

# SCOTTISH ROAD WORKS COMMISSIONER

## Scottish Road Works Register Steering Group

The minute of the meeting of the SRWR Steering Group held on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup>  
November 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.
Jim Forbes	CityFibre	J.F.
Roger Garbett	Improvement Service	R.G.
Darren Grant	SSE	D.G.
Julie Greig	SGN	J.G.
Darren Grindell	Symology	D.Gri.
Jason Halliday	Office of the SRWC	J.H.
Andrew Matheson	Virgin Media	A.B.
Clare O'Brien	Argyll and Bute Council	C.O'B.
Valerie Park	South Lanarkshire Council	V.P.
Iain Ross	Office of the SRWC	I.R.

**In Attendance:** -

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

**Apologies:** -

Owen Harte	Virgin Media	O.H.
Ian Jones	Fife Council	I.J.
Fiona McInnes	Scottish Water	F.McI.
Brian Wilson	Scottish Borders Council	B.W.

**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 18<sup>th</sup> August 2022 were agreed as read.

b. Matters Arising

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

19<sup>th</sup> August 2021 – Item No. 4a VAULT Future Development – Symbology - Ask Edinburgh Trams to submit plant data to VAULT

R.G. commented that the City of Edinburgh Rep on the Gazetteer Group had thought that the information was on the system. There is details under Engineering Difficulty in the ASD files but they need to provide information to VAULT on their underground cables to traffic signals etc. City of Edinburgh have indicated that they will provide the data and the matter will continue to be raised by the Commissioner at his meetings with the Council.

12<sup>th</sup> May 2022 – Item No. 10a Replacing the SRWR Steering Group Chair

F.McI. was not present at the meeting so could not respond to the Item but the understanding was that having agreed to be the RAUC(S) Co-Chair she did not have the time to Chair the Steering Group meeting. J.H. will report back to the next RAUC(S) Agenda Setting Meeting.

J.F. indicated that he would raise the matter at the next SJUG meeting.

The Commissioner said that he would Chair the meetings if a Chair could not be provided by the Community.

D.J.A. commented that he would likely be available to Chair the meetings for up to a year.

18<sup>th</sup> August 2023

Item No. 3a Management and Operation of the SRWR - SRWR Aurora Webinar

The timing of the Webinar in relation to the introduction of new facilities on the Register was discussed and the view was that it was best to have the Webinar first so that the users had an idea about the changes which were being made. Feedback will be checked and if there is an alternative suggestion that will be considered. Details of the changes to the system are provided on the portal so all users should be up to date ahead of any revisions.

Item No. 3b Management and Operation of the SRWR - Quarterly Operational Report - Roadworks Commissioner Indicators

The report was circulated and F.McI. and I.R. will discuss the revision of reporting performance for Local Meetings.

### **3. Management and Operation of the SRWR**

#### **a. Quarterly Management Report**

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

#### **Survey on use of SRWR Works Promoter App**

The survey of all organisations during August, generated a good response from 48 Organisations. Unfortunately, some of the larger organisations did not participate. Please contact the office with an update on your proposals if your organisation did not respond.

A summary of the results is as follows:

- 8 organisations currently using the app, with the majority recording low numbers of notices.
- 21 organisations currently not using the app, but intending to start doing so before 1 April 2023.
- 19 organisations currently not using the app with no intention of using it.

These are generally split between those who say they'll phone into their office and others who will update Aurora using the live site via a tablet. Highland Council, Dumfries and Galloway Council and Scottish Hydro Electric Power Distribution recorded most notices using the app. All three organisations operate in rural areas, suggesting 'not-spot' issues may not be as big a problem as first thought.

Community concerns about connectivity issues have led the Commissioner to investigate ways to help works promoters avoid being penalised if they use the app and there is a delay in it sending the notice to the register that is out with the user's control. All Organisations are reminded that the requirement to enter works start and works complete notices into the register within 2-hours will come into force on 1 April 2023.

### **SRWR Aurora Webinar**

A webinar took place on Wednesday 12 October 2022, which included sections on: -

- Notice Posting Areas
- Surface Type and Base Material
- New Legislation
- Recent Enhancements

This was well received with over 90 delegates taking part.

