

019

Safety of people at work on or near the line



Topic

Guidance on how to create a **Safe Work Pack (SWP)**

Purpose

This document has been designed to guide you through systematically how to create, verify, endorse (where appropriate) and authorise a SWP.

What is a Safe Work Pack?

The **Safe Work Pack (SWP)** provides information on how risks associated with the work being carried out can be managed. It enables effective management and implementation of controls for the safety of people involved or may be affected by the work activities **on or near the line**, or which may affect the line.

The SWP refers to the documentation provided to the **person in charge** for the work they are to undertake. This can be in a paper or electronic version (where available).

Following authorisation and at the point of issue, the SWP must include:

Element of SWP	Provided By:		
	SSOWPS System Generated	Planner Process	PIC Involvement
SWP VALIDATION FORM			
A completed cover sheet Form - F01 , showing CREATION, VERIFICATION and AUTHORISATION sign offs, acceptance and key risks identified	Yes		
RT9909 FORM			
A part completed RT9909 form, ready for final completion by COSS/SWL	Yes		
WORK INFORMATION			
Information and controls that will allow safe access and egress to the site of work, including walking to and from site, this could include a number of safe systems and will include a specified access point	Yes	Yes	Yes
SAFE SYSTEMS			
Details of the safe systems of work to be deployed during each phase of the work, including access to the site of work, sites of work and egress from the site	Yes	Yes	Yes
HAZARD DIRECTORY			
Extracts from the National Hazard Directory that are relevant to the work and location under each safe system of work being deployed	Yes	Yes	

Element of SWP	Provided By:		
	SSOWPS System Generated	Planner Process	PIC Involvement
SECTIONAL APPENDIX			
Extracts from the Sectional Appendix showing the relevant running lines, track layout and work location for the entire mileage for which the work group will be on or near the line	Yes	Yes	
TASK RISK			
Details of the task risks associated with the work taking place. This information is available by selecting the appropriate Task Risk Control Sheets from within SSOWPS or by selecting to use Work Package Plans and Task Briefing Sheets	Yes, Selected by planner	Yes	Yes
PERMITS			
Where a permit has been identified it MUST be included within the SWP. Permits include, lifting plans, hot work, electrical isolation, breaking ground etc.		Yes	Yes
WELFARE AND EMERGENCY ARRANGEMENTS			
Details of the welfare arrangements, including toilet facilities, washing facilities		Yes	Yes
Emergency arrangements, including first aid facilities and first aider required, local hospital details		Yes	Yes
OTHER			
Details of the possession arrangements, including protection arrangements (where appropriate)		Yes	
Additional signalling or track diagrams (where appropriate)		Yes	
A part completed RT3181 form(s) (where blockage(s) of the line are part of the SSOW), ready for final completion by the COSS/SWL	Yes		

Creation of the SWP

The information contained in the SWP should be concise, specific and relevant to the task and location of where the work is being undertaken and the associated risk from the movement of trains, OTM and OTP (known as operational risk). The SWP should provide clear information that the **person in charge** can effectively use to manage the risks to themselves and those working under their supervision.

The production of the SWP requires collaboration between the **responsible manager, planner, the person in charge** and persons with any necessary expertise (e.g. technical leads for other disciplines, plant specific competence etc.) and familiarity with the task and risks involved.

Verification

The **person in charge** will verify the suitability and fitness for purpose of the SWP a minimum of one shift in advance of when the work is to take place.

To verify the SWP, the **person in charge** must check the information that is contained within it, making sure that it contains the necessary information detailed (refer to SWP contents above) and also does not contradict the best practice highlighted in this document.

When checking the SWP, the **person in charge** should consider and confirm that the SWP:

- Effectively identifies the task, site and operational risks associated with the work and how they will be managed
- Contains all necessary elements as identified above
- Is not unnecessarily long or contains information that is not relevant to the work
- Contains the correct information for operational safety arrangements, e.g. correct protection limits/signal numbers, isolation limits, possession information

Endorsement

Where COSS duties have been delegated, the **person in charge** will provide the COSS with an opportunity to check the operational safety element of the pack (e.g. SSOWPS documentation) and make sure that the COSS completes a review of the pack, confirming the details are correct and can be implemented. If the COSS is satisfied with the operational safety management information they will endorse the F01 form in the relevant section.

