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1. **INTRODUCTION**

This document outlines Highways England’s requirements for governance to manage safety risks arising for all Highways England schemes, projects, programmes, and where appropriate operational activities (hereafter ‘project’ or ‘projects’ will be used to cover all terms).

This includes Major Projects¹ and Network Delivery and Development (NDD), some elements of network management undertaken by Customer Operations and it will also be appropriate to apply the principles to policy development and other initiatives undertaken by or for Highways England where there are safety considerations or implications.

This document defines the remit of the two main groups required to provide that governance: the National Safety Control Review Group (NSCRG) and the Scheme/Project/Programme Safety Control Review Group (PSCRG).

The NSCRG reviews and advises on complex, unique or contentious safety issues that are referred to it from PSCRG’s, and endorses solutions developed by PSCRG’s. The NSCRG undertakes periodic reviews of the recommendations and decisions made at individual PSCRGs to maintain consistency. The Group Manager for Asset & Operational Development Group, who represents the Chief Highway Engineer (CHE) and Highways England Board on safety matters, is accountable for the NSCRG.

All projects are required to classify themselves for Safety Management system (SMS) purposes and this is achieved through the application of

- IAN 191 – Requirements Safety Governance for Highways England
- GD04 – Standard for Safety Risk Management on the SRN

The three levels of SMS are Type A (basic) SMS; Type B (moderate) SMS or Type C (rigorous) SMS. Type A SMS will not require a PSCRG. Both Type B and Type C must have a PSCRG. The Highways England Project Manager for each project will be responsible for implementation of PSCRG recommendations, endorsements and advice. The PSCRG is responsible for the safety control processes for the individual project.

2. **BACKGROUND**

The remit for the NSCRG and PSCRG has previously focused on smart motorways. This document has been revised to enable the principles of safety risk management and governance to be applied to all projects where safety is a consideration regardless of their size, scope or delivery organisation. It is therefore now appropriate and applicable for all Type B SMS or Type C SMS projects.

---

¹ Major Project Schemes includes Single Option schemes and schemes following the traditional Project Control Framework (PCF) Lifecycle.
3. NATIONAL SAFETY CONTROL REVIEW GROUP (NSCRG)

The key objectives of the NSCRG are to:

- Ensure alignment of safety objectives with relevant Highways England objectives and targets
- Act as a specialist advisory group providing support to the Chief Highway Engineer (CHE)
- Review and advise on complex, unique or contentious safety issues arising on projects
- Review and advise on safety issues that have a National impact or haven’t arisen on the SRN before.
- Ensure consistency of approach to managing safety across projects (through periodic monitoring of the recommendations from individual PSCRGs)
- Encourage knowledge sharing across projects
- Liaise with national bodies (e.g.: HSE) as required.

Membership: The Chair of NSCRG will consider the quorum and consistency of attendance at NSCRG meetings. There may be two types of attendees who are invited to each NSCRG meeting:

- **Principal members**, who collectively review and advise on complex, unique or contentious safety issues that are referred by PSCRG’s, and endorse solutions developed by PSCRG’s; and who each have the power of veto over such decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset &amp; Operational Delivery Group Manager</td>
<td>CHE (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Roads Group Manager</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical Solutions - Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Risk &amp; Governance Team Leader</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical Solutions - Risk &amp; Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Roads Team Leader</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical Solutions - Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects Business Improvement Manager</td>
<td>Major Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Projects / NDD Liaison Manager</td>
<td>NDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Operations Manager</td>
<td>Customer Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health &amp; Safety Team</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical Solutions - Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Motorway Development Manager</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Technical Solutions - MMALR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Motorway Subject Matter Expert</td>
<td>MM Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Motorway CDMC / Principal Designer</td>
<td>CDMC / Principal Designer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Specialist members**, who provide additional subject matter specialism experience to the group such as when there are specific design issues where specialist input is required in order for a decision to be endorsed.
The NSCRG will make a determination on Type C referrals made by PSCRGs and then either:

- Endorse and pass to the Group Manager for Asset & Operational Development Group who represents the CHE and Highways England Board. The deliverable accepted at this stage will then be submitted for formal approval through the Safety PCF process.

- Should the NSCRG feel that the issue has higher implications then this will be escalated to the CHE and or the Network Performance Group for decision

Or

- Refer back to the project team for further consideration

(Note: All costs associated with project representation to the NSCRG will be met from the individual project budget – not by the Professional and Technical Solutions Directorate.)

