

# **Highways Agency**

## **Audit Report HA DN 53**

### **M40 UK Highways M40 Ltd DBFO**

**21 June 2012**

<b>Document Title</b>	Audit Report HA M40 DN 53
<b>Author</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Owner</b>	Paul Undrell
<b>Document Status</b>	Draft

### Distribution

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
John Gardner	General Manager	UK Highways
Paul Undrell	Secretary of State's Representative	Highways Agency
[REDACTED]	Department's Representative	Highways Agency

### Revision History

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Author</b>
1.1	31 October 2012	Draft issued for comment.	[REDACTED]

### Approvals

<b>Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Version</b>
Paul Undrell		SoS Representative	July 2012	1.0
[REDACTED]		DR	July 2012	1.0

**Contents**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Page</b>
	<a href="#"><u>Audit Details</u></a>	ii
1.	<a href="#"><u>Introduction</u></a>	1
2.	<a href="#"><u>Review of Corrective Actions from previous audits</u></a>	2
3.	<a href="#"><u>Audit findings</u></a>	3
4.	<a href="#"><u>Conclusion</u></a>	6
Annex A	<a href="#"><u>Audit meeting attendance record</u></a>	7
Annex B	<a href="#"><u>Audit Observation and NCR foUKH</u></a>	8

**Audit Details**

<b>Audited Organisation</b>	UKH M40 Ltd
<b>Audit Date</b>	21 June 2012
<b>Audit Number</b>	HA M40 UKH DN 53

<b>Auditors</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
	[REDACTED]	Lead Auditor / NDD National DBFO Contract Team	Highways Agency
	[REDACTED]	Auditor	Highways Agency
	[REDACTED]	Observer	Highways Agency

<b>Other participants</b>	Steve Field	Operations Director	UK Highways (M40) Ltd
	Clare Fionda	Quality Director	UK Highways (M40) Ltd
	Chris Evans	Contract Manager	Carillion
	[REDACTED]	H&S	Carillion
	[REDACTED]	Observing	UK Highways (M40) Ltd

<b>Audit area</b>	Management of Health and Safety
-------------------	---------------------------------

<b>Non-compliance</b>	Nil
-----------------------	-----

<b>Observations</b>	Three minor
---------------------	-------------

<b>Good Practice</b>	Nil
----------------------	-----

## **1 Introduction**

1.1 The audit was carried out on M40 UKH to evaluate compliance with the DBFO Contract and their Quality Management System processes.

1.2 A suggested template was followed at the request of the DR, this included:

QMS - Management of Health and Safety procedure looking at the Health and Safety Policy Statement – reviewing where appropriate.

Speaking with the Quality Manager regarding Advice on changes to legislation, Compliance with legislation and Health and Safety audits.

Inviting explanations as to how reviews of legislation happen (Quality Director input and overview)

Reviewing how

- Health and Safety advice is available to staff.
- Induction.
- Reporting incidents (log and procedure).
- Review Health and Safety competence of contractors.
- How the DBFO Co covers Compliance with CDM procedure and the reporting of RIDDOR accidents to principal contractor.
- Control of asbestos regulations 2012 reviewing the Asbestos management plan, procedures (presuming presence of asbestos; if asbestos found -scheme/fly tipping). Risk assessments where asbestos present and management of those risks. (See observations)

## **2 Review of Corrective Actions from previous audits**

- 2.1 Corrective actions were not provided by the DR nor offered by UKH. A knowledge of current outstanding corrective actions if any would have been helpful as it would assist any audit and should not require any requests.



### 3 Audit Findings

- 3.1 The audit opened at 1035 am and the purpose of the audit was explained to everyone. Everyone was present throughout except for [REDACTED]. Terms of Reference were explained and expectations outlined to the Project Company and its second tier deliverers. The audit was conducted in a friendly, convivial and cooperative atmosphere where requests were met positively.

- 3.2 Policy. A dedicated policy statement for the M40 UKH was examined and questions asked around it. A policy statement signed by [REDACTED] was presented and the appointment of a safety director and their roles discussed. Objective statements for commitment through board meetings, a key objective of zero RIDDOR reportable incidents and the communication of the policy were tested for practical application.

There was evidence demonstrated of senior management application of the policy. One example presented was how senior managers display their commitment to H&S by having a standing agenda item on board meetings.

- 3.3 Organisation & Arrangements. These are incorporated into the overarching business management system through a hierarchy of documents with clear line of sight for example the H&S management procedure (UKH-P-01) is clearly referenced in the quality manual.

ISO 9001 certification was in place and UKH do not feel it necessary to have the H&S management system certified in its own right. The replication of H&S requirements from UKH as the tier 1 supplier through Tier 2 etc suppliers in the contract documents was not readily discoverable.

**This reference will be provided separately by UKH.**

- 3.4 Planning. The plan for implementation of the H&S management system was evidenced at UKH-P-01 which details with it adequately.
- 3.5 System Implementation. A number of aspects of the management system were demonstrated as active at all levels in the organisation, for example: hazard identification with follow up specialist support connected to the recent incident with failure of the grab handle in one of the fleet vehicles. This caused a national response from the manufacturer to prevent injury nationally.

Induction records were examined and it was found that the Quality Director's record needed updating. An induction record was kept for each employee giving details of subsequent training. [REDACTED] was seen from 13 April 2012 and it was also mentioned that he had

undergone a driving assessment to train entering and leaving the hard shoulder and visiting sites. All newcomers undertake a weeks induction.

