CONSULTATION ON THE ROAD WORKS (QUALIFICATIONS OF SUPERVISORS) (SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2016

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

REID-HOWIE ASSOCIATES LTD.

OCTOBER 2016

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of an analysis of responses to a Transport Scotland consultation, carried out between 8th July and 30th September 2016, on the Road Works (Qualifications of Supervisors) (Scotland) Regulations 2016.

The Road Works (Qualifications of Supervisors and Operatives) (Scotland) Regulations 1992 require to be updated, and the Scottish Ministers propose to introduce the Road Works (Qualifications of Operatives and Supervisors) (Scotland) Regulations 2016. The aim is to require trained road works operatives and supervisors who wish to re-register their qualifications to do so on the basis of having their competency reassessed successfully. It is also intended to revise the qualifications structure and simplify and improve existing provisions.

The consultation sought views of the proposed changes, and 33 responses were received. The largest number (42%) were from local authorities or local authority joint bodies. Just under a quarter (24%) were from utilities. Responses were also received from individuals (14%); regulatory bodies or qualifications bodies (9%); road user organisations (6%); and training organisations (3%).

Overall views

The majority of respondents at each question expressed support for the proposals in the consultation document. Additional comments were made by some respondents at all questions. These focused mainly on respondents' reasons for their views, and are summarised below. Additional suggestions are detailed in the main report.

Proposed change 1

Proposed change 1 was: to amend the order in which the sections on supervisors and operatives appear in the Regulations (to place operatives before supervisors in the title, and within the body of the Regulations and associated schedules).

Almost all of the respondents (97%) agreed with this proposal[1]. Common reasons were that it was appropriate and logical, and reflected ranking, knowledge and progression.

No respondents disagreed and one (3%) answered "don't know". The only issues or concerns raised were by one respondent who stated that: there had not been a problem previously; and the order of attainment (i.e. operative then supervisor) was not necessarily accurate.

Proposed change 2

Proposed change 2 was: to make it clearer how other organisations could be recognised by the Scottish Ministers and be added to the list of approved bodies within Scotland.

Q2a Recognition of Awarding Bodies

---

[1] Proportions given of support for proposed changes are of those who addressed the closed element of each question (i.e. who ticked "yes", "no", or "don't know"). Almost all of the respondents addressed each of the questions.

The majority of respondents (82%) agreed with the process described in the consultation document (paras 2.4-2.5) to allow the Scottish Ministers to recognise Awarding Bodies. Common reasons for this view were that it was appropriate and relevant, and would have a positive impact on the process.

Four respondents (12%) disagreed, and two (6%) answered "don't know". Issues and concerns raised included the view that the current system was sufficient, and that the role of the SQA should be retained. Other concerns included: the potential for confusion if there were too many card issuers; and that the proposal would not align with the rest of the UK.

Q2b Other organisations for the Scottish Ministers to consult

Over half of respondents (53%) agreed that there were other organisations it would be helpful for the Scottish Ministers to consult in reaching a view. Those mentioned most frequently were: The Society of Chief Officers of Transportation Scotland (SCOTS); and the Highway Authorities and Utilities Committee (UK) (HAUC [UK]) Training and Accreditation Group (TAG). A number of others were suggested.

Proposed change 3

Proposed change 3 was to: simplify the process of registering qualifications, by providing for electronic communication of examination results and qualifications held.

The majority of respondents (88%) agreed that this proposal would simplify the current system. Common benefits were that such a change would: streamline the process; remove bureaucracy; reduce confusion and improve the ease of administration. It was also suggested that it would: reduce delays; provide cost savings; and accord with the increasing use of electronic recording.

One respondent (3%) disagreed with the proposed change, and three (9%) stated "don't know". Issues or concerns raised included that: operatives may not have access to the required technology; it may be difficult for employers to access information; and some candidates may choose "stand-alone" units which would not produce awards.

Proposed change 4

Proposed change 4 was to: amend the key date for calculation of time periods for the validity of qualifications from the date a qualification is registered to the date when the relevant qualification is achieved.

The majority of respondents (85%) agreed that this would clarify the expiry dates of the registration of qualifications. Benefits mentioned were that it would: reduce confusion and ambiguity; align the approach to other qualifications and to the situation in England; and ensure that workers could fulfil their statutory functions from the date of being certified as competent.

Three respondents (9%) disagreed, while two (6%) stated "don't know". The issues or concerns raised related mainly to concerns about clarity or potential for confusion.

Proposed change 5

Proposed change 5 was to: continue to provide a two month "grace period" during which someone who has passed their exams, but not received confirmation of registration, could fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor; and clarify that candidates cannot fulfil the statutory role once registration has expired.

Q5a Continuation of a two month grace period

Almost all of the respondents (91%) agreed that the two month grace period should continue. The reasons given most commonly were that this would provide time for processing, and allow for any delays or problems in the registration process.

Two respondents (6%) disagreed and one (3%) stated "don't know". Two respondents questioned the relevance of the change with an electronic register. Another considered two months to be too long.