4. PROJECT SAFETY CONTROL REVIEW GROUP (PSCRG)

The PSCRG provides a forum for reviewing and endorsing ‘safety work’ associated with the design and planning of a project before it is submitted for formal approval through the PCF process. By completing the tasks described herein the PSCRG will support the development and endorsement of the PCF safety deliverables: safety plan; hazard log, combined safety and hazard log report. The PSCRG should also review but is not required to endorse the maintenance and repair strategy and statement (MRSS), road safety audits, and the plan for monitoring operations and monitoring output. It is desirable that the PSCRG is in agreement with the content of these documents before sign-off is sought.

The PSCRG is a cross-functional group that reviews ‘safety work’ to agree that safety risks are correctly identified, reviewed and managed appropriately. The need for meetings of the PSCRG through the life of the project is to be determined by the Highways England Project Manager. Quorum, membership of the group and the degree to which consistency of attendance is required shall be agreed with the project Senior Responsible Owner’s representative in advance of the first meeting of the group.

The PSCRG group must be cross functional and ensure that

- appropriate consultation is undertaken and agreement is achieved
- appropriate actions are taken for the effective management of hazards for the whole life operation of the project
- the safety objective for each population is achieved

The PSCRG reviews safety related Departures from Standard (DfS) (before these are formally submitted to the Professional & Technical Solutions specialists) alongside the project specific safety challenges, resultant safety mitigation and their effect on the delivery of the safety objectives.
The PSCRG shall comprise

- **Principal members**, who collectively determine decisions taken to endorse evidence presented to the group, and who each have the power of veto over such decisions

- **Specialist members**, who provide additional subject matter specialism experience to the group such as when there are specific design issues where specialist input is required in order for a decision to be endorsed.

The requirement for specialist member attendance will be decided by the project manager and lead consultant.

- Principal member - a senior Highways England Project Manager and/or Senior Responsible Owner
- Principal member - lead consultancy support, with relevant risk assessment knowledge, competence, design understanding and experience with Highways England safety governance procedures.
- Principal member - Network Delivery and Development Senior User
- Principal member - Customer Operations Senior User
- Principal member - Competent Designer Safety / Operations Expert
- Principal member - Project Construction, Design and Management Coordinator
- Principal member - Contractor representative (when appointed)
- Principal member – Professional & Technical Solutions Safety Risk and Governance representative
- Specialist members - additional technical support (Professional & Technical Solutions specialists or external subject matter experts (SME’s)) as required (e.g. consideration of potential DfS)
- Specialist member - the Design Team Project Manager
- Specialist member – Asset Support Contract representative
- Specialist member – Maintenance representatives, including technology
- Specialist member – Stakeholder representatives (e.g. other RCC/Traffic Officer Service representatives

While such a situation should be avoided, it may be necessary for principal members to send representatives to the PSCRG. Representative attendees must have the competency and delegated authority to represent their senior representative. It must be the senior representative who subsequently signs the PCF safety products approval sheet.

The project will follow the approach set out in GD-04/12, IAN 191, and the DfS process. This will be achieved by the project team through endorsement of the following:

- Assessment of the appropriate level of SMS
- The identification and assessment of significant hazards and new hazards

---

2 Note that Type A SMS schemes do not require a PSCRG.
• Changes to a hazard risk assessment or safety requirement (this may include re-scoring of a hazard and review of appropriate evidence)
• The verification of safety requirements to mitigate significant hazards
• Safety related DfS (before these are formally submitted to the Professional & Technical Solutions specialist)
• Strategies and mitigations for addressing key safety challenges type B and type C issues as defined in [1] and [3]:

Records/minutes as appropriate shall be kept of all activities undertaken, all decisions and their justifications shall be recorded and appropriate risk assessment shall be carried out.

Where safety challenges are identified as Type C they will require a higher level of Highways England consideration and thus will be referred to the NSCRG for review and endorsement of approach. Type B issues may also be referred to the NSCRG where appropriate as defined in IAN 191.

See Annex 1 ‘Template for Project PSCRG Remit’ which provides a template for developing a project specific PSCRG remit document.

