

ADMIN 4.3

Product Review and Comment

- Version 8



Paul Daly
CEO RISSB

10 December 2017

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Identification

Document Title	Number	Version	Date
Procedure for Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	1	20/07/2007
Procedure for Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	2	14/01/2010
Procedure for Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	3	16/04/2010
Procedure for Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	4	3/05/2010
Procedure for Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	5	28/08/2012
Standard Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	6	06/11/2014
Procedure for Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	7	18/02/2016
Product Review and Comment	ADMIN 4.3	8	10/12/2017

Document History

Publication Version	Effective Date	Page(s) Affected	Changes
1	20/07/2007	All	Document Creation
2	14/01/2010	All	QMS System update of document
3	16/04/2010	Page 3 Vote Section	Update of entire document following review
4	3/05/2010	All	Review and Update
5	28/08/2012	All	Review and Update
6	06/11/2014	All	Inclusion of Work Shop
7	18/02/2016	All	Technical content responsibility
8	10/12/2017	All	GM / SDM Update

Product Review and Comment

1 Purpose

The purpose of this procedure is to identify the process for reviewing and commenting on a RISSB product by stakeholders. This includes the internal process used by the RISSB staff, Development Groups, and Standing Committees during the development of a product as well as the external process when RISSB products undertake 'open' reviews. This procedure also includes commentary on the way RISSB handles and responds to stakeholder comments.

2 Product Reviews

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

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

The product review and comment process is designed to advance the development of products from an author's preliminary draft to final draft status.

RISSB product reviews occurs in three forms, namely:

- Internal review and comment
- Open review
- Workshop approval (optional)

2.1 Internal Review and Comment

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

RISSB product authors develop preliminary drafts based on an agreed product objective and scope. Once developed, the author will submit this preliminary draft via the Standard Development Manager for Development Group review. A copy will also be provided to the relevant General Manager (for Standing Committee).

Development Groups comprise the content experts for RISSB Products, and upon receipt of a preliminary draft, DG members will review and comment (ideally in the form of alternative content) for the product being considered. The author will collect and document all Development Group, Standing Committee, and SDM input into an Issues Register. This register will consist of all comments received and details any actions taken as a result.

The author uses this DG, SC, and SDM input to develop subsequent product drafts. Depending on complexity, and DG consensus requirements, it is possible for a draft product to be subject to multiple internal reviews before being deemed ready to progress to Open Review.

It is only when the DG agrees that the draft product is of an acceptable standard, the SDM will progress the draft product to an Open Review.

2.2 Open Review

The Open Review process requires RISSB 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 comment.

Notification consists of RISSB website communique to all RISSB subscribers (available to all interested parties), GM and SDM's email contact lists, and circulation by Development Group and Standing Committee circulation within their respective organisations.

Open review duration is determined by the document type being developed:

- RISSB developed Australian Standards shall be subjected to an open review (public comment) for a period of 60 days (8 weeks)
- RISSB Codes of Practice shall be subjected to open review of 4 weeks
- Other RISSB products are not automatically subject to open review but may be circulated for public comment at discretion of RISSB CEO., with –

Following the Open Review period, the author is provided a four-week period to assimilate the comments received into a final draft document.

The final draft is submitted to the Development Group for approval to proceed to validation stage (if product is an Australian Standard) or to Standing Committee for final endorsement before publication.

Where the product is an Australian Standard, the final draft is validated in accordance with the process articulated in ADMIN 4.4 Product Validation.

2.3 Workshop Approval Stage (Optional)

In instances where there has been a strong interest and a lot of public comment in relation to a draft product, RISSB's development process has provision to run an optional Workshop Approvals stage.

The need for a Workshop Approval will be by decision of RISSB CEO, in consultation with SDMs, GMs, SCs, and DG members and validators.

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 validated draft standard is work shopped 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 validated draft is tested during the workshop by participants. The Validator is present during this activity and can immediately respond to any issues raised. The author amends the workshop draft and provides the final draft for DG members' approval.

3 Issues Register

The Issues Register is used to track stakeholder comments from internal and open reviews, and record the actions taken as a result.

Issues registers are maintained as a record of stakeholder deliberations and form an audit trail as the product moves through its various development phases.

Issues registers may be maintained as separate documents (excel or word lists) or can consist documents with tracked changes (MS Word (tracked changes) or 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 internal review and comment are attached in Appendix A.

4 Record Requirements

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

- Issues registers (MS Word or MS Excel – versioned and saved each submitted draft).
- Comments, and their disposition
- Public comment documents
- Minutes from the workshop (if applicable)
- Product drafts (1st, 2nd, subsequent, Final) (Each draft version submitted for review to be retained).
- RFS documentation (validators)
- Validation Reports

Note: Original Issue Registers are to be secured and maintained within RISSB record keeping systems. Issues Registers used in the public domain (i.e. open reviews or workshop approvals) shall be de-identified in accordance with RISSB Privacy Provisions.

Appendix A Issue Register Examples

Issue register - product development in MS Excel

SECTION	CLAUSE	REQUIREMENTS	TYPE	SOURCE	HAZARD	IC	Background Information	Reviewers' Comments	Impact	Author's Response
1		INTRODUCTION	HED							
1.1		DISCLAIMER	HED							
	1	This document is a draft only and has been issued solely for the purposes of development within the rail industry.	SUP							
	2	Disclaimer text	SUP							
	3	Disclaimer text	SUP							
	4	Disclaimer text	SUP							
	5	© Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board	SUP							
1.2		PURPOSE	HED							
	1	This document describes requirements for...	SUP							
	2	The main purpose of the requirements is to reduce the risk of...	SUP							
1.3		SCOPE	HED							
	1	This document applies to (new and existing) (locomotive / freight / passenger / infrastructure maintenance) rolling stock.	SUP							
	2	Sections ... apply to new (new and existing) (locomotive / freight / passenger / infrastructure maintenance) rolling stock.	SUP							
	3	The document covers the design, construction and maintenance of rolling stock.	SUP							
	4	Operation of rolling stock is not covered.	SUP				Operation of rolling stock is covered in the Operation section of the Code.			
	5	Light rail, cane railway and monorail rolling stock are not covered.	SUP				Currently excluded.			
1.4		COMPLIANCE	HED							
	1	Compliance text	SUP							
	2	Compliance text	SUP							
1.5		CONTENT	HED							
	1	The "SECTION" plus "CLAUSE" columns provide a unique identifier for each sentence/row/requirement in the document, e.g. this is sentence 1.5.1.	SUP							
	2	The "REQUIREMENTS" column contains the main body of the document.	SUP							
	3	White-coloured cells in the "REQUIREMENTS" column contain the document requirements.	SUP							
	4	Green-coloured cells in the "REQUIREMENTS" column contain additional supporting information.	SUP							
	5	Grey-coloured cells in the "REQUIREMENTS" column contain the section heading descriptions.	SUP							
	6	The "TYPE" column categorises each row into one of supporting information (SUP), a heading (HED), a mandatory requirement (MAN) or a recommended requirement (REC).	SUP							

Issue register – MS Word

1. INTRODUCTION

Comment: Draft AS XX-X clause no. - Industry comment. {Organisation name}

Response: Author response.

Comment: Draft AS XX-X clause no. - Industry comment. {Organisation name}

Response: Author response.

2. SECTION HEADING

Comment: Draft AS XX-X clause no. - Industry comment. {Organisation name}

Response: Author response.

Issue register – Adobe Acrobat (as comments)

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