Q5b Prohibit fulfilling the statutory role once registration has expired

The majority of respondents (79%) agreed that it should be clarified that candidates cannot fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor after expiry of registration of their qualification. Reasons given were that this would: improve standards and checking; enable planning; provide clarity; avoid confusion; and align with other regulations.

Five respondents (15%) disagreed with the proposal, and two (6%) stated "don't know". Issues or concerns raised included that: an applicant would remain competent during the three month period after expiry; the proposed change could lead to staffing problems; an individual could continue to push their date back and remain technically qualified; and it was unclear how the proposal would operate.

Proposed change 6

Proposed change 6 was to: amend the qualification requirements for trained operatives and supervisors, to include provision for reassessment.

The majority of respondents (88%) agreed that this proposal was relevant and appropriate. The reasons included that it would: improve standards and competence; keep skills up to date; ensure safety; and align with England.

Three respondents (9%) disagreed with the proposal, and one (3%) stated "don't know". Issues and concerns raised related to: a lack of need for this; a lack of value of refresher courses; and a view that there are other ways to demonstrate competence.

Proposed change 7

Proposed change 7 was to: introduce reassessment of competencies every five years. Provision would be made for applications to re-register qualifications to be submitted within the first four years of a registration period. The subsequent registration period would run from the next anniversary of the original period. The maximum gap allowed between lapsed registration and application to re-register a qualification on the basis of reassessment would be five years.

Q7a Requirement to pass an appropriate reassessment for re-registration

The majority of respondents (85%) agreed that candidates should only be allowed to re-register qualifications if they have passed an appropriate reassessment examination. Common reasons were that this would: have a positive impact on competence; keep the workforce up to date; and improve and maintain standards.

Three respondents (9%) disagreed, and two (6%) stated "don't know". Issues and concerns raised included: a perceived lack of need for reassessment; and a concern that this would not improve the situation, or would lead to additional costs.

Q7b Early applications to re-register

The majority of respondents (88%) agreed that the proposal to allow early applications to re-register qualifications would provide candidates and employers with greater flexibility to plan when and how candidates will take their reassessment examinations. It was suggested that this could: help employers with planning and scheduling; meet business needs; and streamline the process.

One respondent (3%) disagreed with the change, and three (9%) stated "don't know". Issues and concerns raised related to: potential for abuse of flexibility; difficulties of arranging expiry of all qualifications together; and uncertainty about how this would operate.

Q7c Maximum five year gap for re-registration based on reassessment

The majority of respondents (72%) agreed that that the maximum gap that should be allowed between the lapsed registration of a qualification and an application to re-register that qualification on the basis of a reassessment examination should be 5 years. Benefits of this approach included that it would align the timescales with other schemes and with the process in England; enable planning; and help ensure consistency and clarity.

Seven respondents (22%) disagreed with the proposed change and two (6%) stated "don't know". Issues and concerns related to the view that the proposed maximum gap was too long, or to the lack of a "grace period". Other issues or concerns included: potential costs; a lack of need for the changes; and queries about how this would operate in practice. One respondent stated that this did not align with the reassessment model being introduced in England.

Proposed change 8

Proposed change 8 was to: revise the qualifications structure, making "Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus" and "Signing, Lighting and Guarding" mandatory qualifications in their own right (and requiring these to be current for any other qualification to be valid). Annex A of the consultation document proposed a new way of listing and numbering the qualifications.

Q8a Revision and clarification of units and qualifications

The majority of respondents (84%) agreed that the proposal to revise and clarify the system of units and qualifications would be a more straightforward way for the qualifications to be listed. Few additional comments were made, but reasons to support the proposal included improved clarity and standards, and the perceived importance of these qualifications (along with the opportunity to highlight this).

Three respondents (9%) disagreed with this, and two (6%) stated "don't know". Issues or concerns raised included: potential for confusion; and concern that the new numbers would be out of alignment with the old ones. One respondent stated that the proposed system was different to that in England.

Q8b Signing, Lighting and Guarding as mandatory qualifications

Almost all respondents (91%) agreed that "Signing, Lighting and Guarding" and "Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus" should be qualifications in their own right, and a mandatory requirement for any other qualification. Reasons again related to the perceived importance of these qualifications, and to safety benefits.

One respondent (3%) disagreed and two (6%) stated "don't know". The only concern was that this could reduce flexibility and make work programming more difficult.

Proposed change 9

Proposed change 9 was to: have cross-border recognition of road works qualifications, with a need to recognise those registered elsewhere in the UK and in the European Union.

The majority of respondents (88%) agreed that cross-border recognition of road works qualifications is required. Reasons included that this would benefit the many companies now operating across borders, or with workers from outwith Scotland. It would also enable consistency, quality and a simpler, cost-effective process.

One respondent (3%) disagreed, and three (9%) stated "don't know". Issues or concerns were: how to ensure equivalence of qualifications; how the change would operate; and a perceived need for further assessment for those from elsewhere in the EU.