The Highways England project manager for the PSCRG and the Chair of the NSCRG must be able to demonstrate that the groups have sufficient individual and collective competence to fulfil their duties and the specific aspects for which they are responsible under the terms of reference. Where gaps are identified, relevant subject matter specialists may be consulted (in person or by correspondence) to provide advice or supplementary information. Such subject matter specialists may also be requested to audit items under discussion or decisions reached to support the responsible individuals in fulfilment of their obligations.

5. FURTHER INFORMATION

For further information or clarification please contact the Safety Risk & Governance Manager via email on:

SafetyGovernance@highwaysengland.co.uk

6. REFERENCES

[1] Interim Advice Note 191, Guidance for the safety governance of Highways England projects
[3] MPI-31-082014 Clarification on the role of the Operations TLG and programme board
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1. The need for a Project Safety Control Review Group

Application of Highways England Guidance for the Safety Governance of schemes, projects, programmes, appropriate operational activities and other initiatives where there are safety considerations and/or implications (hereafter known as ‘projects’)

The PSCRG provides a forum for reviewing and endorsing ‘safety work’ associated with the design and planning of a project before it is submitted for formal approval through the PCF process. By completing the tasks described herein the PSCRG will support the development and endorsement of the PCF safety deliverables: safety plan; combined safety and hazard log report.

The PSCRG is a cross-functional group that reviews ‘safety work’ to agree that safety risks are correctly identified, reviewed and managed appropriately. The need for meetings of the PSCRG through the life of the project is to be determined by the Highways England Project Manager. Quorum, membership of the group and the degree to which consistency of attendance is required shall be agreed with the project Senior Responsible Owner’s representative in advance of the first meeting of the group

The PSCRG group must be cross functional and ensure that:

- appropriate consultation is undertaken and agreement is achieved
- appropriate actions are taken for the effective management of hazards for the whole life operation of the project
- the safety objective for each population is achieved

1.1. The need for hazard review
Risk assessment of the proposed design, operation and maintenance of the project will identify and assess the key hazards that the project team needs to manage to meet the project safety objective.

1.2. The need for departure from standard (DfS) review
The design process for the project is likely to generate a number of safety related DfS. These will require review by the PSCRG prior to formal submission to the Professional & Technical Solutions technical specialist for their consideration and acceptance.

The ICert process is a trial that enables designers and their organisation to independently certify low – medium risk DfS, removing the requirement for a review by Professional & Technical Solutions and subsequent sign off.

1.3. The need for review of safety challenges
The project may face a number of safety challenges. There is therefore a need for the PSCRG to review the project Safety Team’s assessment of these challenges and the

---

3 Further information can be found in the Highways England Professional & Technical Solutions - An Introduction to Designers Independent Certification (ICert).
strategies and mitigations proposed by the designers to manage them in the delivery of the safety objectives. This is to ensure challenges have been identified, assessed and mitigated in an effective and efficient way in line with GD04 in support of the project’s objectives. Where challenges need a higher level of Highways England consideration they shall be referred to the NSCRG for further review and endorsement of approach.
2. **Project Safety Control Review Group**

The project manager shall set up a PSCRG with the following remit, ensuring that the group has sufficient individual and collective competence to fulfil their duties. This follows guidelines set out in GD04 and IAN 191.

2.1. **Scope**

“Assuring the approach of the project in managing hazards, DfS and safety challenges is appropriate and cross-functional.” This will be achieved by the PSCRG through endorsement of the following:

- Assessment of the appropriate level of safety management system (SMS) i.e. type A, B or C. The Professional & Technical Solutions technical specialist team shall participate in the assessment of the appropriate SMS

There are three possible SMS Types:

- **Type A**: Basic SMS needs to be applied. This will be satisfied by the application of existing standards, safety management processes, a brief safety plan and combined safety and hazard log report. There may be some departures associated with this project type.

- **Type B**: A moderate level of SMS needs to be applied and mapped out in the Safety Plan. This will include the application of existing standards and SMS processes, where they exist. However, it will also require some additional risk assessment plus a more detailed combined safety and hazard log report. There are likely to be a significant number of departures associated with this project type.

- **Type C**: Rigorous SMS shall be applied and mapped out in a safety plan. Where they exist, existing standards and SMS processes will still be applied, but by definition, much of the project will fall outside of existing experience. Projects of this nature are likely to result in many departures from standards.

All projects are required to:

- identify and assess significant hazards and new hazards
- identify the safety requirements to mitigate significant hazards
- identify changes to a hazard risk assessment or safety requirement (this may include re-scoring of a hazard and review of appropriate evidence)
- verify safety requirements
- ensure that all strategies and mitigations for addressing key safety challenges identified as type B and type C issues are in accordance with and as defined in GD04 and IAN 191.