Errors and changes to SWP

If the COSS is not satisfied with the operational safety element of the SWP, they will return it to the **person in charge**, informing them of the errors and changes required. The person in charge will make arrangements for the pack to be amended, after which they again provide the COSS with an opportunity to conduct their check.

Where the COSS duties are delegated, the **person in charge** shall only complete the verification of the SWP once the COSS has endorsed the F01 form. Without the COSS endorsement, the verification process cannot be completed.

Where the person in charge is not satisfied with any element of the SWP they must return it to the planner. When returning the pack to the planner, an explanation of required amendments will be provided to enable the planner to make appropriate changes to the SWP.

Where a SWP is reissued with amendments, the verification and authorisation process will be applied again.

Authorisation

Once the **person in charge** is happy with the contents of the SWP and has necessary endorsements where required, they shall complete the verification section of the F01 form and return the SWP to the **responsible manager** for authorisation.

At least 1 shift before the work, the **responsible manager** will undertake a review of the SWP and check that the **person in charge** has completed their verification. This will include a check that the F01 form has been correctly completed. The **responsible manager** can also speak with the **person in charge** to confirm their understanding of the SWP contents and how it will be implemented.

When the **responsible manager** is satisfied with the SWP and verification they will authorise it for use by completing the relevant section of the F01 form, after which they will return it to the **person in charge**.

Acceptance

Before implementing the SWP on site, the **person in charge** will carry out a final check, comparing the details within the SWP against the site conditions. Where the SWP is correct and can be implemented as planned the **person in charge** will confirm their acceptance of the SWP on the F01 form, after which they will implement the SWP and commence work.

When a SWP is produced for cyclical or repeat activities the planning process applied is the same as for a SWP for a single, non-cyclical work activity.

However, the verification and authorisation process is only required once every;

- 6 month period where the SWP may contain an element of working with warning; or
- 12 month period where the SWP is prepared for working under protection only.

Cyclical / repeat SWP

The difference between a cyclical and a repeated pack is that a cyclical pack is produced for an activity that has a frequency identified in a Network Rail standard. Repeat packs are for an activity that requires the same work activity to be undertaken more than once at the same location (e.g. multiple concurrent shifts within a blockade or repeated visits) but not a frequency contained within a Network Rail standard.

Where a cyclical/repeat SWP is produced it must still be provided to a person or persons in charge, nominated by the responsible manager, at least a shift in advance. This does not have to be the person in charge who was involved in the planning.

The benefit with using the process for cyclical/repeat is that where multiple persons in charge will be undertaking the same task over a period of time, the planning process will only be required once and will produce a pack that can be used multiple times.

So what should a good SWP look like?

The matrix below should provide you with guidance for you to ascertain if your SWP is suitable under the new 019 Standard.

	Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Work Information	References the relevant plan number and indicates on the F01 whether it is a cyclic, repeat or non-cyclic SWP. Contains specific details about the access point, mileages and worksite details		Contains errors, or has a duplicate pack number or uses generic information.
Description	A specific description of the activity, including the discipline/asset involved and the task, suggesting the competences needed e.g "Plain line Basic Visual Inspection of track".	Conveys an understanding of the discipline/asset involved and gives an idea of the generic activity, eg "Track Patrolling".	Uses generic terms that don't specify discipline/asset or specific task involved eg "Inspection".
Roles	The planner, responsible manager and person in charge are all different people. The person in charge who is the verifier is the same person as the one on site delivering the work.	The planner and responsible manager are the same person (as long as the responsible manager holds core planning skills). The on-site person in charge is different from the verifier. The on-site person in charge must always be the acceptor	One person doing all elements, or the elements being done out of order. Under no circumstances can one person be the verifier and authoriser.
Planning the SSOW	Whatever SSOW that is adequate for the location and task. This is what happens now. The SSOW planning process always tries to implement protection arrangement with additional protection.	The safe system of work is adequate for the location and task. The SSOW planning process relies on warning system more than protection systems or the protection system does not use additional protection.	The SSOW is not appropriate for the work and/or location. For example carrying out work that affects the safety of the line using a warning system, e.g. felling a tree. The safe system of work does not include safe access and egress arrangements.

