# Introduction

This template and guidance has been provided to enable Network Rail to assess external organisational for suitability of appointment to the role of the Principal Designer. The skills, knowledge and experience and organisational capability requirements provided in the template is guidance only and should be reviewed and amended by the assessor, and made appropriate for the project and works the Principal Designer is being appointed for. The template is based upon the information contained in draft HSE Guidance L153 and the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015.

We recognise that the update to the CDM Regulations 2015 is a major change, and the Principal Designer role is new. It will take time for Network Rail and our supply chain to react and learn how the role is best discharged on our projects and our industry. At the present time, there is not a Principal Designers Licence scheme or criteria in RISQS (formally Achilles Linkup), so this specific assessment will need to be undertaken for each appointment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project / Contract the assessment is made for:** | Replace with project or contract name here. |
| **Organisation Assessed:** | Replace with name here | Date of assessment: |  |
| **Representative’s signature:**  |  | Date of signature: |  |
| **Network Rail Assessor:** | Replace with name here | Date of assessment: |  |
| **Assessor’s signature:**  |  | Date of signature: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Outcome** |  |  |
| **The organisation has been assessed as:** **(tick as appropriate)** | **Demonstrating compliance for organisational capability.** |  | Demonstrating compliance for organisational capability, but requires support / changes in several areas. The changes and support required have not been agreed. |  |
|  | **Demonstrating compliance for organisational capability, but requires support / changes in several areas. The changes and support required have been agreed.** |  | Not demonstrating compliance for organisational capability. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment valid until:**  |  |  |  |
| **Enter the date that this assessment expires and a new one is required. This shall be no longer than 1 year.** **It may be until a specific GRIP stage, if the organisation needs to implement improvements before then.** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Regulation or guidance reference.** | **Requirement** | **Evidence****(Example / guidance evidence given in red – delete these before use)** | **Mitigation or support required**Use this column to record corrective actions or additional support required to the organisation planning to discharge the PD role.  |
| **General Duties – Regulation 8 - Skills, knowledge, Experience and Organisational Capability** |
| Reg. 8 (3)HSE Guidance Para.60. | Does the proposed Principal Designer have the necessary Skills, Knowledge and Experience to carry out the role in a manner that ensures the Health & Safety of any person is not put at risk? | 1. The PD has a competency management system, and it has been assessed that it is fit for purpose. Roles are clearly defined, with clear accountability and responsibility. The system has assurance systems to check for compliance and implementation, including a mechanism for self-correction.
2. The PD’s project specific CV’s have been reviewed for “key roles”, and assessed to be sufficient for the nature of the works.
3. CRE’s have been individually competency checked by the CEM in accordance with NR/L2/INI/02009.
4. The PD organisation has demonstrated that it has been certificated to the requirements of PAS 91.
 |  |
| Reg. 8 (3)HSE Guidance Para.60. | Does the proposed Principal Designer have the organisational capability to ensure the role is carried out in a manner that ensures the Health & Safety of any person is not put at risk? | 1. The PD has provided an H&S policy which is adequate.
2. Pre-qualification checks have been undertaken of the companies past performance. These did not relieve any shortfalls.
3. Pre-qualification tender review confirmed the PD has met the requirements of PAS 91.
4. Pre-qualification tender review confirmed the PD has passed a SSIP as a lead designer.
5. The PD has demonstrated a documented design risk management system that is in compliance with the CSM REA, and BS EN 50126.
6. The PD has clear procedures and competent staff for the production of system architecture diagrams.
 |  |
| Reg. 8(3)HSE Guidance Para 63 | What systems or processes does the proposed PD have in place to assess the skills, knowledge, experience and organisational capability of any designers they intend to appoint? | 1. The PD has a documented competency and supplier assessment system, which assesses the necessary skills, knowledge, experience and organisational capability of their supply chain.
2. The PD has a documented competency management system for assessing “key roles” from their supply chain.
	1. The PD has provided examples where competencies of their supply chain fell below acceptable levels, and the support that the PD provided to correct the situation.

The PD has a documented assurance system, and a specific audit and monitoring plan for this project. |  |
| HSE Guidance Para 31 C) and Reg. 11 (2) | Where there is organisation change within the proposed PD organisation or project structure, what arrangements does the proposed PD have in place? Including how a lack of resources will be escalated to the part of Network Rail with Client accountabilities? | 1. The proposed PD has a process in place to assess the consequences of organisational change, and document the impacts.