---

4 Type B and C schemes require a PSCRG and hazard log. Type A schemes do not have a requirement to set up a PSCRG or hazard log. However, if any safety challenges arise through the design process it may be appropriate to assess any hazards through a meeting with key parties which would take a similar form to a PSCRG.
Therefore, records/minutes shall be kept of all activities undertaken, all decisions and their justifications shall be recorded and appropriate risk assessment shall be carried out. A comprehensive combined safety and hazard log report will be required.

By completing the above tasks PSCRG will support the development and endorse the project safety deliverables: safety plan and combined safety and hazard log report.

**Endorsing the identification and assessment of significant hazards (e.g. State/Event Hazards scoring 08 (S/E08) and above)**

For Type B and Type C projects a hazard log shall be produced. Some projects may already have a hazard log which will be reviewed and updated to reflect the project design.

The project will also be reviewed to determine if it introduces any new project specific hazards. The designer will be responsible for completing the design and implementing any safety requirements or task plans for mitigating hazards.

The evidence supporting the definition and assessment of a significant (e.g. S/E08 and above) hazard will be presented to PSCRG. PSCRG will only endorse the hazard analysis if they agree with the definition of the hazard and the underlying assumptions and evidence which together formulate the assessment. If they do not endorse a hazard, they will give their reasons so that the hazard can be reviewed and revised. The revised hazard will then be represented to PSCRG for endorsement. In reviewing the hazards the PSCRG shall actively seek to identify any important new hazards that have so far not been identified by the project team.

**Endorsing the safety requirements to mitigate significant hazards**

The party responsible for the safety requirements will be required to present their hazard mitigation proposals. PSCRG will review the plans and only endorse them if they consider them to suitably achieve the objective of the requirement. If they are not satisfied they will record their concerns so that the requirement owner can review, and if necessary modify the hazard mitigation proposals. The PSCRG should not only review whether there are proposals to address the identified hazards in place but shall satisfy itself that these proposals are implemented and the requirement is being met.

Similarly PSCRG will review progress on implementing key task plans to mitigate hazards.

**Endorsing changes to a hazard risk assessment or safety requirement**

During the life of the project it is likely that new data / evidence will lead to the reassessment of some hazards and / or their safety requirements. This will enable the project team to gain further confidence in the assessment. A reassessment of a hazard could show that it is considered less significant, in which case less onerous mitigation measures may be possible or the hazard may become tolerable. Alternatively a hazard that is deemed to be more significant may require additional mitigation measures. Finally, while the assessment of the hazard may not change, a new means of mitigating it may be found. In all these cases the reassessed hazard and any proposed change in safety requirements will be re-presented to PSCRG so that they can review the changes. If PSCRG is satisfied that the changes are warranted, they will then endorse them. If not, they will record their concerns so that the items can be reassessed again.
PSCRG may also review significant changes to key task plans.

**Endorsing the verification of safety requirements**

Once safety requirements have been completed and implemented, the party responsible will need to collect evidence to verify this. The party responsible will present this evidence to PSCRG so that they can review it. If they are satisfied that the safety requirement is complete the verification of the safety requirement will be endorsed. If they are not satisfied, they will record their concerns so that the owner can determine what further evidence/work is required to demonstrate adequate and appropriate mitigation to endorse the verification of the safety requirement.

Similarly PSCRG will review key task plans that have been met.

**Endorsing Safety related DfS that may be cross-discipline**

Early engagement with Professional & Technical Solutions specialists will assist the design team in identifying DfS as the design progresses. The safety related DfS will be reviewed and endorsed by the PSCRG before formal submission to the Professional & Technical Solutions specialist. These DfS will be presented to the PSCRG along with the supporting evidence to demonstrate the requirement for the DfS and steps taken to ensure that the safe use and operation of the project remains tolerable.

**Endorsing strategies and mitigations for addressing key safety challenges type B and type C issues**

The project is likely to face safety challenges (Type B and Type C issues). The designer will assess these challenges and identify suitable strategies and mitigations to address them in line with GD04/12. The Designer will present its analysis, conclusions and recommendations to the PSCRG allowing sufficient time for consultees to properly review, consider, and make informed recommendation for endorsement. If PSCRG is satisfied with the analysis and agrees with the conclusions reached and the recommendations made, they shall then endorse them. If not, they shall detail their concerns so that the items can be reassessed by the Designer.