Planner and Person in Charge relationship	The planner and the person in charge sit alongside each other and create the plan together.	The interaction of the planner and person in charge is done via a phone-call, an email with pdf attachment, or SWP is left in pigeon hole. This must be done with enough time for the SWP to be reviewed and accepted to prior to authorisation.	A person in charge is not appointed or involved in the planning, and the Verify section is signed on the shift that the work is planned for.
	Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Task Risk Considerations	The first consideration should be to eliminate risk. This could be using a machine if feasible. If the risk has been eliminated, controls do not need to be put in place. Remember though, there may be a consequence of eliminating the risk, for example, if using a machine instead of carrying out a task manually, and exclusion zone may be required.		
Task Risk Controls	Follow principles of eliminate, reduce, isolate & control Task Risk control sheets and any permits included, E.g. lift plans. Good practice is having controls (such as Task Risk Control Sheets) for all risks that are specific and relevant to the planned work. E.g. HAVS, noise and ballast dust.	SWPs should not be full of paper just for the sake of it, but if in doubt, it is always better to have the paperwork included in the SWP than left out, but do not include things in the pack that are not specific and relevant to the task or site. It is best to seek advice from someone experienced in the discipline and task in this instance.	Inadequate controls with inappropriate delegated owners. It would be very unusual for an adequate SWP to have no specific risk control measures.
Working alongside others - Engineering Worksites	The person in charge works with the planner and reviews all task risk controls submitted by other work owners. Any work groups that have planned activity with risks that have the potential to conflict are contacted, and a solution is determined by all parties (de-confliction) and records are made of the outcomes. This might involve different staging (timing) of the works, or cancellation. De-confliction is to take place at T-5 weeks.	The planner works with a responsible manager to plan the de-confliction. It is possible that a manager would manage all the de-confliction before appointing an ES. Lockdown is at T-10 days.	Potential conflicts identified and not addressed OR the other work owners do not submit task risk information for inclusion or not reviewed. Non-emergency work is planned inside T-10 days, and has to be managed through late change process, thus disrupting all planned work.
Working on one activity with more than one function (1 job with different functions)	The work owner contacts the different functions to get the task risks for inclusion and delegated risk owners/controller are identified. These are provided by the different functions in writing with all risks and controls detailed on it. This is supplied to work owner for inclusion in the SWP before T-5 weeks for any potential de-confliction considerations.	The function could have a template task risk sheet for each activity, for example, changing a plain line rail for the welding department. Each time it is needed, the SWP reference and date/time of planned work is added, along with the delegated risk owner/controller, then submitted to work owner.	No task risk information is submitted to work owner or only generic site risks such as "slips, trips and falls", and does not reference any risks and control measures associated with their work element. Inadequate controls with inappropriate delegated owners.

Welfare Arrangements	Welfare arrangements (such as fixed facilities, portable facilities) are identified, along with the location. Additional facilities, such as messing facilities, first aid arrangements and other emergency arrangements are clearly identifies and linked to the task risks.	Welfare arrangements are provided, but consist of breaks planned every 2 hours with no more than 20 minutes travel to the facility. The welfare provision does NOT rely on the use of public conveniences.	The SWP does not consider welfare or make provision for the workforce. It is not acceptable to state 'Go behind a tree', or rely on the use of the nearest public conveniences.
----------------------	---	--	---

If SWP falls in the unacceptable column, tick "No" and return the SWP

DRAFT