2. The PD has proposed that their “Network Rail Account Manager” will alert Network Rail of the impact of organisational change that will impact upon safe project delivery. Where this cannot be escalated through the contractual mechanisms.
3. The PD has clearly defined tasks to be performed in their documented design management system, and there is RACI chart showing who should perform them. This will be the benchmark used to assess the impact of any changes, and where any responsibilities are transferred to other roles.
 |  |
| **Specific items for consideration of PD organisation capability** |
| HSE Guidance Para.61. | Does the proposed Principal Designer have a good track record in managing the Health & Safety risks of a project? Including experience? | 1. Project references have been checked. No negative comments were received.
2. HSE prosecution and enforcement database checked. No negative enforcement action.
3. Interviews undertaken; the proposed PD presented how they plan to manage the project, including what good practice from past projects, and how they learnt from past lessons.
4. Draft design management plan reviewed and would be suitable for this project.
5. Example Hazard Record(s) and HAZID workshop reports reviewed as a sample. The process and output look appropriate from a comparable project.
 |  |
| HSE Guidance Para 62 | For the “Key Staff” identified by the proposed PD, is the type and level of professional membership appropriate for this assignment? Including the quantity available?Is the proposed PD a corporate member (or equivalent) of the relevant professional bodies?  | 1. The PD is expected to be a member of a relevant technical body. This will be project specific. A signalling project would require the organisation be an affiliate with the IRSE.
2. It would be expected that all PD’s organisation will be a corporate member of IOSH, SARS or IIRSM.
3. The staff identified in the PD’s RACI chart, have evidenced relevant professional membership. CV’s of these staff have been provided and confirm as members.
4. The PD has provided a resourcing schedule and it is appropriate for the project.
 |  |
| HSE Guidance Para 62 | For “Key Staff” identified by the proposed PD, do they an up to date CPD record or log book? | 1. The PD has provided CPD records for staff undertaking “key roles” on the project and these have been reviewed and are deemed suitable.
 |  |
| HSE Guidance Para 60 / 64 | Has the proposed PD been assessed as meeting the discipline specific requirements in RISQS, for those design elements involved in the project? | 1. RISQS does not have requirements for the PD role at this time.
2. The organisation meets the RISQS requirements for the disciplines involved in the project. A PD must have the level of knowledge to review the details from the other designers involved in the project. If they don’t then the PD must show how they will supplement their team with the required knowledge and skills – independent checkers for example.
 |  |
| **Principal Designer Arrangements – Regulation 11** |
| Reg. 11 (1) | What systems does the proposed PD have in place for the generation of a project and design programme, including identifying the associated H&S risks from different options? | 1. The PD has demonstrated that they have the resource to produce a P3e design programme that is resourced linked. An example from a previous project was provided, and a narrative given as to the changes from the initial base-line and H&S risks.
2. The PD has developed a programme risk matrix and criteria that highlights where the scheduling and resourcing in the programme might lead to an increase in risk – for example where two design packages are misaligned, or where the level of uncertainty for a design package is large and no HAZID has been scheduled.
 |  |
| Reg. 11 (2) | What systems does the proposed PD have in place to apply the Principles of Prevention to design and risk management? Including the Common Safety Method for Risk Evaluation and Assessment? | 1. The PD has demonstrated a suitable and documented H&S management system, and design management system and it includes;
	1. Hazard Identification processes and procedures.
	2. Risk Management processes and procedures.
	3. Methods for undertaken multidisciplinary design reviews.
	4. Methods for multidisciplinary design coordination.
	5. Change management procedures and processes in relation to safety.
2. The PD’s management system for safety risks in design are based around the CSM for Risk Evaluation and Assessment methodology.
3. The PD has an online system for recording the Hazard Record.
4. The PD has provided examples from previous projects where they have applied the Principles of Prevention and the safety benefits delivered for the use and maintenance of the structure in a rail environment, or equivalent.
5. The PD has a method (online) for recording safety decision and has a clearly defined escalation process in line with the RSSB “taking safe decision” process.
 |  |
| Reg. 11 (3) | What systems and processes does the proposed PD have in place to identify foreseeable (and eliminate or control) risks to the health and safety of any worker carrying out construction work by their design decisions? | 1. The PD has a contract or in house resource with constructability specialist knowledge and experience, which are part of their design team.
