

SCOTTISH ROAD WORKS COMMISSIONER

Scottish Road Works Register Steering Group

The minute of the meeting of the SRWR Steering Group held on Thursday 17th
February 2022 on MS TEAMS

Present: -

Kevin Hamilton	Scottish Road Works Commissioner	K.H.
David Armitage (Chair)	Aberdeenshire Council	D.J.A.
Mike Bartlett	Symology	M.B.
Clare Callaghan	Scottish Water	C.C.
Jim Forbes	CityFibre	J.F.
Julie Greig	SGN	J.G.
Darren Grindell	Symology	D.Gri.
Ian Jones	Fife Council	I.J.
Fiona McInnes	Scottish Water	F.McI.
Andrew Matheson	Virgin Media	A.B.
Valerie Park	South Lanarkshire Council	V.P.
Alex Rae	SGN	A.R.
Iain Ross	Office of the SRWC	I.R.
Brian Wilson	Scottish Borders Council	B.W.

In Attendance: -

George Borthwick	Secretary – RAUC(S)	G.B.
-------------------------	----------------------------	-------------

Apologies: -

Darren Grant	SSE	D.G.
---------------------	------------	-------------

1. Introduction and Apologies for absence

David Armitage welcomed all to the meeting.

Apologies were recorded as above.

2. Minutes of the last Meeting

a. Accuracy

The minutes of the last meeting of the SRWR Steering Group held on MS TEAMS on Thursday 18th November 2021 were agreed as read.

b. Matters Arising

All recorded on the tracking Summary with the following additional comment and discussion: -

19th August 21

Item 4a VAULT – Edinburgh Trams Plant

The Commissioner had spoken to Edinburgh Trams at the last meeting about posting their plant information on VAULT. There had been no progress since then so the topic will be raised again at a meeting to be held later today.

Item No. 5b – SRWR System – Chat Room and Forum

I.R. had discussed this suggestion with SAT and they had indicated that they were not in favour of having this facility and would not be prepared to assist in the development or its essential management. They considered that it would not create anything positive and existing facilities e.g. Support Desk should be used.

The Commissioner was not prepared to allocate staff time to the development and to some degree agreed with the SAT.

The option was raised of a Super User Forum being set up again. This would be driven by users of the Register with a high level of knowledge of the system and could be held when considered necessary. On that basis Symology would be prepared to be involved in the forum.

One issue which often needs input is Regulations and legislation so this would need to be considered.

J.F. indicated that SJUG met from time to time to discuss issues which were raised.

The suggestion was made that a once-a-year Seminar / Webinar be held to allow discussion and sharing of expertise.

An occasional event along the same lines could also be held to deal with Regulations / Legislation. The Commissioner would also be keen to have discussion on Best Practice at this or a separate forum.

These proposals will be considered and this Action should be closed with two new Actions to cover Super Users Forum / Webinar and the Regulation / Legislation (possibly including Best Practice) Webinars / Forums. **Action – Steering Group / Symology / o.S.R.W.C.**

18th November 2021
3a Quarterly Management Report

The o.S.R.W.C. is updating the Contact Records and as part of the process the responders had been warned that the contact information would be shared with members of the Community. **Action – Closed**

5a Gazetteer Update Submission Report

The invite had been issued to the Chair of the Gazetteer Group to attend the Steering Group when there was a topic which required his input. **Action – Agenda Item - Closed**

Similarly, the Chair would be asked to submit a report / minute to the RAUC(S) meeting for information and discussion as necessary. The Chair would be invited to attend the meeting where there was a need for his input but he would not be able to vote on any topic which was required by RAUC(S) members at the meeting. The Secretary was asked to

add an Item to the RAUC(S) Agenda to cover reports from the Gazetteer Group. **Action – Secretary**

9a Inspection Sample Calculation

The current calculation is based on the works carried out over the previous three years and the resultant figure can then be adjusted in accordance with the discussions between both parties to accommodate for instance a predicted change in the programme of work being considered. The algorithm has been reviewed and appears to be satisfactory.

The Register estimates the size of the Section 109 sample based on the R.A. record of these works and not the individual Section 109 Notices. The number of Inspections to be carried out (probably 3) should be indicated on the Conditions issued to the Applicant and charged in the application fee or after each Inspection is made.

J.F. commented that West Lothian had set up a separate channel for Sect. 109 Notices. These were not performance monitored. The system did not generate inspections, but each Notice was subject to a Category A, B, and C. inspection and that cost was charged to the applicant.

