



RAIL INDUSTRY SAFETY AND STANDARDS BOARD

ABN: 58 105 001 465

ADMIN 4.7 PRODUCT REVIEW AND MAINTENANCE

VERSION 9

Damien White
CEO, RISSB

27 November 2022

1 Purpose

This procedure describes the process for maintaining RISSB products (Standards, Codes of Practice, Guidelines, and Rules) to ensure currency and applicability.

RISSB products have a review period of seven (7) years. A product review is initiated by change requests submitted by the rail industry or by the RISSB age review process.

2 Request for Change

2.1 Change requests

All stakeholders can request a change be made to a product via the RISSB website through the lodgement of a change request. Change requests are available for both the RISSB Glossary and RISSB products.

Change requests received usually relate to:

- correction/amendment to the content; or
- the currency or applicability of the product.

If a change request is accepted and the product is required to be updated, the change management practices incorporated within "ADMIN 4.2 Product Development" will be applicable.

2.2 Processing the change request

Details of the request will be captured within the change management system on the website. The Accreditation Manager will be responsible for ensuring that:

- the change management system is accessed at least once a month to review any new change requests;
- new change requests are downloaded into a .CSV file; and
- the data is updated in the excel based "change tracking system (CTS)" for review and consideration.

The Standards Development Manager (SDM) will, for products in the current or proposed work plan, submit the proposed changes for consideration to the DG and update the CTS accordingly.

Where the product is not listed for review in the current or proposed work plan, the SDM shall assess the request as per Section 2.3.

2.3 Determining the response to the change request

The SDM responsible for the discipline-specific Standing Committee will review the change request in the context of the product to establish the materiality of the request considering:

- that sufficient detail about the change has been obtained, or whether additional information is required; and
- the impact of the change.

See Appendix 1 for the decision-making process for change requests consistent with RISSB's accreditation requirements.

2.3.1 Determining the Change Required

Any change should be made using the decision-making process in Appendix 1.

- Amending the product in response to a change request:
 - the change is material (i.e., change alters requirements or products' intent and isn't simply a typographical or format change)
 - the Standing Committee will determine that the review will be included in the work plan development procedure (ADMIN 4.1). This excludes where an urgent change is required; and
 - if the change is deemed urgent by the appropriate Standing Committee, the change will be expedited to RISSB management for consideration ahead of the next work plan.
- Acceptance of the proposed change with deferred action:
 - These are minor changes, e.g., non-critical typographical errors or a request to enhance a diagram or an opportunity to simplify wording; and
 - can be addressed as part of the next aged review cycle.
- Rejection of the proposed change:
 - Where insufficient evidence was provided to progress the change;
 - where the change request (if implemented) would lead to inferior levels of safety within the national rail networks; or
 - where a proposed change was recommended from an individual which was unacceptable to the broader rail industry; and
 - the SDM will respond to the applicant advising the reasons for the rejection and outlining the decision appeal process (ADMIN 3.1).

All decisions will be documented against the change request on the CTS.

2.3.2 Document approval

Changed RISSB documents shall be approved in accordance with the Board approval and publication procedure (ADMIN 4.5).

3 Aged product review

As part of RISSB's work plan development (ADMIN 4.1), the Accreditation & Quality Manager will notify the SDMs of those products due for aged review in the following work plan year.

The SDMs will arrange for the relevant Standing Committee (SC) to review the products to determine whether changes are required and if they are:

- material or otherwise;
- significant and numerous.

This will determine if the product is to be:

- withdrawn;
- re-confirmed;
- amended; or
- re-developed.

The SC decision shall be recorded on the Standing committee meeting minutes, and the CTS will be updated accordingly.

3.1 Product withdrawal

Indicates that the product is no longer relevant or suitable for use by the Australian Rail Industry. A product may be 'Withdrawn' if it is not:

- up-to-date technically or does not reflect current practice or research (and lacks enough support for amendment/redevelopment);
- suitable for new and existing applications (products, systems, or processes); and
- compatible with current views and expectations regarding quality, safety, and the environment.

3.2 Product reconfirmation

Indicates that the Product is still relevant or suitable for use by the Australian Rail Industry. Reconfirmation occurs when a product's current status is to be renewed ("re-confirmed") without any changes to its content.

3.3 Product amendment

Indicates that the product is still relevant for use by the Australian Rail Industry. Amendment occurs when a product's status as a current Standard, Code of Practice, or Guideline is to be renewed with only minor modifications, such as formatting & typographical changes or minor error corrections. Such modifications shall be reviewed and approved by the standing committee before publication.

If a change has the potential to alter the technical intent of the product, such changes will require the product to follow the product redevelopment process outlined in section 3.4.

3.4 Product redevelopment

Indicates that the product is still relevant or suitable for use by the Australian Rail Industry but requires updating. Redevelopment occurs when enough update or technical change is needed to the current version, which impact/alter the technical intention of the product.

Where the Standing Committee recommends a product redevelopment, the SDM will consider this a new product request and submit a Product Prioritisation Form.

The review process will be consistent with product development (ADMIN 4.2 Product development).

4 Records Management

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

- Meeting minutes
- Change requests

5 Appendix A – Change Request Considerations Flow Chart



