



RAIL INDUSTRY SAFETY AND STANDARDS BOARD

ABN: 58 105 001 465

ADMIN 4.3 PRODUCT REVIEW AND COMMENT

VERSION 9

Damien White
CEO, RISSB

13 January 2023

1 Purpose

This procedure aims to identify the process for reviewing and commenting on a RISSB product by stakeholders. This includes the internal process used by the RISSB staff and Development Groups (DG) during the development of a product, as well as the external process when RISSB products undertake 'open' reviews. This procedure also includes commentary on how RISSB handles and responds to stakeholder comments.

2 Procedure

RISSB products consist of standards, codes of practice, rules, guidelines and handbooks.

Regular review throughout the product development stage will ensure that content is appropriate and correct for industry use and that good stakeholder commitment and ownership exist for the developed product.

This procedure is designed to advance the development of products from an author's preliminary draft to final status.

RISSB product reviews occur in the following forms, namely:

- DG review and comment
- Public consultation
- Peer review
- Independent review
- Workshop review (optional)

Development of Standards shall have regard for the General Provisions of the World Trade Organisation Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade.

https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/17-tbt_e.htm:

2.1 DG review and comment

DG Review and Comment is the process that allows technical content experts (Development Group members and Workshop participants) the opportunity to review the preliminary draft of RISSB products and, through a collaborative process, advance products to final status.

RISSB product authors develop preliminary drafts based on an agreed product objective and scope. Once created, the author will submit this initial draft via the Standard Development Manager for Development Group review.

Development Groups comprise the content experts for RISSB Products. Upon receipt of a preliminary draft, DG members will review and comment (ideally in the form of alternative content) on the product being considered. The author will collect and document all Development Group input and consolidate them through a pdf commenting tool for

discussion at the subsequent DG meeting. This document will hold all the comments received and the associated actions taken as a result.

The author uses these DG comments and the associated action to develop subsequent product drafts. A draft product can be subject to multiple DG reviews before being deemed ready to progress to Public Consultation. Depending on the complexity and DG consensus requirements, DG may request additional input from the SME within the SC. Any feedback provided by the SC will be documented.

Only when the DG agrees that the draft product is of an acceptable standard will the SDM progress the draft product to public consultation.

2.2 Peer review

Reviews undertaken by RISSB staff are referred to as peer reviews. Peer reviews focus on the documents' structure, language conventions, formatting and flow to ensure consistency in how RISSB products are developed and presented.

Peer reviews are generally undertaken prior to the document's public consultation or independent review.

2.3 Public consultation

The Public Consultation process requires the developed Standards and Codes of Practice drafts to be published on the RISSB website and for the appropriate industry and community stakeholders to be notified and invited to review and offer comments.

Notification consists of RISSB communique to all RISSB subscribers (available to all interested parties) and circulation by Development Group within their respective organisations.

Public Consultation duration is determined by the document type being developed:

- The developed Australian Standards shall be placed for public consultation (public comment) for a period of 60 days (8 weeks)
- RISSB Codes of Practice shall be placed for public consultation for 4 weeks
- Other RISSB products are not automatically subject to public consultation but may be circulated for public comment at the discretion of the GM.

Following the Public Consultation period, the author collates and provides the information to the DG. The DG then decided on which comments to accept and update. Finally, the author updates the final draft document based on the DG acceptance.

2.4 Independent review

An independent review (IR) is undertaken while the draft is placed on public consultation if the product is an Australian Standard or code of practice. For all other documents, the independent review is undertaken before DG approval to proceed to Standing Committee for final endorsement before publication.

The independent review is undertaken in accordance with the process articulated in ADMIN 4.4 Independent Review.

2.5 Workshop review (Optional)

In instances where there is strong interest, and much public comment about a draft product, RISSB's development process has a provision to run an optional Workshop review stage.

The need for a Workshop Review will be by the SDM in consultation with GMs and SCs.

All interested parties will be invited to attend the workshop via RISSB Communique a minimum of four weeks before the date of the Workshop. The independently reviewed draft standard is workshopped by interested stakeholders, including Development Group members and other appropriate people (e.g. Risk and Human Factor experts).

No new issues for the standard are introduced at the workshop. However, the content of the IR draft is tested during the workshop by participants. The independent reviewer is present during this activity and can immediately respond to any issues. The author amends the workshop draft and provides the final draft for DG members' approval.

3 Feedback/comment tracking

The SDM or author will track stakeholder comments from DG review and public consultation and record the actions taken.

Feedback/comment tracking will be documented and maintained as a record of stakeholder deliberations and form an audit trail as the product moves through its various development phases.

Tracking may be maintained as separate documents (excel or word lists) or as documents in Adobe Acrobat (comments).

Regardless of the format, the register shall record the following information:

- Clause identification
- Commenter identification
- Comment
- Response

Examples of issues registers for DG review and comment are attached in Appendix A.

4 Record requirements

The following records are retained as evidence of compliance with this procedure:

- Feedback/comment tracking (PDF version - saved each submitted draft).
- Comments and their disposition

- Public comment documents
- Minutes from the workshop (if applicable)
- Product drafts submitted for review (Each draft version submitted for review is to be retained).
- RFS documentation
- Independent review reports

Note: Record of comment tracking is to be secured and maintained within RISSB record-keeping systems. Record of comments placed in the public domain (i.e. public consultation or workshop review) shall be de-identified in accordance with RISSB Privacy Provisions.

Appendix A Issue Register Examples

Issue register – Adobe Acrobat (as comments)

The screenshot shows a document page with a blue header. The header contains the RISSB logo and text: "RAIL INDUSTRY SAFETY AND STANDARDS BOARD" and "AS 7453:2018 Recruitment and Selection of Rail Traffic Drivers". The main content area has a white background with a large, faint "DRAFT" watermark. The text on the page includes:

people to fill job vacancies against defined position descriptions and specifications, including: advertising the role and attracting candidates, the application process, sifting applications

Selection criteria: Aptitudes or skills that candidates must possess to a sufficient level in order to be considered as potential rail traffic drivers.

Selection process: identifying the most appropriate candidate, or candidates through a process including but not limited to interviewing, testing (including psychometric assessment) and reference checking.

2 General

2.1 Rail Traffic Driver

The successful recruitment and selection of a candidate to meet the role requirements of a Rail Traffic Driver (RTD) is critical to the safety obligations of the Rolling Stock Operator (RSO).

RSOs who employ RTDs must satisfy themselves that the selection procedures they use —

- (a) will not illegally discriminate against any applicants, and
- (b) will make sure as far as reasonably practicable that only competent persons are selected.

The inclusion of psychometric assessment process to measure the attributes that are relevant to undertaking the responsibilities of the RTD role and to distinguish between capable and potentially high safety risk candidates is of paramount importance for safety and shall be a part of the selection process for RTDs.

2.2 Performance Information

Data on RTD performance during training and on the job is necessary to assess the validity of the recruitment and selection process. RSOs should have a system in place to capture data and feedback into the recruitment and selection process.

3 Recruitment of a candidate

3.1 Purpose

The purpose of the recruitment process is to identify potential candidates that are available to

There are several yellow speech bubble icons scattered across the page, indicating comments or issues raised in Adobe Acrobat. These are located near the list items (a) and (b), the paragraph about psychometric assessment, and the paragraph about performance information.