Proposed change 10

Proposed change 10 was to: introduce an explicit exemption from the regulations for Scottish Fire and Rescue Services (SFRS) when checking fire hydrants (but not when carrying out repairs).

The majority of respondents (69%) agreed that this was appropriate. Reasons for support included that this would: make practical sense; align with other Administrations; and provide clarity. It was also stated that SFRS would consult utilities to assist, if required.

Seven respondents (22%) disagreed, and three (9%) stated "don't know". Issues or concerns related largely to a need for safety in SFRS work, as with any other works.

Supplementary questions (11)

Supplementary questions (11) focused on: the possible future extension of some qualification requirements to roads authorities (making qualifications relating to safety and plant protection mandatory); and the addition to the "Signing, Lighting and Guarding" curriculum of a new module on communication with the public.

Q11a Future extension of some qualification requirements to roads authorities

Most respondents (82%) agreed that it would be a good idea to extend the requirement for certain qualifications to Roads Authority operatives and supervisors. Among the benefits were that this would promote fairness and parity, and help to promote competence, standards; safety; consistency and compliance.

Three respondents (9%) disagreed, and three (9%) stated "don't know". The only issues or concerns raised related to unnecessary costs, or to the view that Roads Authorities themselves should determine how to ensure competence in their staff.

Q11b Added content on engagement and communication with the public

The majority of respondents (64%) agreed that it would be a good idea to add content to Signing Lighting and Guarding on how best to engage and communicate with members of the public with whom they come into contact during the undertaking of road works. The

most common reason for this view was that this would improve relationships between members of the public and those carrying out road works. It was also suggested that it would enhance the content of SLG training.

Four respondents (12%) disagreed and eight (24%) answered "don't know". The most common issues or concerns raised were about the importance of organisations' own practice in promoting positive engagement, to meet their own varied needs. Other issues included views that: the public should be guided by signage; and the introduction of the change might cause confusion in other Administrations.

Additional information

A small number of respondents made other comments or provided additional information as part of the consultation process. These included comments on:

- The overall importance of addressing issues relating to road works.
- The need for quality training and minimum standards.
- The need for alignment of requirements between Administrations.

One respondent stressed a need for greater consideration of the needs of cyclists in road works, through having better qualified operatives and a more professionalised workforce. Another expressed their willingness to be involved in going forward.

All of the findings are presented in detail in the full report, with the full responses available on the Transport Scotland website[2].

.

---

[2] http://www.transport.gov.scot/publications-stats

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1.   This report presents the findings of a Transport Scotland consultation on the Road Works (Qualifications of Supervisors) (Scotland) Regulations 2016.

The policy context

1.2.   The legal framework covering who may work on, and who may supervise road works is set out in two pieces of legislation: The New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 NRSWA) and The Road Works (Qualifications of Supervisors and Operatives) (Scotland) Regulations 1992.

1.3.   The NRSWA puts an obligation on roads works undertakers to ensure that there is at least one suitably trained operative on site at all time when work is in progress, and, in most cases, that the works are supervised by someone who has an appropriate supervisor qualification.

1.4.   Road works are carried out on, or behalf of, the four main utility groups (water, gas, electric and telecoms) and most utility companies have a statutory right to install, inspect, maintain, repair or replace apparatus. Roads Authorities can also grant road works licenses to others.

1.5.   The Road Works (Qualifications of Supervisors and Operatives) (Scotland) Regulations 1992 describe a number of units of competency that must be completed by approved operatives or supervisors at road works. There are currently 16 units of competence and these are assessed by one of three Awarding Bodies across the UK. The overall Street Works Qualification Register (SWQR) is maintained by the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) and covers England and Wales, as well as Scotland.

1.6.   Road works staff are required to register for a fixed period, and can re-register once they have demonstrated their ongoing competence in the relevant area. Each registered worker is provided with a "card", which details their qualifications. This is open to inspection at any time.

1.7.   The 1992 Regulations now require to be updated. The Scottish Ministers propose to introduce the Road Works (Qualifications of Operatives and Supervisors) (Scotland) Regulations 2016. The aim is to require trained road works operatives and supervisors who wish to re-register their qualifications to do so on the basis of having their competency reassessed successfully. At the same time, it is intended to revise the qualifications structure, and to simplify and improve existing provisions.

1.8.   Transport Scotland carried out a consultation on the proposed changes, in order to inform the way forward. This took place from 8th July to 30th September 2016.

The consultation

1.9.   A consultation document was published on Transport Scotland's website. It sought views of 10 specific proposed changes, and a supplementary question. These related to:

- Changing the order of sections on supervisors and operatives; and changing the way Approved Bodies are defined (Proposed changes 1 and 2).
- Simplifying the process of registering and re-registering qualifications (Proposed changes 3, 4 and 5).