### 2.2. Supporting approval of project safety deliverables

PSCRG will support the approval of project safety deliverables as follows:

- The 'draft' project safety plan will be presented to PSCRG to explain the safety management approach for the project and achieve its endorsement
- PSCRG endorsement of the significant hazards and safety requirements is required for the combined safety and hazard log report
- PSCRG, and if required NSCRG, endorsement of safety related DfS and mitigations for key safety challenges is required for the combined safety and hazard log report

### 2.3. SMS Classification

The level of SMS must to address the key challenges that are specific for the project. Further information on the application of the SMS is included within Section 3. Section 3 provides further information relating to Major Projects Smart Motorway (SM) projects, Major...
Projects non SM projects and Network Delivery and Development Directorate (NDDD) projects.

2.4. Frequency and duration
The need for meetings of the PSCRG through the life of the project is to be determined by the Highways England Project Manager. The exact meeting schedule will be regularly communicated to all PSCRG members (and observers and other people as required) to address the scope of PSCRG's work. Reasonable time e.g. 7 days will be provided for members to review all papers to be considered.

2.5. Attendees
The PSCRG shall comprise

- **Principal members**, who collectively determine decisions taken to endorse evidence presented to the group, and who each have the power of veto over such decisions

- **Specialist members**, who provide additional subject matter specialism experience to the group such as when there are specific design issues where specialist input is required in order for a decision to be endorsed. The requirement for specialist member attendance will be decided by the project manager and lead consultant.

  - Principal member - a senior Highways England Project Manager and/or Senior Responsible Owner
  - Principal member - lead consultancy support, with relevant risk assessment knowledge, competence, design understanding and experience with Highways England safety governance procedures.
  - Principal member - Network Delivery and Development Senior User
  - Principal member - Customer Operations Senior User
  - Principal member - Competent Designer Safety / Operations Expert
  - Principal member - Project Construction, Design and Management Coordinator
  - Principal member - Contractor representative (when appointed)
  - Principal member – Professional & Technical Solutions Safety Risk and Governance representative
  - Specialist members - additional technical support (Professional & Technical Solutions specialists or external subject matter experts (SME’s)) as required (e.g. consideration of potential DfS)
  - Specialist member - the Design Team Project Manager
  - Specialist member – Asset Support Contract representative
  - Specialist member – Maintenance representatives, including technology
  - Specialist member – Stakeholder representatives (e.g. other RCC/Traffic Officer Service representatives

The meeting may be considered quorate if the Chair (or his representative) and two other Members (or their representatives) are present, including the domain expert for the topic discussed. Quorum, membership of the group and the degree to which consistency of
attendance is required shall be agreed with the project Senior Responsible Owner / Highways England Project Manager or their representative in advance of the first meeting of the group.
3. Additional Guidance for projects (Smart Motorways, Non Smart Motorways and NDD projects)

3.1. Specific information appropriate for Smart Motorway (SM) projects is as follows:

**SM Safety Baseline**

The safety baseline to be used for a SM project is the number (averaged per annum) of fatal and weighted injury (FWI) casualties and the rate of FWIs per billion vehicle miles per annum averaged for the three years, prior to the installation of any element of SM (i.e. it is a D3M without MIDAS). FWI is defined as:

\[(\text{Number of fatalities}) + 0.1 \times (\text{number of serious casualties}) + 0.01 \times (\text{number of slight casualties})\]

Where MIDAS is installed, the safety baseline will be based on information from the recorded accidents before installation of MIDAS or, if this data is not available or older than 5 years, data from the three years prior to the installation of SM and an adjustment to account for MIDAS. It is generally accepted that MIDAS reduces accidents rates by between 9% and 13% therefore a value of 10% will be used for this purpose.

The SM project will satisfy the safety objective for road users if both of the two key indicators above are demonstrated to be no worse than the safety baseline for the three years after full project opening. In addition no population (e.g. car drivers, pedestrians, HGV drivers and motorcyclists) can be adversely affected in terms of safety. (Where different forms of managed motorways are proposed on opposing carriageways, for example, controlled motorways and SM-ALR, then the road user benefits shall be considered per link per carriageway).

There is no specific numerical safety objective set for road workers. This risk will be managed in accordance with the requirements of the Health and Safety at Work Act to be So Far As Is Reasonably Practicable (SFAIRP)\(^5\).