V.P. indicated that South Lanarkshire used Channel 109 and recorded the inspections manually. J.F. suggested that this was an instance of Good Practice.

J.G. reported that the Code would be revised in accordance with the changes in the Legislation. This includes inspections being recorded as target and not as a sample.

The Group accepted the method of setting the sample by the Register using the existing algorithm.

A revision should be written into the Advice Note.

I.J. indicated that David Carter was reviewing the process for Section 109. I.J. agreed to raise this with D.C. and would ask him if his group would review the Advice Note to accord with the agreement of the Committee. **Action – I.J.**

The SRWC agreed with this approach and dealing with it in conjunction with the requirements of the R.Q.Ps.

3. Management and Operation of the SRWR

a. Quarterly Management Report

The previously circulated Bulletin was taken as read with the following comments: -

- **Fees and Amounts**

The draft matrix with the estimated fees to be charged for 2022 / 23 has been circulated for budgeting purposes. The draft figures are likely to change prior to 1st April but not by much. Estimate fees will be issued to all at the beginning of March with the final Accounts being issued for 1st April.

- **Symology Support Desk**

Symology Support Desk has a new telephone number for the SRWR Support. The new number is 0808 196 8341 (or by email to srwr@symology.co.uk).

Issues should be reported to the Symology Support Desk in the first instance. If the Support Desk are not able to resolve the matter or have closed it without

resolving satisfaction, please escalate it to Iain Ross (via enquiries@roadworks.scot) along with details of the escalation

Please be aware that Symology may, in line with industry best practice, wish to close the Support Desk case when it is escalated internally to their Development Team. Such cases are added to the Known Issues List and when resolved an announcement is made to the Community on release. These are instances where the Symology Support Desk are unable to resolve the issue, as such repeatedly raising the same issue will have little benefit and will not get it resolved any faster. As above, if there is an issue on the Known Issues List that is taking too long to resolve please escalate it to I.R. More information can be found on: - <https://aurora-portal.symology.net/category/srwr-news/known-issues/>

<https://aurora-portal.symology.net/category/release-notice/>

Following the release of Aurora Ver. No. 2, there have been a small number of reports from the Symology Support Desk that some customers have been exhibiting behaviour that staff have found to be disrespectful. The Commissioner wishes to remind all callers to be respectful in their dealings with Support Desk and that bullying in any form will not be tolerated. Should there be a problem with the service it should be escalated to the Commissioner as described above.

User Satisfaction Survey

To help gauge the effectiveness of the Scottish Road Works Register a questionnaire has been circulated to all Users of the register. It is relatively simple, only take approximately 6 minutes to complete. Could all Users be encouraged to complete this questionnaire.

The link can be found in the Aurora Portal under News on: -.

<https://forms.office.com/r/6KtLj5Ngfi>

- **New Undertakers**

Forbury Assets Limited (Electricity) have been given access to the SRWR.

- **Vault**

At a recently meeting with a group from Atkins who are working for the Geospatial Commission on their NUAR project they indicated that they are interested in Vault and expressed an interest in talking to some R.As and S.Us who are using Vault as well as those providing data to it. As such RAUC(S) are asking for volunteers to meet with Atkins Representatives.

ai. SRWR Service Report

The Group noted the version of the Report which was previously circulated. A summary of the various sub reports was given to the Group.

b. Quarterly Operational Report

The previously circulated Report was taken as read with the following comment: -

Log4j Vulnerability

On 9 December 2021 reports began to emerge of a problem with the mapping on the system. On 16 December 2021 a patch provided by ESRI was applied which removed the Log4j component from all of our infrastructure. To date Symology does not believe there have been any intrusions or “indicators of concern” with the service.

SRWR Hosted Service

There have been a few minor disruptions since the last meeting. On 26 January 2022 an overrunning scheduled process on the server caused a few users to receive “Server error” messages. Once the process was completed, the errors stopped occurring. On 1 February 2022 mapping services in the SRWR were slow to respond. This was caused by some additional processes overloading the GIS server which subsequently needed to be restarted to clear the load. However due to an ESRI caching issue, the restart didn’t clear the load, so another restart was required, which prolonged the incident. Symology have an ongoing project to clone their GIS servers to not only reduce the load, but also increase resilience.

SRWR Software Since the v2 release in October 2021

There have been a series of minor upgrades on the 26/11/2021, 17/01/2022, 27/01/2022 and 07/02/2022 without significant problems and it is believed that the stability of the register has been restored.

For these releases additional regression testing was performed within our development and PQT teams to review the quality of the release and we now have a larger set of standard test scripts available, some of which have been automated. Notification of each release is sent to all users of the register and the detail of each release is made available on the News page within the Community Portal.