2. The PD has included in their design programme a sequence of constructability reviews, which has included the Network Rail proposed Principal Contractors.
3. The PD has a system for the production of 4D construction sequences for difficult areas of the design, which will be used as part of the design review process and “design testing”.
4. The PD has a defined method for identifying elements of the design that require prototyping to test the feasibility of on-site construction or installation.
5. The PD has internal design guidance, such as RAG lists on design choices that are “banned” from their design, and those that are promoted as good practice for construction safety.
 |  |
| Reg. 11 (3) | What systems and processes does the proposed PD have in place to identify foreseeable (and eliminate or control) risks to the health and safety of any worker carrying out cleaning or maintenance work by their design decisions? | 1. The PD has a contract or in-house resource with a maintenance specialist knowledge and human factors specialist knowledge, which is part of their design team.
2. The PD has internal guidance on the design criteria for access requirements for different maintenance activities, which they will use as the basis of the design.
3. The PD has a defined method for identifying elements of the design that require prototyping to test the feasibility of hazard free maintenance.
4. The PD has prepared whole-life costing for their design. This enables them to justify intrinsic safety measures, that while may be greater in CAPEX, result in a safety environment and a reduction in OPEX over the life of the asset.
 |  |
| Reg. 11 (3) | What systems and processes does the proposed PD have in place to identify foreseeable (and eliminate or control) risks to the health and safety of any person using the structure by their design decisions? | 1. The PD has internal guidance and tools for the checking of the design against the requirements of the Workplace Regulations 1992.
2. The PD has included in their design programme a series of workshops with the end-users and Unions to review the design. The PD has provided details on how they will run the workshops in an interactive session for non-design specialists – i.e. not in a room staring at 2D drawings.
3. The PD has included in their design programme; cardboard / Virtual Reality mock-ups of key areas of the design for; end-user, Union and design team review.
4. System-safety elements are proposed to be subjected to RAMS analysis and the CSM REA method and the PD have demonstrated their systems for delivering this.
 |  |
| Reg. 11 (4) | What systems and process does the proposed PD have in place to ensure that all designers on the project share and communication design information? | 1. The PD utilises an online Hazard Record, and all project members have been given access. The Hazard Record is searchable and lists all tasks, with deadlines and accountably for applying the CSM REA to them.
2. The PD can demonstrate a design programme for monthly (project dependent) Hazard Record progress reviews, with sub-discipline meetings every two weeks (project dependant).
3. The PD has a system to produce systems-architecture showing the design interfaces, and from that has created a schedule of interface meetings for safety coordination.
4. The PD is utilising a 3D modelling system that can display safety information from the Hazard Record.
5. The PD has demonstrated the capability and is willing to host all the design team in their offices; as co-located design teams have been shown to lead to an increase in design collaboration.
6. The PD has proposed a live dashboard to be shown on screens located around the office, of the KPIs relating to prevention through design and engineering performance, and key H&S design issues.
 |  |
| Reg 11 (5) | What systems and arrangements does the proposed PD have in place to ensure co-operation between designers and with Network Rail? | 1. The PD has provided a contractual obligation with their supply chain to cooperate with all project parties in “good faith”.
2. The PD has a documented escalation process in the contract where cooperation is being undertaken, and has proposed that Network Rail adopt this for the project.
	1. The escalator process briefly comprises: 1) Project Meeting 2) Early Warning Notice – escalation to project board / senior leaders 3) Network Rail (Client) facilitated resolution meeting 4) Formal Mediation 5) Contract Claim / Alternative solution procured.
3. The PD has documented processes in place for interface coordination. Meetings have been included within their design programme – for design detail and a separate regular meeting for project issues. The PD has developed a project specific RACI chart showing the interfaces between the different organisations.
4. The PD has identified the interfaces and the required actions by Network Rail or parts of Network Rail, to assist in the delivery of the role. For example, that the Pre-construction information regarding asbestos is provided with the first two weeks of project commencement. The information exchange / tasks are recorded in a caveats, dependences and interfaces register managed by the PD. The register is scheduled to be review at the project managers meeting every week with Network Rail CDM Client Representative in attendance.
 |  |
| Reg. 11 (6) | What systems and arrangements does the proposed PD have in place to assist Network Rail (as Client) in the provision and briefing of pre-construction information to; every designer and contractor appointed or being considered for appointment? | 1. The PD can articulate the challenges of collecting pre-construction information from the different Network Rail internal databases and records stores.