The Operational Managers site visit sheet was requested but it was pointed out that he rarely goes out on site; perhaps some 18 months since a previous visit. Instead, the Clerk of Works' records, who goes out most days was presented showing a full record of training and site inductions to a very deep level. All records were available as the induction sheets were stored.

Prior to commencing works on the ground a "scouting" visit is made to the works site to discover hazards not already documented in the generic risk assessments.

- 3.6 Performance Measurement. The quality manual calls up a number of approaches to performance measurement ranging from RIDDOR AFR to audit findings, both of these measures were examined and shown to be active and producing reliable data.
- 3.7 Audit. A recent audit report was viewed post fieldwork and was seen to score the audit areas performance. Within the report there was a consolidated list of findings requiring action was noted.
- 3.8 Management Review. The record of a recent management review meeting demonstrated that H&S was high on the agenda and reviewed the measurement outputs described above.
- 3.9 Compliance with CDM 2007. A Management review had noted the update of H&S files, a sample F10 was viewed and testing of the delivery of the clients duties which on this contract UKH are accountable for was also tested.

It was considered that assurance relating to the delivery of the clients duties could be improved as no consolidated record demonstrated this, although there was no adverse evidence relating to non fulfilment of the duties that were apparent.

Both UKH and their Tier 2 partner Carillion had dedicated CDM C appointed. It was not demonstrated that both companies had formally evaluated these appointments for competence however there was no adverse evidence regards the individuals fitness to deliver the CDM C requirements. It might have inspired more confidence had the question of competence and assessment responsibilities been answered as being at the back of the ACoP.



**Conclusion**

- 3.10 The audit identified no non-conformities, and have three minor observations for areas of improvement and no areas of best practice.
- 3.11 UKH and Carillion demonstrated the level of importance they attach to the Management of Health and Safety in the workplace. The issue of the Asbestos Management Plan will require a further meeting in the spirit of cooperation in order to fully demonstrate UKH compliance with the legislation.

**END**

**ANNEX A – Audit meeting attendance record**

Audit Meeting Attendance Record					
Organisation		UKH Ltd			
Audit No.		HA M40 UKH DN 53			
Entry meeting	Date	21 Jun 12	Exit meeting	Date	21 Jun 2012
	Time	1035 am		Time	1500
Attendees					
Name	Title	Organisation	Initial		
			Entry	Exit	
Steve Field	Operations Director	M40 UKH	1035	1500	
Clare Fionda	Quality Director	UK Highways (M40) Ltd	1035	1500	
Chris Evans	Contract Manager	Carillion	1035	1500	
██████████	H&S	Carillion	1035	1500	
██████████	Observing	UK Highways (M40) Ltd	1035	1200	
██████████	Lead Auditor / Operational Support Manager NDD National DBFO Contract Team	Highways Agency	1035	1500	
██████████████████	Auditor	Highways Agency	1035	1500	
██████████		Highways Agency	1035	1500	

**ANNEX B – Audit Observation and NCR for UKH**

<b>Audit Non-Conformance Report</b>			
<b>Audit No.</b>	HA M40 UKH DN 53	<b>Date</b>	21 June 2012
<b>Item</b>		<b>NCR No.</b>	
<b>Statement</b>			
You are hereby notified of the following Non-Conformance:			
<p>No non-conformances found</p>			
<b>Category (Major/Minor)</b>			
<b>Signature (Auditor)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Response</b>			
Proposed immediate Corrective Action:			
Proposed Preventive Action (Long Term):			
Cause of deviation:			
Scheduled completion/implementation:			
<b>Signature (Auditee)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Verification</b>			
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

Audit Observation Report			
<b>Audit No.</b>	HA M40 UKH DN 53	<b>Date</b>	21 June 2012
<b>Item</b>		<b>Observation No.</b>	
<b>Statement</b>			
You are hereby notified of the following Observation:			
<p>The replication of H&amp;S requirements from UKH as the tier 1 supplier through Tier 2 etc suppliers in the contract documents was not readily discoverable and should be supplied by UKH.</p>			
<b>Signature (Auditor)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Response</b>			
Proposed action (if any):			
<p>This reference will be provided separately by UKH.</p>			
Cause of deviation:			
n/k			
Scheduled completion/implementation:			
UKH to provide information; upgrade to NCR after 31 Aug 12			
<b>Signature (Auditee)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Verification</b>			
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	



Audit Observation Report			
<b>Audit No.</b>	HA M40 UKH DN 53	<b>Date</b>	21 June 2012
<b>Item</b>	Induction	<b>Observation No.</b>	Minor verbal
Statement			
You are hereby notified of the following Observation:			
<p>Update induction for Technical Director.</p>			
<b>Signature (Auditor)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
Response			
Proposed action (if any):			
<p>Left with records management – minor admin matter</p>			
Cause of deviation:			
<p>N/A</p>			
Scheduled completion/implementation:			
<p></p>			
<b>Signature (Auditee)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
Verification			
<p></p>			
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

Audit Observation Report			
<b>Audit No.</b>	HA M40 UKH DN 53	<b>Date</b>	21 June 2012
<b>Item</b>		<b>Observation No.</b>	Minor 2
<b>Statement</b>			
You are hereby notified of the following Observation:			
<p>Previous non conformities are best presented at the start of the audit.</p>			
<b>Signature (Auditor)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Response</b>			
Proposed action (if any):			
<p>Present non conformances register at start of audit</p>			
Cause of deviation:			
<p>Not known</p>			
Scheduled completion/implementation:			
<p>This should be good practice in all audits for comparison alone</p>			
<b>Signature (Auditee)</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Verification</b>			
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	

**End**