Scottish Road Works Commissioner Indicators

Development will commence on the changes to the SRWCIs proposed by the SRWC at the last meeting. This set of changes will include the updates to the revision of the RAUC Areas. Note that this change will be applied retrospectively so that it would be as if the previous historical RAUC areas never existed, and all data will be categorised using the new areas. A webinar which would be provided to cover the revised system has been suggested.

SRWR Coring Reports

The Coring Report process will update the surface types considered in accordance with the latest Coring Advice Note. This change was applied to the register on the 17/01/2022. The coring reports were subsequently run and published on 26/01/2022. They are available for download via the News page here:

<https://aurora-portal.symology.net/category/srwr-news/news/>

Since publishing the reports, it was noted that some users were running the Coring Reports themselves during the day which placed an excessive load on the servers during normal operating hours. There does not appear to be a reason why users should need to rerun the reports the option has been disabled. If a user needs to re-run the report, then they should contact the Helpdesk.

I.R. confirmed that the sample provided equated to 30% of appropriate records which when divided by 15 provided the 2% sample of sites for consideration for the coring.

B.W. commented on issues being experienced where the site indicated was in the footway while in actual fact it extended into the carriageway.

SRWR Helpdesk

The Helpdesk has reported that interaction with the Community has improved, and is much appreciated.

Vault Submissions

Symology are currently undertaking a trial with BT to provide access to their data via the SRWR mapping. Symology has been provided with API access to a Production set of web services and are revisiting this project with a view to adding the data to Sandbox for future tests.

The revised Vault symbology is being investigated. However, this requires Mobile App changes, and these will have to wait for specialist development resources to become available. We received an enquiry about how to handle S.U. Vault data where the supplier of the data is not the owner of the apparatus. This is similar to Section 109 information supplied by some R.As. Vault holds separate free text fields to handle this:

- OWNER – who owns the apparatus
- CURATOR – who has supplied the apparatus data

If the metadata and/or processing rules provide methods of populating these fields separately then this will be performing during the Vault update. To change the Vault processing rules just raise a call with the Helpdesk. Currently the SRWR only displays the OWNER field on the Info card. A suggestion has been made to extend this to include the CURATOR. If a change request is recorded and approved, then this can be actioned. Further discussion may be required relating to the Mobile App which currently only shows a subset of the fields.

Vault celebrates its 10-year anniversary on 20 March 2022.

Gazetteer Submissions

SDTF2 format gazetteers were loaded in December 2021.

SDTF4 Gazetteers have been received from all Road Authorities, but there is a problem with the way the ASD is plotted in SDTF4 which is likely to cause a poorer service for users. Work is ongoing with the SRWC and the Improvement Service to find a solution. In the meantime, it is likely that SDTF2 gazetteers will be loaded until the ASD plotting issues are resolved.

SRWR E-Learning and webinars

The uptake of the e-learning courses is consistently averaging over 100 new course registrations each month since March 2021.

Webinars are ready restart as soon as there are topics to cover and suggestions will be welcomed.

Dial Before You Dig

There was an interruption to the service at the beginning of January due to enquiries being routed to an old disused Larbert number. This was checked and remedied.

c. Training Updates

All as previously discussed.

Training was covered in Items above.

I.R. raised the matter of modelling training to suite the App only users. In general, the App users were not requiring all the content provided in the existing modules.

K.H. agreed with this request commenting that training needs to meet the Organisation's needs but ensuring that the Operative has the knowledge necessary for them to carry out their tasks with an understanding of reasons behind why they need to work in a specified way.

The suggestion was made that users should be given the opportunity to explain what they do, so that the training can be matched to their duties.

J.G. commented that she was using Visor to assist with training which she considered was relatively easy to use. I.R. would review what she was doing and decide if or how Visor could be used in the Community. J.G. and I.R. will discuss this matter and decide on how it should be progressed. **Action – J.G. / I.R.**

4. VAULT

a. Future Development

The discussions with O.S. / NUAR on VAULT may in the future lead to changes which could improve the existing system. The development will be monitored going forward.

A Webinar of VAULT FAQs will be held on 27th April 2022.

b. Vault Scorecard

The previously circulated report was taken as read with the following comment: -

- The performance was all generally as in the previous quarter.