- Amending the qualifications requirements for trained operators and supervisors to provide for reassessment (Proposed changes 6 and 7).
- Revising the qualifications structure and introducing the requirement to comply with the EU (Recognition of Professional Qualifications) Regulations 2015 (Proposed changes 8 and 9).
- Exempting the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) from the Regulations when checking fire hydrants; and considering extending the coverage of some qualification requirements to Roads Authorities (Proposed change 10, and supplementary question 11).

1.10. All of the questions asked respondents to agree or disagree with a proposed change (via a "tick box" with the options "yes" or "no" or "don't know". Each question also invited respondents to give the reasons for their answers.

1.11. Additionally, at most of the questions, respondents were asked to give their views on any additional costs and benefits of the proposals to inform the Business and Regulatory Impact Assessment (BRIA). Respondents were asked the following:

> *"Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business with regard to, for example:*
> *the day to day running of your business, e.g. economic growth or limitations;*
> *the positive or negative financial or administrative burden or benefits."*

1.12. A response form was provided on which respondents could record their answers, and they were asked to complete a Respondent Information Form (RIF) with their details.

1.13. The questions are set out in full at the relevant points in each section of the report, and a list of questions is provided at Annex 1.

Submissions and respondents

1.14. A total of 33 responses were received by the closing date. Table 1 below summarises the respondents by category.

Table 1: Respondents by category

Category	Number	%
Local authorities or local authority joint bodies[3]	14	42
Utilities	8	24
Individuals	5	14
Regulatory bodies or qualifications bodies[4]	3	9
Road user organisations	2	6
Training organisations	1	3

1.15. As is clear from the table, the largest number of responses (just over two fifths) were from local authorities and representative bodies. Just under a quarter (24%) were from utilities. Responses were also received from individuals (14%); regulatory bodies or qualifications bodies (9%); road user organisations (6%); and training organisations (3%).

---

[3] Described in the text as "local authority respondents", covering all of those in this category

[4] Described in the text as "regulatory body respondents", covering all of those in this category

1.16. Almost all of the respondents addressed the specific questions and followed the format of the response form. All but one (who provided their views by email) used Citizen Space. One respondent who used Citizen Space, provided additional material via email.

1.17. One respondent requested that their response be treated as confidential. A further 19 stated that their response could only be published anonymously. For those reasons, the report does not include a list of respondent names.

1.18. There was a high level of response to each questions (at least 97% in each case). Most respondents addressed all of them. Additional comments were provided at each question.

Analysis of the data and presentation of the information

1.19. The analysis of the data involved a number of stages, which were:

- Design of an Access database to include the data for each question.
- Transfer of responses submitted through Citizen Space and verbatim input of the response submitted by email.
- Quantitative analysis of the closed questions.
- Preparation of a series of Word documents containing all textual material.
- Qualitative analysis and Identification of key themes at each question.
- Summary of the findings and preparation of this report.

1.20. The presentation of the information involves some quantitative material, along with qualitative detail. The quantitative information includes:

- The number of respondents overall, and by type (Table 1 above).
- The proportion of respondents who answered each closed question and who made additional comments.
- The breakdown of views in the closed parts of the questions and sub-questions.

1.21. The rest of the analysis and presentation of the material is qualitative. The information is presented by themes to reflect the range and depth of views provided.

1.22. The overall balance of respondents highlighting broad themes is given in each case (e.g. "most of the additional comments focused on") and actual proportions are not given. For the detailed material, qualitative terms (e.g. "a small number"; "a few"; "several" etc.) are largely used to indicate the balance of views. In some cases, reference is made to an actual number of respondents (e.g. where the number is very small).

1.23. It would be inappropriate to quantify this material further, because:

- The focus was on the range of views, rather than the "weight" of responses.
- Some responses represented the views of a number of contributors.
- Respondents were self-selecting, making it impossible to generalise from findings.

1.24. The report cannot provide a compendium of the information in the responses, nor can it present every individual point made. It does, however, summarise themes and issues raised, even by small numbers of respondents.

1.25. The wording used to present the qualitative material sometimes follows the wording of a response closely (although not presented as a "quote"). This is done to ensure a

respondent's intended message is represented accurately. Quotations have not been used, as this might imply that the views of one respondent carry more weight than another.

1.26. The report does not list the types of respondent identifying each individual theme, as this would make the report difficult to read. It does, however, present the information by category for each question in Annex 2. The term "respondent" refers to one response, even if it represents the views of more than one contributor.

1.27. The remainder of the report presents the findings, as follows.

- Chapter 2: Proposed changes 1 and 2.
- Chapter 3: Proposed changes 3, 4 and 5.
- Chapter 4: Proposed changes 6 and 7.
- Chapter 5: Proposed changes 8 and 9.
- Chapter 6: Proposed change 10; and supplementary question 11.

2. Proposed changes 1 and 2

2.1.   This chapter presents the findings relating to proposed changes 1 and 2, corresponding to questions 1, 2a and 2b in the consultation document.