This webinar shouldn't be confused with the Transport (Scotland) Act Webinar held on 27 October, which described to the Senior Managers the upcoming legislative changes.

### **New Organisations on the SRWR**

Converged Communication Solutions Limited, a telecoms company, has been given access to the SRWR.

Broadband for the Rural North (B4RN) indicated they no longer have assets in Scotland and don't intend to carry out any works. Since their road works were complete in 2017 which are out of warranty the Commissioner has agreed to remove them from the register.

If there are any issues relating to the above they should be passed to the o.S.R.W.C.

#### **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.

On 1st November 2022, there were reports of the mapping services being slow to respond or reporting authentication errors. The Technical Services team performed remedial actions during the day to restore the service, but the issues continued to recur intermittently. In the afternoon, the decision was taken to restore the GIS servers back to a known good state. This was unsuccessful, and the team reverted to rebuilding the GIS server. This was a significant exercise, and the Production services were restored late that evening, except for Mobile Apps, which were restored early the next morning. During the incident, the Community was kept informed with regular posts to the service status page (<https://trust.symology.net>) with updates to the SRWR Manager. The Customer Services teams were busy answering the very many calls.

Calls to the service desk have levelled off over the year.

The App usage levelled off but in the last month there has been a drop in use. This may have been caused by the October holidays.

From a peak of 4000 the number of VAULT users has levelled off to just over 3000.

#### Small Projects

BT Vault Data Submission – Open - Update Vault to display BT Apparatus data from a BT Web Feature Service.

Commissioner Reports – In progress - The SRWC has requested some changes to existing reports and some new reports along with some associated changes to the operation of the SRWR.

Works API Project Murphy Gas / Electric (Skewb) – Initial Stages - Initial engagement and understanding requirements to help with API development.

Glasgow Council have been in contact regarding accessing the register from their Alloy system – Initial Stages - Initial meeting is being arranged and business requirements are being prepared.

There were slight variations in the monthly use of the Training Modules but after a peak in September, probably due to the system revisions, the level has dropped back to the norm.

Requests to the Support Desk were pretty level and there were no issues with outstanding requests.

Dial Before You Dig requests have levelled off.

#### b. Quarterly Operational Report

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

##### **The Hosted Service**

The problems with the mapping are covered in the previous Minute.

Fortunately, incidents like the mapping problems are rare. It has been five months since our last significant unplanned outage and in that time a number of projects to improve the robustness of the service have been completed with further projects planned. Discussions are ongoing with our 3rd party mapping supplier to identify the cause of this specific incident and to identify any other actions which can be taken to prevent further recurrences.

There were also a couple of other very minor disruptions over this period: -

On 14th September 2022, there were some reports of intermittent connection errors. Two web instances were identified as having issues. These instances were killed, replacements automatically started back up, and normal service resumed.

On 11th October 2022, there were reports of new works not appearing on the SRWR mapping. It was identified that some maintenance work had resulted in a misconfiguration. This was rectified that evening, as it required a service restart. Later that same day, there appeared to be a networking issue which caused some disruption to the service over a 5-minute period around 15:30. The issue appeared to resolve itself, although it took another 10 minutes for all servers to return to full operation.

J.G. asked for more information to be provided on the expected duration of outages especially where they affect Notice opening and closing which can result in FPNs being received.

Information will be provided on the News Page which can be used in discussions about the validity of the FPNS and if this is not sufficient, the Support Desk will provide details on the relevant outage.

I.R. indicated that information is recorded on the Trust Page which remains available for up to 28 days. FPNs should be either not issued or cancelled where the problem is caused by a technical problem.

V.P. commented that South Lanarkshire records outages so the relevant FPNs are not issued.

### **SRWR Software**

Since the last meeting in August 2022, five upgrades have provided minor feature enhancements and stability improvements. We are pleased that with continued additional testing in place, there were no major issues with these releases. Notification of each release is sent to all users of the register and the detail of each release is provided on the News Page within the Community Portal:

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

On the evening of the 21st September the new click-through agreements for the Register's Terms of Use was implemented.