2. The PD has prepared a project specific matrix of the expected information, and which project parties are required to be brief on the details. This PCI-Matrix will be used by the PD to identify missing information, when information has been provided and the version of the information provided. At the moment this is a manual system and requires a dedicated H&S co-ordinator. The PCI-Matrix is listed as a KPI and weekly management agenda item.
3. The pre-construction information briefing sessions / workshops have been included in the design programme and have a resource and costs associated with it.
4. For information collected / prepared by the PD:
	1. The PD has a documented system that captures survey information and presents it in a 3D model, which can be access online by the design team. The system requires that the hazards identified by the survey are added to the Hazard Record.
	2. The PD has included in their design programme regular “survey briefings”.
	3. The PD has demonstrated a section on their online document management system where the survey information will be stored, and made available on a “self-service” basis to the design team.
 |  |
| Reg. 11 (7) | What systems and arrangements does the proposed PD have in place to liaise with the PC to share information for planning, management and monitoring of the construction phase? | 1. The PD has a documented interface management system that defines their approach to liaising with the PC; this will be through project specific “interface control documents” that define the areas where and how the PD will require involvement and the expected access and information required from the PC.
2. The PD has a documented system for including H&S notes on 2D and 3D drawings, which have a unique reference back to the detailed information in the online Hazard Record. The PD has given access to the online Hazard Record to all project parties.
3. The PD has proposed a “construction phase plan” presentation and workshop with the PC, so they can highlight the key hazards that will require management during the construction phase.
4. The PD has proposed a regular meeting with the RAMS / DRAMS for the route, so that they can formally accept any safety measures / requirements placed upon them in the Hazard Record, during the asset life-cycle. The details will be recorded in the H&S File.
5. The PD has generated an example construction programme and has identified the hazard profile and phasing required.
6. The PD has a shared library and access to CIRIA publications, and International Standards, British Standards, CIBSE publications, and they have produced a matrix showing which standards and clauses is intended to be used as the risk acceptance criteria. The PD intends to share the matrix with the project team and use it as the basis of design reviews. This process is documented in their design management system.
 |  |
| **Construction phase plan and health and safety file – Regulation 12** |
| Reg. 12 (3) | What systems and arrangements does the proposed PD have in place to assist the PC in preparation of the Construction Phase Plan, by providing relevant pre-construction information and information from other designers? | 1. The PD has a documented system for including H&S notes on 2D and 3D drawings, which have a unique reference back to the detailed information in the online Hazard Record. The PD has given access to the online Hazard Record to all project parties.
2. The PD has proposed a “construction phase plan” presentation and workshop with the PC, so they can highlight the key hazards that will require management during the construction phase.
 |  |
| Reg. 4 (5) (b)Reg. 12 (5) | What systems and arrangements does the proposed PD have in place to prepare the H&S File, including how to identify the information suitable for this project? | 1. The PD has demonstrated an online document management system that is simple and user-friendly for the on-line compilation for H&S files. This is linked to their Hazard Record, so that the H&S information is risk based.
	1. The online document management system has a section modelled on the Network Rail H&S File Deliverables Matrix.
	2. Each H&S deliverable has an assigned provider and an included target date, linked to the project programme.
 |  |
| Reg. 4 (5) (b)Reg. 12 (6) | What systems and arrangements does the proposed PD have in place to review, update and review the content of the H&S throughout the project? Including how they identify when changes have occurred to require a H&S file update. | 1. The PD has included H&S File review meetings and milestones in the design programme. These are linked to design package production as a dependency.
2. The PD is able to demonstrate that their design management plan states that the H&S file deliverables must be available in draft for an Interdisciplinary Check and in full to enable a Form 3 package of information to be issued.
3. The H&S file production is listed as a KPI on the designer’s H&S dashboard.
 |  |
| Reg. 12 (8) & (10) | What systems and arrangements does the proposed PD have in place to transfer the H&S to the PC or the Client depending on when the appointment concludes? | 1. The H&S online document management system allows the information to be transferred to another subscriber of the system. The PD proposes that the PC/Network Rail also subtribes to the system, otherwise a structured download of the information onto a DVD / USB Drive is proposed. This will be supported by a formal H&S File transfer workshop / meeting, and a “standard” agenda has been provide by the PD and deemed sufficient.
 |  |