Proposed change 1

2.2.   Proposed change1 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

> **Change the order in which the sections on supervisors and operatives appear in the regulations**
>
> **a) Place operatives before supervisors in the title of the Road Works (Qualifications of Operatives and Supervisors) (Scotland) Regulations 2016; and**
>
> **b) within the body of the regulations and associated schedules.**

2.3.   Question 1 asked:

> *Q1. Do you agree with the proposed change of ordering in the title and within the regulations? Yes/No/Don't Know*

2.4.   Question 1 also asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answer, and to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change.

Overall pattern of views (Q1)

2.5.   All of the respondents addressed Question 1. All but one (97%) answered "yes" and agreed that the order in which the sections on supervisors and operatives appear in the regulations should be changed. None disagreed, and one road user organisation (3%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q1 below and Table A3, Annex 2).

Table Q1: Overall views of question 1[5]

Response	Number	%
Yes	32	97
No	0	0
Don't know	1	3
	33	

2.6.   The full quantitative analysis of Question 1 is presented in tables A1-A3 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

2.7.   Just under two thirds of respondents (64%) made additional comments at Question 1. Almost all of these focused on benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

---

[5] All of the tables in the report presenting "overall views" at each question relate to the views of those who addressed the "closed" element of the question (i.e. who ticked "yes", "no" or "don't know"). Not all of these tables sum to 100%, due to rounding.

2.8. Among the benefits of, or reasons to support changing the order in which the sections on supervisors and operatives appear in the regulations, several respondents of different types described this as logical, appropriate and relevant, and one local authority respondent stated that it would align with other parts of the UK.

2.9. Three respondents (from the local authority and utilities categories) stated that it made sense in terms of ranking, knowledge and progression (i.e. from operative to supervisor). Other respondents stressed the importance of operatives' training, and one local authority respondent stated that this may be more pertinent than that of supervisors (as operatives would be completing the work on site).

2.10. A few respondents stated that the proposal involved only an administrative change, or that it would not affect their organisation.

Issues or concerns

2.11. Only one respondent (an individual) raised any issues or concerns with the proposal to change the order in which the sections on supervisors and operatives appear in the regulations. They stated that they did not see this as a problem currently. They also expressed the view that the expected order of attainment (from operative to supervisor) was not necessarily accurate (citing that a degree qualified civil engineer would be expected to achieve a supervisor's qualification, but would be unlikely to attain an operative's qualification first).

Additional suggestions

2.12. A small number of respondents made additional suggestions on the proposals overall, or on particular issues for consideration. These are summarised in Chapter 6.

Costs and benefits

2.13. Just under three fifths of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of the proposal. Several made no comment, and a few said this was not applicable to them.

2.14. Most of those who commented (including most of the utilities respondents) stated that the proposal would have no impact (e.g. on costs, benefits or the running of the organisation). One added a proviso that there would be no additional costs provided the changes to hard copy documentation and operative and supervisor road works cards were made on expiry (not before).

2.15. Two respondents mentioned costs, although these appeared to relate to wider issues. One local authority respondent, for example, provided a figure for the cost of training for operatives. One utilities respondent stated that there would be costs involved in re-assessment (although they would be outweighed by the potential to enhance safety).

2.16. Two respondents mentioned additional benefits, which also appeared to relate to the proposals overall, and were that this would:

- Prove the competency of operatives and supervisors on projects.
- Ensure that all staff were suitably trained for a task.
- Enhance safety.

Proposed change 2

2.17. Proposed change 2 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

> **Changing the way Approved Bodies are defined**
>
> **We propose to make it clearer how other organisations can be recognised by the Scottish Ministers and be added to the list of approved bodies within Scotland.**

2.18. Question 2 had two parts, and asked:

> *Q2a. Do you agree with the process described in paragraphs 2.4-2.5 to allow the Scottish Ministers to recognise Awarding Bodies? Yes/No/Don't Know*
>
> *Q2b. In helping the Scottish Ministers to reach a view we propose to consult with RAUC(S), SQA Accreditation, the Scottish Road Works Commissioner and HAUC(UK). Are there any other organisations you consider it would be helpful for the Scottish Ministers to consult? Yes/No/Don't Know*

2.19. Q2a asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answer and to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change. Q2b asked them to provide the name of potential consultees, and explain the reasons for their proposal.

Overall pattern of views (Q2a)

2.20. All of the respondents addressed Question 2a. The majority (82%) answered "yes", and agreed with the process described in paras 2.4-2.5 of the consultation document (to allow the Scottish Ministers to recognise awarding bodies).

2.21. Four respondents (12%) answered "no". These included three local authority and one utilities respondents. Two respondents (6%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q2a below and Table A6, Annex 2).

Table Q2a: Overall views of question 2a

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	82
No	4	12
Don't know	2	6
	33	

2.22. The full quantitative analysis of Question 2a is presented in tables A4-A6 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

2.23. Just under three fifths of respondents (58%) made additional comments, of which most focused on the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, while several made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

2.24. Among the benefits of, or reasons to support the process described, to allow the Scottish Ministers to recognise awarding bodies, comments (from respondents of different types) included that it was common sense, appropriate and relevant, and satisfied legislation.