On the evening of the 30th September the new Surface Type and Base Material lookups was implemented

### **Roadworks Scotland Website**

The roadworksscotland.org website has not changed since the last meeting.

### **Roadworks Commissioner Indicators**

Phase 3 of the "SRWC Monitoring of Inspections on SRWR" is complete.

### **SRWR Mobile Apps**

The Mobile Apps have not changed since the last meeting.

### **Vault Submissions**

Symology is currently undertaking a proof-of-concept technical trial with BT to provide access to their data via the SRWR Vault mapping. We have successfully integrated the BT data into the Aurora Vault processing, and the data is now available on the Sandbox solution for internal testing (although this environment has scaled down mapping resources). Since the last meeting the following software changes have been made: -

- If it fails to connect to the BT layer transiently, it tries again.
- If it fails to connect to the BT layer within 10 seconds, it displays a warning toast indicating data may be missing (though it may appear shortly afterwards).
- For each new SRWR session, when initially turning on Vault data, all the Vault sublayers will now be turned on by default. (Previously, the SRWR would remember which sublayers were on or off).

Further investigation is taking place between Symology, ESRI and BT regarding accessing the BT layer on the Mobile Vault app.

Scottish Water previously raised an issue regarding supplying apparatus, which they are not the owner of. It has been agreed to display a new field to separately identify who owns the data from who supplies it. This new field is now available in the register.

### **Gazetteer Submissions**

SDTF2 format gazetteers were loaded in September 2022.

SDTF4 Gazetteers have now been received from all R.As, There are still problems with the way the ASD is plotted in SDTF4. This is likely to result a degraded service for SRWR users. Discussions are ongoing with the SRWC and the Improvement Service to find a solution to this. It is expected that SDTF2 gazetteers will continue to be loaded into the SRWR for the foreseeable future.

### **SRWR E-Learning**

See report in previous Item.

### **SRWR Webinars**

SRWR Webinar 10 was held on 12th October 2022 with around 90 attendees. We look forward to receiving more suggested topics for future Webinars.

### **SAT Meeting**

There have been two SAT Meetings since the last Steering Group meeting. See report below.

#### c. Training Updates

All as previously discussed.

## **4. VAULT**

#### a. Future Development

The development to provide BT Plant Information on VAULT is ongoing. A short demonstration was given on the various aspects of the service. The system will provide live up to date information on the Plant.

BT data should be instant but the data from others builds up so takes a little bit longer to complete the record for the location being presented.

Layers can be added or removed from the frame if required for clarity.

The information box does not indicate that the line is BT plant.

J.F. was interested in shifting CityFibre to a similar system as it would keep their plant recorded in the system fully up to date. M.B. was not happy to proceed along the lines of providing this service to other Organisations as it would result in greater stress on the sever opening and closing the plots. The use of vector data allows greater degree of flexibility in data use.

Scottish Water daily updates their plant on Geofield which could feed into VAULT and keep their records current.

R.G. suggested that the way forward would be along the lines of direct delivery of the plant data providing the up to date records but this requires development.

The use of the data e.g. paper copies for the site, on line interrogation for planning works in the office may require different display of the data.

J.F. is still keen to have the records current but appreciates the need for this to be considered and developed with the flexibility of the display of the data essential.

M.B. commented that the different uses of the data meant that the ability to interrogate needs to be flexible.

I.R. agreed with the above but confirmed that the Vector display was currently the best option and tile display would need development to achieve the available flexibility.

J.G. commented that the use of the plans on site when doing surveys was helpful and the facility to switch off layers helped interrogation deal with congested plant within a frame.

R.G. indicated that the way data was being used, what is the best format for the required purpose all needed to be considered. There would need to be a standard convention.

The Group gave a positive response and welcomed BT onto VAULT. There was a need to review the Register and VAULT to develop the future service and the use of vector and Raster presentation.

The Group were happy to get the BT data on VAULT but the display needs to be compatible and the discussions on vector / raster can be ongoing. BT should be informed that provision of vector data needs to be considered moving forward.