5. Gazetteer Group

a. Gazetteer Update Submission Report

The previously circulated Report was taken as read with the following comments: -

- The S.W. Trunk Road Operator and National Rail both need to provide data.
- The remainder of the Organisations are currently satisfactory.

b. Gazetteer Group Highlight Report

I.R. commented as follows: -

- The problems with SDTF4 mentioned above need to be rectified as the delay is affecting other parts of the system but it is likely to be another 6 months before the system is working properly.
- Software developers may have problems with providing the required software to carry out the required changes.
- Improvement Services are providing good input for the development.

6. SRWR System Assurance Team

a. SAT Report

The Team had a productive meeting last week. Clare Callaghan has moved to a new post so has left the Team. In the interim Gordon Russell will be the Chair until Clare O'Brien returns to the Team and resumes as Chair.

b. Change Requests

The following C.Rs which had been circulated were taken as read with the following discussions: -

C.R. No. 769 – Reinstatement Materials Drop Down List - Looking to enhance the detail in the register in relation to Hot Rolled Asphalt. Can there be a distinction made between 15/10 and 30/14 as this will assist in identifying materials.

There was extensive discussion on this C.R. and it as follows: -

- The Drop-Down List was considered and the draft prepared and circulated to this meeting.
- C,McQ. Considered the clarity on base materials was good but he was concerned about the list becoming too complicated. J.F. was also concerned about the list having too many options.
- F.McI. indicated that the use of the correct options was beneficial for agreeing cores. In her view the staff involved should have the knowledge to use the drop-down list correctly.
- D.J.A. agreed that there were benefits to be gained from being able to refer back to the material details when assessing reinstatement performance at a later date.
- D.J.A.; I.R.; F.McI.; J.G.; J.F.; M.B.; C.McQ.; L.H.; and the Commissioner would review the draft list and discuss it on an MSTEAMS meeting and would report back to the next Steering Group meeting.
- J.G. suggested the list be revised into Type / Group to reduce the number of options.

C.R. No. 775 - UPRNs - Can we have this included in Aurora. I see these records are free.

- Scottish Water has still to comment on the proposal provided by Symology.
- UPRNs are available on a O.S. data Set which could be used on the Register. Improvement Services were happy to proceed on that basis.
- C.C. in the original request was looking for the ability to search on the UPRNs. Post Codes was a searchable field, and it may be that the UPRNs would be the same. This would be checked out. **Action – I.R. / M.B.**
- F.McI. would check with Gordon Russell to ensure that the proposal satisfied the requirements of Scottish Water. **Action – F.McI.**
- If all are happy with the proposal the C.R. can lapse.

C.R. No. 784 – I am raising the issue with registering remedial repairs (smaller than the original size) as a change request following our SAT meeting on 18/5/21. Registering a remedial repair larger than the original size is not an issue, we create a new site enter the new date and this is subject to a new warranty period. Repairs smaller than the original size is proving tricky. If we create a new site with a new date, it prompts a new warranty period which shouldn't happen. If we enter the new smaller repair size on the original site, put the new date of repair but don't tick the warranty box, this doesn't reset the warranty.

The following comments were made: -

- J.F. indicated that Carole McDonald was in discussion with Symology about their proposal.
- The proposal had been discussed with Ken and revised to satisfy both.

- The revisions to the Register needed to accord with the Code.

C.R. No. 789 - Would it be possible to have Footpath Closure on as a choice for Traffic Management? At the moment we have to select Road Closure (which flashes up that it may not be suitable) so this would be much more appropriate for closing a footpath.

The matter had been dealt with on the basis of the discussions at the last Steering group Meeting. This had been agreed with Falkirk.

There was no need to differentiate between a Footpath and a Road Closure.

There were still the occasional request for a footway closure but this was dealt with by discussion.

C.R. No. 801 - The addition of the pre site survey / dilapidation inspection to be considered. This inspection is in both the Code of Practice for Inspections and the SROR.

Procedures for pre-inspection are set out in the SROR

J.F. was clear what was required but felt the SROR W.G. should add clarification when reviewing the Code.

The inspection was an opportunity to agree what reinstatement would be required to complete the works. This was particularly required when dealing with: -
Modular Paving
Road surfaces which were showing signs of stress / failure
6-year guarantee

On these criteria it was essential that pre inspections were carried out and recorded with photographs attached. Defects are being issued where the problem was clearly due to the condition of the road pre-works.

There was a difference of opinion about the need for the pre-inspection but with the conditions of the roads continuing to drop it was essential that the meetings are held and the data recorded. This would largely reduce the issue of Defect Notices and the discussions needed to agree future maintenance requirements.

K.H. had commented that the Inspections Code and the SROR fall short on information, and both needed to be improved.