2.25. A few respondents described the way in which they believed the proposed change would impact on the process, with comments including that it could:

- Clarify the process.
- Ensure consistency across the UK.
- Provide more competition relating to Approved Bodies.
- Allow recognition of other awarding bodies.
- Use existing expertise and knowledge to make recommendations.
- Enable more relevant, specialist and practical based bodies to influence decisions.

2.26. One regulatory body respondent expressed support for the *principle* that Scottish Ministers would be involved, with a "central body" approving Awarding Bodies, but stated that they could not comment further without details of the application, approval and appeals process. A few respondents stated that the proposal would not impact on their organisation, or would have no negative consequences for them.

Issues or concerns

2.27. A small number of respondents who did not support the process described in the consultation document raised issues or concerns. These included views, for example, that the current system met their needs and maintained all information about qualifications in one organisation; and that the SQA should be retained as the Awarding Body.

2.28. One utilities respondent stated that having too many recognised card issuers could cause confusion as to what would be accepted on site. One local authority respondent stated that, while they understood the position of the Scottish Ministers, they were concerned that this was not in line with the rest of the UK.

Additional suggestions

2.29. Several respondents (with differing overall views of the proposal) made additional suggestions about the process to allow Scottish Ministers to recognise Awarding Bodies.

2.30. A few utilities or training organisation respondents mentioned a need for a consistent or standardised approach. Other suggestions (by small numbers of respondents) included a need for:

- A robust system.
- Clarity, and definition of the requirements.
- Prevention of any impact on the quality of training or increased costs.

2.31. Two respondents made suggestions about consistency across the UK. One utilities respondent stated, for example, that the change may be carried out through the Highway Authorities and Utilities Committee (UK) (HAUC [UK]) Training and Accreditation Group (TAG). A local authority respondent suggested that there should be a more formalised link with the Scottish Roads Commissioner and the Roads Authorities and Utilities Committee (Scotland) (RAUC[S]).

2.32. One respondent expressed specific support for input from the Scottish Road Works Commissioner (SRWC), represented on TAG.

Costs and benefits

2.33. Just under a third of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of the proposal. Several made no comment, and a few said this was not applicable to them.

2.34. A few local authority and utilities respondents stated that the proposal would have no impact on them (e.g. on costs, benefits or the running of the organisation).

2.35. Four respondents made some comments on costs, although none quantified them. One utilities respondent stated (as at Question 1) that the cost was outweighed by safety benefits. Other comments from local authority respondents were that the costs were unknown, and that any increased cost would be passed to customers. One local authority respondent stated that the proposal may lead to an additional financial burden in checking qualifications across several awarding bodies.

2.36. The only additional benefit mentioned (as noted at Question 1) was the potential of the proposals to enhance safety.

Overall pattern of views (Q2b)

2.37. All but one of the respondents addressed Question 2b. Of these, just over half (53%) answered "yes", and agreed that there were other organisations it would be helpful for the Scottish Ministers to consult in reaching a view. Around a third (34%) answered "no", while 13% stated "don't know. (See Table Q2b below.)

Table Q2b: Overall views of question 2b

Response	Number	%
Yes	17	53
No	11	34
Don't know	4	13
	32	

2.38. The full quantitative analysis of Question 2b is presented in tables A7-A9 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

2.39. Almost three fifths of respondents (59%) made additional comments at Question 2b. Most identified other organisations for the Scottish Ministers to consult, and a small number made comments on the organisations mentioned in the proposal.

Other organisations for the Scottish Ministers to consult

2.40. Those additional organisations identified most frequently were:

- The Society of Chief Officers of Transportation Scotland (SCOTS), as the umbrella group for all Roads Authorities in Scotland (mentioned by four local authority respondents).
- The HAUC (UK) Training and Accreditation Group, to provide consistency across the UK (mentioned by three utilities respondents).

2.41. Others mentioned, either for consultation or to make submissions included:

- Civil Engineering Contractors Association (CECA).
- Construction Industry Training Board (CITB).
- National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG).
- Joint Authorities Group (UK) (JAG [UK]).
- Utilities.
- Roads Authorities.

2.42. One individual respondent suggested that training centres should be included, to provide the views of those directly involved in practice. Engagement with supply chain contractors and industry representatives was also suggested.

Organisations mentioned in the proposal

2.43. A small number of respondents commented on the organisations mentioned in the proposal. One stated that the proposed change gave greater recognition to RAUC(S) and the SRWC, and another that local authority roads departments should be represented via consultation with RAUC(S). One individual respondent questioned the level of interest by HAUC (UK) and stated that there had been little recent information from them.

3. Proposed changes 3, 4 and 5

3.1. This section presents the findings relating to proposed changes 3, 4 and 5, corresponding to questions 3, 4, 5a and 5b in the consultation document.