The data symbology will be displayed using the NUAR format. R.As will need to provide data in the NUAR format.

The Commissioner had spoken to NUAR and indicated the changes of Legislation taking place at the March 2023 introduction.

A message will be issued to comment on the differentiation between colour symbology for sewers and BT plant. **Action – I.R. / D.J.A. / M.B.-**

b. Vault Scorecard

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

- The R.As record is reasonable but as always could be improved. Stirling Council and the SW Trunk Road Area need to update information.
- The smaller S.U.s need to ensure that their plant data is recorded on the system.

## 5. Gazetteer Group

a. Gazetteer Update Submission Report

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

- R.G. has spoken to Network Rail and they have indicated that a submission will be made. Data will hopefully be available on the system by the end of the month. He will assist if required.
- The work on the SDTF 4 is almost completed with the additional geometry being added. Discussions are ongoing with the PKC consultant. The R.As have done a

lot of work on this project over the last year and the SDTF 4 version will be loaded sooner than later.

- There are some roads which still have no reinstatement category allocated to them. This requires to be actioned as soon as possible. This only affects about 400 USRNS.
- The Trunk Road Area gazetteers still need some work done on them to complete the data. This will be raised with the relevant Organisations and the shortcomings explained.

The Gazetteer is the backbone of the Register and needs to be accurate and kept up to date.

b. Gazetteer Group Highlight Report

No issues raised.

**6. SRWR System Assurance Team**

a. SAT Report

The previously circulated draft Minutes of the last meeting were taken as read with the following comments.

- The number of Change Requests which were received were down on previous meetings.
- There are two new members of the Team. They are: -  
Emma West – Scottish Water  
David Carter – South Lanarkshire Council

b. Change Requests

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

C.R. No. 813 – When working on a one-way system, with works on CW but no traffic impact there is no option but to select Road Narrowing (two way working) which is obviously not correct. Road Narrowing (one way system/ route) or something similar could be added.

Discussion on this C.R. was recorded as follows: -

- Lindsay Henderson had considered the C.R. and was not in favour of the proposal. His comments on the subject are recorded on the C.R. as follows: -  
"I would say there is far more occasions where road narrowing is used on a two way carriageway than a one way road. And it is paramount that people understand that road narrowing allows two-way traffic flow. I would leave as status quo and in a comments field state 'Please note this is a one-way road'."
- J.F. suggested that this was only a training issue, and a C.R. was not required.
- The content of the Notice should not fail the T.M. The failure should be based on the signing code and the Red Book and what is safe. K.H. commented that he agreed with J.F.
- J.G. said she would send examples to the Commissioner of where failures had been issued for their sites. She will ask staff to refer such failures to the o.S.R.W.C. for information on this problem.
- In South Lanarkshire, V.P. tried to focus on the site and not the Notice. The T.M. appropriate to the site should be in place.



## 7. Scottish Road Works Commissioners Report

### a. Changes in Legislation

The Commissioner reported: -

- His Office, Scottish Government and Symology are in discussion on the changes in the Legislation and how they affect the Register.
- A request was made for advice to be issued to the Community about the operation of the 2 hour stop / start recording. Information would be welcomed on the monitoring and resultant action if stop / starts are not recorded correctly. This would be an FPN offence, but pragmatism should be management of failures where it can be shown that the recording has been affected by “not spots”. Inspectors and Administrators should receive the appropriate training and advice. If the delays are not regular, then leniency can be given but should they be regular they need to be the subject of investigation by the employer and the R.A.

## 8. RAUC(s) Remit

### a. The Recording of works on Roads and Footpaths which are Prospectively Adoptable

This is related to Developers preventing access for S.U.s to roads within the Development to lay plant during construction.

It was suggested that Sect 146 of NRSWA covered this situation, but comment was made that the wording confused the operation of gaining access.

There needs to be consistent practice across all R.As.

D.J.A. indicated that in his view if the Council declares the road prospectively it covers the whole road within the Development. If the road was opened for laying plant immediately after adoption this would be a case of lack of coordination. The R.A. would not want tracks in a newly completed road.

