site of work

Competence:

- Appointed locally using PC internal process

Since the PIC who is SWL competent will initially draft and then assist the planner in producing the SWP it's difficult to see what added benefit a task leader will add to the process. The only difference stated appears to be one of terminology i.e. draft/ assist.

As above, suggest the PIC already covers this role.

Response: This has now been removed from the How to Guide

Question: Page 8 Figure 1 – process for producing the safe work pack: The workflow does not follow the logic given on page 7 in that there is no relationship shown between the Responsible Manager, the Person in Charge and the task leader/ technical expert.

Response: The TL has been removed from the logic on page 7 so only the three roles are documented in both the workflow and the logic removing any confusion.

Question: Page 12 section 5.4.3 Safe work leader level 2: The SWL2 may also lead a work activity as a task leader (TL) within a worksite if it is safe to do so, and if it does not compromise their ability to undertake their other responsibilities. In a worksite containing multiple tasks and/or groups the SWL2 reviews the interface risks associated with multiple tasks, and therefore does not need to be competent to undertake each of the tasks under their control. They should confirm that the relevant TL has assessed and will implement the controls to manage the risks associated with the delivery of their task. Task leader should be removed and replaced with PIC for work area - keep terminology simple and consistent. – refer to text under section 9.5 flowchart 'each work area must have a PIC.

Response: During the planning stage the TL would be a PIC in their own right and would have accountability and responsibility for creating their own SWP for their task.

Question: Page 14 section 6.2 de-confliction of worksites:

There are multiple variations given for managing works in a possession/ worksite – this could potentially lead to confusion.

Response: The guide has been created to act as a prompt and introduces a number of variants and options at key stages.

Question: Page 20 example scenario: Possession scenario – why introduce 'task leader' when we already have an SWL 2 competent pic?

Response: The TL is still on the scenarios and remains accountable and responsible for the task they are undertaking

Question: Page 21 example scenario: Possession scenario – multiple roles appear at this point. The original intent of PDSW was to answer the question ‘Who is in charge’? Surely the PIC by definition must be the person in charge. Why undermine the original intent of PDSW by adding unnecessary layers - If each worksite must have a PIC why introduce the term technical expert/ task leader- refer to text under section 9.5 flowchart ‘each work area must have a PIC’
SWL2 cannot act as PIC for multiple Work areas

Response: The SWL2/SWM is the PiC for the worksite and is accountable and responsible for all activities associated with the worksite. TLs will be responsible for the work tasks they are undertaking.

Question: Page 24 Planning process: When carrying out work for IP all identified SWL trained staff under their Sentinel competence shall be ‘primary sponsored’ by the nominated Principal Contractor that is leading the works. Any person who undertakes the role of COSS within a worksite (when these duties are delegated) shall as a minimum be ‘secondary sponsored’ by the contractor who is undertaking the works. If COSS duties are delegated what benefit does secondary sponsorship add – the group will still be led by the PIC who is in turn appointed by the Principal Contractor. This appears to be an overburden of administration and does not (in itself) make the job any safer.

Response: The secondary sponsorship issue has been specifically requested by the ISLG working group as a safeguard. After subsequent discussions with the ISLG working group this requirement has now been removed from the guide.

Question: Can we continue to engage this service from these approved suppliers (they are a RCC organisation) for the roles of ES, PC, SWL2 etc. as long as their Primary Sponsor’s Responsible Manager allocates them to the role and they are engaged with us (Kier as PC) during the planning stage?

Response: Support roles such as PC, LXA, Points OP and Strapping teams can be used as a support service working for the RCC organisation or PC Holder whichever is applicable. All SWLs must be primary sponsored by the Lead Organisation carrying out the work this is normally the PCL Holder.

Question: Under the new requirements can we and do we, as Kier, appoint the MOD 3B as the PIC? Does the supplier with his Responsible Manager appoint the MOD 3B as the PIC? Are we still able to appoint a PIC that is not Primary Sponsored by ourselves? And I guess another question related to this can the TIC be appointed as the PIC for all testing activities albeit he will have several small teams working in a possession in various locations spread out across a worksite?

Response: First Part of the question is Yes as long as they undertake the Tester in Charge role. The second part of the question, they will need to be primary sponsored by KIER and appointed by the KIER RM. The third part of the question is all staff required to carry out a PiC role must be primary sponsored by KIER. Lastly, PiC can delegate the COSS duties to the various small teams working for them.

Question: Currently my understanding is that the PIC can only delegate the COSS responsibility if they are a COSS themselves. From the scenario above this will be very difficult to fulfil (depending on response to questions above). Is it acceptable that if at the planning stage that it is identified that the PIC and COSS are to be separate people that the COSS can be appointed in this way as long as they are both appointed by the RM and part of the planning process.

Response: The guide has been amended to reflect that TL/Tech experts no longer need to hold operational competence to delegate role book duties. This has to be agreed at the planning stage, the PiC and the operational competent person planning the job must also implement the SWP on site. This arrangement must be approved in advance by the Std 019 owner with an accepted Temporary Non Compliance.

Question: When will the update be released to the Verification Form removing the loop-hole preventing the implementation of the plan; include N/A or re-phrase Responsible Manager's "Any additional specific controls identified? If no, reject the SWP."

Response: This is in the process of being amended by the Standards team.

Question: SWP verification form references Appendix A, B for planner and C for PIC as per NR/L2/OHS/019 – please confirm which these are as only Appendix A (Contents of a Safe Work Pack) is referenced in NR/L2/OHS/019.