J.F. offered to assist in drafting a paper to submit to the National R.A. meeting to allow them to consider the matter. This is not a problem in all R.A. Areas so it may just need to be discussed and a common approach agreed.

The need was agreed in principle, but a process would need to be agreed and added to the Codes before Symology was asked to review what changes may be required in the Register.

7. Scottish Road Works Commissioners Report

a. Changes in Legislation

The Commissioner reported: -

- Detailed Regulations and revisions to the Register to deal with RQPs will need to be progressed.

- A paper relating to Start / Stops was currently being tabled at each Area Meeting. The changes required by the proposal will need to be mirrored in the Register.
- A Webinar was held on the same day as the RQP documents were launched. It was well attended and confirmed webinars are a good way of broadcasting information / changes.

8. RAUC(s) Remit

There were no remits from the last RAUC(S) meeting which was held on 1st December 2022.

9. SRWR System

a. SRWR Performance Reporting - Inspection Reports

The previously circulated paper was taken as read with the following comments: -

- The Report relates D2 / D2a Notices which have not been dealt with within 6 months.
- Changes are being made to the Register to accommodate the new reporting procedure.
- The roll out of the new Report will be made for Q1 2022 / 23 from 1st April 22.
- The changes have been intimated to the Area Meetings in the current round.
- The Committee noted that where a site was changed due to resurfacing, or a new reinstatement by another Organisation the D3 / D3a needed to be closed. I.R. commented that he would highlight that in his presentation to RAUC(S) and would revise the paper.
- J.F. suggested that where this happened, an abortive visit should be recorded but it should be reported as a D£ / D3a Abortive. This would close the defect procedure on that site. There was an extended discussion on this. In the Inspections Code Clause 2.3.6 deals with D3 inspection with works completed and Clause 2.5.7 deals with abortive inspections but there is no clear guidance so needs to be reviewed and revised.

Where the defect is repaired then the response is a D3 pass but if the reinstatement could not be seen the code needs to be revised to provide the required guidance.

F.McI. commented that in her view the response was a D2 abortive where a vehicle was parked over the site, and it would be a D3 abortive where the site was changed e.g. resurfaced.

The view was that the D2 abortive would raise another inspection. D3 Abortive would not require another Inspection and would close the process. The D3 Pass would also close the procedure with the defect dealt with.

- I.R. would revise his papers and the RAUC(S) presentation **Action – I.R.**
- RAUC(S) would be asked to confirm the proposed process. **Action – J.F.**
- The Inspections Code would be revised in accordance with the discussions including the proposal that where site cannot be viewed due to a parked vehicle etc on a D3 it should be recorded as a D2 abortive to set the system to raise another inspection.
- The Inspections Working Group should note the decision and revise the Code accordingly. **Action – J.G.**

b. User satisfaction Survey

I.R. reported on the User satisfaction Survey as follows: -

- The paper indicates the link to the survey.
- All Users should be encouraged to complete the questionnaire. So far only 156 responses have been received from some 2000 Users.
- The date the responses have been positive. The response on the Apps indicated a low level of performance but this was probably due to not all who responded having experience of using the Apps. A request will be made to App Users to complete the survey so that a better picture can be formed.

10. A.O.C.B.

a. Replacing the SRWR Steering Group Chair

D.J.A. indicated that he was on a flexible retirement programme and while not immediately retiring from his current 3 day week he considered that a new Chair should be appointed to take over when he retires.

While it should probably be a S.U. Representative it was not essential. J.F. will raise this topic with SJUG at their next meeting. **Action – J.F.**

Since the Steering Group is the Commissioner's responsibility he will need to be consulted as part of the process to appoint the new Chair.

The Committee noted that Alex Rae was retiring which would need consideration for replacements on the Steering Group, RAUC(S) and Associated Committees. This was also the case for Elaine Stewart who was also retiring. The replacement of these two Representatives will be raised at the SJUG meeting.

D.J.A. on behalf of the Group thanked Alex for all his input and wished him a long and happy retirement.

11. Dates of Future Meetings

The Committee will consider the meeting programme and decide which if any will be held face to face but the next meeting will be held on MSTEAMS.

The Committee agreed that the meetings of the Steering Group would continue to be held on a three-month cycle matching that of the Contract meetings with Symology. The next meeting is due to be held on 19th May which will clash with the HAUC UK Conference so will be held on Thursday 12th May instead.

The next meeting will be held on: - Thursday 12th May 2022

Venue to be MS TEAMS or as agreed

Future Meeting Dates: -

Thursday 18th August 2022

Thursday 17th November 2022

The meeting closed at 13.50