This should be referred to the Coordination Working Group to have it included in the revised document. The Register should have the required functionality to deal with this problem.

**Action – D.J.A.**

R.G. commented that the responsibility for new roads may lie with other sections within the Council. There needs to be discussion across all relevant sections within the Council to ensure standard agreement.

The R.A. needs to work with the Road Manager (Developer) in the management of the roads being developed. The Roads Manager may request extended reinstatement e.g. up to full panel.

Reasonable conditions in the Construction Consent should be included to allow management of these sites. The Register allows the Declaration to be recorded.

The Register needs to be able to confirm that the road can be opened by others to lay their plant during development.

## 9. SRWR System

### a. Inspection Sample Calculation

This Item was remitted to the next meeting.

**Action – D.J.A.**

b. Additional Contact Types

The SAT is in general supportive of the proposal.

J.G. indicated that the additional information would help with the monitoring of specialist contractors to see where failings were occurring. This would be increasingly necessary when the RQPs are approved and introduced next April

Some information will be available from information Boards.

The public facing site should be populated with contact information to allow problems to be reported. The Emergency / Out of Hours contact information would be helpful as the information could be recorded with a Representative of the Organisation who would have access to the correct contacts for a site.

K.H. commented that there should be one point of contact and the caller should not be sent round the houses to find a person who will deal with their issue. Main Contractor / Originator (Primary Contact) should probably suffice with the others optional as required.

The operation of the Register and its capacity to deal with more than one contact needs to be considered. The requirements of GDPR also need to be considered.

As above the S.U.s would wish to have the contacts for Traffic Management and Reinstatement Contractors provided for quality monitoring.

The suggestion was that there were too many contacts being asked for. All were asked to consider the content of the Change Request and bring their views to the next meeting for continued discussion to lead to a final recommendation. **Action – All / Secretary**

c. Material Drop Down Schedule

This matter was discussed as follows: -

There was a view that the list had moved away from the original use.

The Commissioner agreed that the new list was leading to complication and the original list was satisfactory. There were two options i.e. keep the new list or revert to the original format.

The detail required for the recording of trials need to be considered and accommodated.

This Item will be kept on the Agenda for the next meeting when all should have considered the matter ready to formulate a final decision on the list. **Action – All / Secretary**

**10. A.O.C.B.**

a. Change Request No. 830 –

The request relates to the ability to access contact details on the Register.

The comment was made that problems with contact information should be raised at the Local RAUC Meetings.

While the Inspectors contact information is provided the request relates to the ability to locate the contact for the Representative who added comments and or directions,

The recommendation was made that only the contact name for directions or FPNs should be added. **Action – I.R.**

b. Kings Coronation - Register Arrangements

The Commissioner will inform the Community that there will not be a holiday on the Register but that a pragmatic approach should be taken on late noticing etc. **Action – The Commissioner**

c. Dial Before You Dig Service

The usage of the service has dropped and there is a need for a review on the way forward.

The option to remove the service was not acceptable and the decision was needed on how to advertise its availability.

All R.As need to be aware of the facility and ensure that Section 109 Permit holders have used the service to collect the plant details before they commence work.

A reminder that the service is available and a copy of the flier will be circulated via the Area RAUCs and via the news page. **Action – I.R. / M.B.**

d. Preparation of the Register to accommodate the new Legislation

J.G. asked if the Register would be modified in time to accommodate the 6 year guarantee and the Category C inspections.

The PGD will give guidance and K.Q. / o.S.R.W.C. / and Symology will agree the programme to have all necessary changes in place. The Commissioner commented that the first inspections would only be required 2 years after April 2023.

**Action - K.Q. / o.S.R.W.C. / Symology**

## 11. Dates of Future Meetings

D.J.A. thanked all for their attendance at this meeting and indicated that the next meeting would be held on: -

**The next meeting will be held on: - Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> February 2023**

Venue to be MS TEAMS or as agreed

**Future Meeting Dates: - Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> May 2023  
Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> August 2023  
Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2023**

The meeting closed at 13.55