Response: These are in the process of being removed from the verification form by the Standards team.

Question: Delegation of COSS duties, IP LNE briefed not under any circumstances, however PDSW guidance issue 1.1 restricts SWL1 only. Which is correct?

Response: COSS duties can only be delegated in a worksite scenario; this is for a limited time. IP will require all Task Leaders to hold SWL1 competence at an appropriate time in the future.

Question: JV's and Alliances – SWL/Task Leaders being primary sponsored by PC. Where employed as specialist in own field of works & PCL holder in own right, sponsorship status' should remain in place.

Response: When delivering your own work as part of an Alliance you are required to Primary Sponsor your own staff. If you are carrying out work on behalf of the PC all SWLs should be sponsored by the PC.

Question: Accountability needs to be clearer regarding task risk, discussed and agreed at IP Northern Programme workshops SWL2/SWM accountable for Operational coordination and interdependencies between tasks, Task Leaders responsible for task risks themselves. Discussed this would be made clearer on scenario slides, when will this be done?

Response: This clarification is being added into the IP How To Guide in sections 5.4.3 & 5.4.4.

Question: “On Call Responsible Manager” to authorise significant change, not specifically THE Responsible Manager who authorised the SWP, this can be another RM with similar experience. This was agreed in IP Northern programme workshops, however not covered by 019 v9 or guidance notes for PDSW, can this be agreed for Murphy national rollout?

Response: we believe that this is already documented in Standard 019 issue 9 in section 6.

Question: PDSW Guidance notes 1.1 supports IP implementation of NR/L2/OHS/019. With reference to the modules supporting 019 (1-4) are there any guidance notes or do these remain unaffected?

Response: There is no guidance for the 019 supporting modules. We feel that everything you need to know about ‘how’ to run the process is documented in the IP ‘How to’ Guide.

Question: Will acting as SWL1&2 count towards COSS & ES assessment criteria? Currently East Mids team cross over onto LNW to perform tasks to retain tickets, no SWL1/2 training recerts currently exist.

Response: Recertification for the SWL roles is not due to commence until 2019 as we have ‘extended’ all SWL competencies out by a further two years. Undertaking workplace assessments for SWL competencies in lieu of ES/COSS should count as part of the assessment criteria for both roles (Letter of Instruction: NR/BS/LI/383 issue 2 refers and applies to East Midlands only).

Question: Regarding ES & COSS courses. Will ES & COSS courses be updated to 019 v9? Will ES & COSS courses be combined with SWL1&2?

Response: These requirements sit with Network Rail Training (NRT) to resolve. We will provide an update on this when we receive an update from NRT.

Question: SWM course availability schedule to be identified. Current lack within the industry for availability for implementation prior to 23rd September 2017.

Response: SWM train the trainer course was an open invite to 30+ organisations who hold the highest levels of training accreditation and there have been 7 organisations which have been successful in passing the SWM train the trainer sessions. They are, in no particular order:

- Distinction
- Fastline Training
- Colas Rail
- Absolute Training
- Carillion
- Babcock
- Bridgeway consulting

Question: How does the new standard work in relation to their “High Street” Environment and Conditions for Work Outside Network Rail Managed Infrastructure standard.

- Do you still require a SWP, just without the operational risk?
- Is a PIC still required and can they be a Competent Representative?

Would we be correct in saying that similar to a PIC not being able to PIC or Look Out that they cannot act as Site Keeper?

Response: A SWP is required when the work is directly related to the construction, testing, inspection, surveying, maintenance, replacement, disposal or commissioning of Network Rail infrastructure or assets (including the delivery and use of materials, tools, equipment, plant and vehicles to facilitate such work). It applies to all Infrastructure Projects (IP) work-banks. No work shall be undertaken by any individual or group without a valid SWP when work is being undertaken either:

- 'On or near the line'
- Has the potential to disrupt or import a direct risk to the safe running of the operational railway (e.g. adjacent to the operational railway which could cause unintentional obstruction of the running line or, unintentional contact with the OLE or 3rd/4th rail), or
- Imports a direct risk to the safe running of the operational railway. This can also involve works that are being undertaken 'on the lineside' or 'off lineside'.

A SWP is not required where the work is directly related to facilities management and does not affect the operational railway.

Question: In relation to POS:

- Presumably the POS will be the single point of contact between the plant and the PIC?
- As the PIC will brief on all the site of task and location risks, what will the POS rep brief?

There is a concern that the POS brief will be repeating what the PIC has already briefed.

Response: The POS is appointed to ensure the supervision of the machines, that the paperwork for the safe use of the plant has been completed and all safety checks are carried out correctly. There may be some briefing repetition but the PIC and POS can agree who briefs what.

Question: Murphy, Story & AMCO agreed upon information to be supplied to SWL2 would be TBS. Can there be a standard set for all IP contractors regarding info & timescales for sharing and de-confliction process to take place? Risk that each contractor will require something different & timescale unknown to others and loss of work occurring.

Response: These arrangements cannot be mandated across all IP functions as we all work slightly differently. You should already know what these arrangements are and should be working to them today. We foresee no change to this process going forward.

Question: On a task requiring 1x Task Leader with 1x SWP, working with 2x CC, 2x SSOW would be required for the CC. If audited, would NR be expecting CC's to have received full SWP as per Task Leader?

Response: The CCs would sign onto the SWP produced by the TL as they would be working under that task.