Proposed change 3

3.2. Proposed change 3 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

> **Simplify the process of registering qualifications**
>
> **The proposed regulations will seek to simplify the process by providing for electronic communication of examination results and qualifications held**

3.3. Question 3 asked:

> Q3. *Do you agree that the proposal to simplify the process for recording and registering qualifications will improve on the current system? Yes/No/Don't know*

3.4. Question 3 also asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answer, and to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change.

Overall pattern of views (Q3)

3.5. All of the respondents addressed Question 3. The majority (88%) answered "yes" and agreed that this proposal would simplify the current system. One individual respondent (3%) answered "no", while a further three respondents (9%) answered "don't know". (See Table Q3 below and Table A12, Annex 2.)

Table Q3: Overall views of question 3

Response	Number	%
Yes	29	88
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
	33	

3.6. The full quantitative analysis of Question 3 is presented in tables A10-A12 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

3.7. Almost two thirds of respondents (61%) made additional comments. Most focused on the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

3.8. Common perceived benefits of this proposed change related to the impact of simplifying the process. It was suggested (by respondents of different types) that this would: generally improve and streamline the process; remove bureaucracy; reduce confusion; and ease administration.

3.9. A small number of local authority, utilities and regulatory body respondents stated that electronic recording would help reduce costs, or be more efficient (e.g. by stopping individuals losing certificates; reducing delays; and saving time, paperwork and costs).

Two respondents mentioned that this approach to recording was now commonplace, making it a natural progression.

Issues or concerns

3.10. While most comments focused on the benefits of electronic communication, a few individual and local authority respondents (with differing overall views) raised issues or concerns. These were that: operatives may not have an email address or access to a PC; data protection issues may affect how employers gain access to information; and some candidates may choose to do stand-alone units which would not produce awards or cards.

Additional suggestions

3.11. A few respondents of different types made additional suggestions about electronic communication of results or qualifications. Two, for example, focused on enabling access to information, with suggestions including to:

- Ensure a mechanism for employers to access employees' results.
- Notify current employers of the date of certification, in order to plan reassessment.
- Send a reminder to individuals to advise them that they are in the period in which reassessment should be completed.

3.12. Suggestions were also made about issuing cards and certificates, which were that:

- A card should be issued so that site managers could review this.
- Cards and certificates should be issued to candidates via their employer, and not to their home address.

3.13. One regulatory body respondent (who agreed with the proposal in principle) stated that Figures 1 and 2 in the consultation document (showing the registration process) were incomplete. They suggested that the process for both the "original" and "reassessment" should be the same.

Costs and benefits

3.14. Just under two fifths of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of the proposal for electronic communication of results and qualifications. Several made no comment, and a few stated that this was not applicable to them.

3.15. Among those who made comments, a small number of local authority and utilities respondents stated that there would be no impact on their organisation (unless, in the view of one, employers were charged to access the records for their employees).

3.16. Two respondents identified costs, but did not quantify these. One individual respondent stated that there would be an additional administrative burden. One utilities respondent made the general point that there would be some costs (but, as they stated previously, these would be outweighed by safety benefits).

3.17. Four respondents identified additional benefits, most commonly that streamlining the process for recording and registering qualifications would reduce administration.

Proposed change 4

3.18. Proposed change 4 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

> **Changing the key date from the date a qualification is registered to the date when the relevant qualification is achieved.**
>
> **The current 5 year period when qualifications are valid is calculated from the date the qualification is registered. This approach is inconsistent with the introduction of reassessment which needs to be more closely linked to when the candidate was assessed as competent. The proposed regulations will therefore seek to use the date on which an awarding body certifies the candidate as being competent as the key date for the calculation of subsequent time periods.**

3.19. Question 4 asked:

> *Q4. Do you agree that the proposed change clarifies when the expiry dates of the registration of qualifications will fall? Yes/No/Don't Know*

3.20. Question 4 also asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answer, and to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change.

Overall pattern of views (Q4)

3.21. All of the respondents addressed Question 4. The majority (85%) answered "yes", and agreed that amending the key date for calculating time periods for the validity of qualifications from the date a qualification is registered to the date when it is achieved would clarify this.

3.22. Three respondents (9%) answered "no". These included one utilities, one local authority and one individual respondent. A further two respondents (6%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q4 below and Table A15, Annex 2.)

Table Q4: Overall views of question 4

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
	33	

3.23. The full quantitative analysis of Question 4 is presented in tables A13-A15 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

3.24. Almost three fifths of respondents (58%) made additional comments. Almost all of these comments focused on the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

3.25. The main benefit identified (by respondents of different types) was that the proposal would reduce confusion and ambiguity, and increase clarity relating to the expiry date. It was also suggested that the proposal was straightforward and sensible and that it would ensure that workers (operatives and supervisors) could fulfil their statutory functions and undertake their tasks from the date of being certified as competent to work.

3.26. A few respondents stated that the change would align the approach to other qualifications, and with new regulations in England. One regulatory body respondent

stated that it would ensure that all records held (by the centre, the Awarding Body and the SWQR) would be accurate and in line with each other.