**Hazard Analysis**

This work has begun with the preliminary hazard analysis based on the generic SM Hazard Log. Further risk assessment work will be undertaken during the subsequent design phases of the project.

The generic hazard analysis for a SM project indicates that approximately 90% of the total safety risk is contained within the 19 highest scoring hazards. With this in mind, the PSCRG

\(^5\) Currently there is no numerical objective or target for Road Worker accidents on SM projects and the risk is managed in accordance with SFAIRP. Highways England’s “Aiming for Zero” strategy is intended to be a catalyst for further positive action to reduce the risk to Road Workers. One part of the strategy aims to eliminate all fatalities and serious injuries to Road Workers maintaining the Highways England road network.
shall focus on the highest scoring hazards and exceptions, but shall also consider hazards that are likely to have significant stakeholder interest or hazards that have been scored significantly different to other projects or the generic SM hazard log.

**Endorsing the identification and Assessment of significant hazards**
A generic hazard log has been produced for SM-ALR. This will be reviewed and updated to reflect the project design for the specific project.

The SM project will also be reviewed to determine if the project introduces any new project specific hazards that are not included in the generic SM-ALR hazard log: if identified they will be risk assessed. The designer will be responsible for completing the design and implementing any safety requirements or task plans for mitigating hazards.

A generic safety assessment for SM projects has been undertaken. It is not expected that any new hazards will be identified. Any new hazards identified shall be discussed with the Safety Risk & Governance Team.

**Safety Management System Classification**
With regard to SM projects the result of the safety management system (SMS) selection process is that the application of a type B SMS is likely to be suitable for these projects. However there may be some type C issues. Guidance on these issues may be sought from the Operations Technical Leadership Group (TLG). Other major projects will need to establish the level of SMS classification.

Management at the project level will be provided through the project team and the PSCRG. A type B classification represents a ‘medium’ level of safety management which is consistent with the current advice from Highways England regarding the safety management of SM projects. This level of safety management will be sufficient to address the key challenges that are specific for the project.

**3.2. Additional Guidance for non Smart Motorway Projects**
Specific information appropriate for Major Project projects (non SM) projects is as follows:

**Safety Baseline**
Major Project projects (other than SM) will need to establish and agree the safety objective and baseline as necessary.

**Hazard Analysis**
Hazard analysis for Major Project projects (non SM) can be based on the generic SM Hazard Log and updated/reviewed accordingly. Whilst not directly comparable this will provide the basis for further risk assessment work undertaken during the subsequent design phases of the project.

The PSCRG shall focus on the highest scoring hazards and exceptions, but shall also consider hazards that are likely to have significant stakeholder interest or hazards that have been scored significantly different to other projects.
It is unlikely that a hazard analysis is needed for a type A project, where safety risk and the delivery of the safety objective is appropriately managed by the application of existing standards.

_Safety Management System Classification_
Major projects (non SM) will need to establish the level of SMS classification. If the classification is a Type B or Type C the project will require a PSCRG.

### 3.3. Additional Guidance for Network Delivery and Development Directorate (NDDD) projects

The management of safety risk for Network Delivery and Development Directorate (NDDD) projects shall be undertaken in line with IAN 191 – Guidance for the Safety Governance of Highways England Projects

The IAN describes the safety risk management frameworks, as it shall be applied to the maintenance, operations and improvements of the network undertaken by NDDD.

_Safety Baseline_
NDDD projects will need to establish and agree the safety objective and baseline as necessary.

_Hazard Analysis_
Hazard analysis for NDDD projects needs to be undertaken in line with IAN 191.

_Safety Management System Classification_
NDDD projects will need to establish the level of SMS classification in accordance with IAN 191. If the classification is a Type B or Type C the project will require a PSCRG.

### 3.4. All Project types

The first meeting of the PSCRG will generally take the form of a stocktake to assure the project manager that they have achieved collective competence. It is also important that all principal members are apprised of their responsibilities as principal members of the group along-with how their role and that of the PSCRG fits into the wider safety governance function.

At the request of project managers the safety risk and governance representative will provide a presentation to the group that explains the remit in more detail along with an overview of the various processes and activities that the PSCRG will be engaged in including:

- Hazard analysis, consideration, classification and Hazard Log production
- Safety plan production;
- Combined safety and hazard log report