# 1. Purpose

This procedure describes the process for the maintenance of RISSB ACOP products (Australian Code of Practice) to ensure currency and applicability.

# 2. Requests for change

Requests for change can be received both externally and internally.  Requests usually relate to:

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

## 2.1. Change management

Change management practices will be applied to ensure a controlled and auditable implementation of changes made to products.

Change management practices:

- ensure an evaluation of proposed change;
- ensure affected parties are identified;
- enable affected parties to assess the impact of the proposed change and associated risks;
- ensure consultation of changes; and
- ensure changes are approved.

## 2.2. Change requests

Both internal and external requests can be made via the RISSB website, through the lodgement of a change request.  Change requests are available for both the RISSB Glossary, and for RISSB products.

## 2.3. Processing the change request

Details of the request will be captured within the change management system on the website.  The Accreditation and Quality 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 .CSV file is emailed to the Standards Development Managers for their review and consideration.

The Standards Development Manager (SDM) will, for products in the current or proposed work plan:

- update the issues register in the DEPOT Development Plan for the product to show the change request; and
- continue to update the Issues Register in the DEPOT throughout the progression of the proposed changes in accordance with this procedure.

Where the product is not currently listed for review in the current or proposed work plan the SDM shall assess the request as per Section 2.4.

## 2.4.    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.

### 2.4.1    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 error 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 with the change being added to the issues register.
- Rejection of the proposed 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

      o   The SDM will respond to the applicant advising the reasons for the rejection and outlining the decision appeal process (ADMIN 3.1).

### 2.4.2   Document approval

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

# 3.      Aged product review

RISSB products have a review period of no more than seven (7) years.

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 to review the products to determine whether changes are required, and if they are:

- material or otherwise; and
- significant and /or numerous.

This will determine if the product is to be:

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

## 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);
- is not suitable for new and existing applications (products, systems, or processes); and
- is not 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 may be either:

- without amendment – When a product's status as a current Standard, Code of Practice, or Guideline is to be renewed ("reconfirmed") without any changes to its content; or

- with amendments – When a product's status as a current Standard, Code of Practice, or Guideline is to be renewed ("reconfirmed") with only minor changes, such as formatting & typographical changes, and/or minor (non-technical) material content updates.

Care should be taken that any such changes will not alter the technical intent of the Standard, Code of Practice or Guideline. Any such changes will require public consultation.

## 3.3.    Product redevelopment

Indicates that the product is still relevant or suitable for use by the Australian Rail Industry but requires updating. Redevelopment occurs when there is enough update or technical change required to the current version as to 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 that followed for product development (ADMIN 4.2).

# 4. Appendix A – Change Request Considerations Flow Chart



**Triggers for Review**

**Consideration:**
SDM (Standards Development Manager)
AM (Accreditation Manager)
SC (Standing Committee)
DG (development Group)

**Product Outcomes**

Are required changes significant and/ or numerous i.e. warrants a DG
— Yes → DG convened / updates document. → New product Edition / Full development one → Public Consultation req # / New Edition - 7 year review restarts

— No → SC amends / updates document. → Product Amendment → Public Consultation req # / Same edition with certificate of review - 7 year review restarted

Are material changes required
— No → SDM & AM progress change → Correction /File Swap → No Public Consultation req / Same edition with certificate of review - 7 year review restarted

Are changes required
— No → No action – Change request remains in RISSB system → No change → No Public Consultation req / Same edition with certificate of review - 7 year review restarted

Time based review (7 years)
Risk based review (Due to significant scope change)
→ SC reviews all document content

Is change required urgently
— yes → SC reviews and progresses only the requested change → Product Amendment → Public Consultation req # / No restart of 7 year review

Is proposed change 'material'?
— no → SDM and AM progress change → Correction /File Swap → No Public Consultation req / No restart of 7 year review

Change Requests
→ Proposed changes are sufficient to warrant immediate change?
— No → No action – Change request remains in RISSB system → No change → No Public Consultation req / No restart of 7 year review

**#  Public consultation not required for Guidelines**