Issues or concerns

3.27. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns about the proposal. These related largely to concerns about clarity, or potential for confusion. Specific comments included that the proposal:

- Would simply change the date, not provide clarity.
- Differed from changes being introduced in England in April 2017, and could lead to confusion for organisations with workers spanning boundaries.
- Could lead to confusion about when to renew if separate qualifications were held.

3.28. One local authority respondent stated that this proposal may be more relevant if reassessment were applied, but, without this requirement, they were unsure how much of an issue it was. An individual respondent noted that awarding bodies had been consulted prior to contractors (who, in their view, would be most affected).

Costs and benefits

3.29. Just under three fifths of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of the proposal. Several made no comment, and a small number stated that this was not applicable to them.

3.30. Among those who made comments, several respondents (from the training organisation, local authority and utilities categories) stated that the proposal would have no impact on them (e.g. on costs or benefits, or more generally).

3.31. Only one utilities respondent mentioned costs, reiterating their previous general comment that costs would be outweighed by safety benefits).

3.32. A few local authority and utilities respondents identified additional benefits, which were that this would help to:

- Streamline the process and reduce some administration.
- Reduce the number of days lost through individuals being unable to work.
- Focus operatives and supervisors on ensuring that qualifications were current.

Proposed change 5

3.33. Proposed change 5 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

So called "grace periods"

The 1992 regulations have been interpreted as providing for two separate so called "grace periods": However only one of these interpretations has any basis in fact.

(a) The 1992 regulations did allow a candidate who has passed their exams to work as someone trained while they wait for their qualification to be registered (for up to 2 months). In the proposed regulations, we will continue to provide a 2 month derogation to avoid delays arising from the administrative process in registering qualifications.

(b) There was also the belief that because the regulations allowed an application to re-register a qualification to be made within 3 months after the expiry of the original period of registration, that this allowed someone to continue to work in a trained position within that 3 month period. This is not in accordance with the 1992 Regulations. Therefore, under the proposed regulations, the registration of any qualification will have an expiry date linked to the date of certification. Once this date of expiration has been reached and if no fresh application to register a qualification has been received, then candidates will not be able to fulfil the statutory role of being a trained operative or supervisor.

3.34. Question 5 asked:

Q5a. Do you agree that we should continue to provide a two month "grace period" during which someone who has passed their exams can fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor even though they have not yet received confirmation of the successful registration of their qualification? Yes/No/Don't Know

Q5b. Do you agree with our proposal to clarify that candidates are not able to fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor once the registration of their qualification has expired? Yes/No/Don't Know

3.35. Questions 5a and 5b asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answers. Respondents were also asked to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed changes.

Overall pattern of views (Q5a)

3.36. All of the respondents addressed Question 5a. Almost all (91%) answered "yes" and agreed that the two month grace period should continue. Two utilities respondents (6%) answered "no", and one respondent (3%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q5a below and Table A18, Annex 2.)

Table Q5a: Overall views of question 5a

Response	Number	%
Yes	30	91
No	2	6
Don't know	1	3
	33	

3.37. The full quantitative analysis of Question 5a is presented in tables A16-A18 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

3.38. More than half of the respondents (52%) made additional comments. Most focused on the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

3.39. The benefits mentioned most commonly (by respondents of different types) for the provision of a grace period related to the time required for the process. Comments included, for example, that this would provide the necessary processing time and allow for

any delays or problems in the registration process. One local authority respondent stated that operatives and supervisors should not be penalised as a result of a registration time lag.

3.40. It was also suggested, more generally, that the provision of the two month grace period was common sense and reasonable, and one regulatory body respondent stated that the date of certification was the start date used by SWQR.

Issues or concerns

3.41. A small number of respondents mentioned issues or concerns with the proposal. One local authority and one utilities respondent questioned, for example, whether a "grace period" would be relevant with an electronic register. One utilities respondent stated that two months was too long to wait after qualification, and that the time period should be reduced to four weeks (with systems and processes able to register approval on-line, and produce digital or hard copies of certificates quickly).

Additional suggestions

3.42. A few respondents (mainly in the "utilities" category) made additional suggestions about the proposal. Comments included a perceived need to enable an individual to prove their qualification through, for example: continuing to provide a certificate at assessment / reassessment; or issuing pre-printed letters of confirmation (such as a proforma from SWQR, stating that a candidate has passed and noting the two-month grace period).

3.43. As noted in para 3.41, one utilities respondent stated that the time period should be reduced. Another expressed the view that it was an operative or supervisor's responsibility to follow up on any delayed registration within the period. One regulatory body respondent stated that the wording should read "assessment" rather than "exam".

Overall pattern of views (Q5b)

3.44. All of the respondents addressed Question 5b. The majority (79%) answered "yes" and agreed that it should be clarified that candidates cannot fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor after expiry of registration of their qualification.

3.45. Five respondents (15%) answered "no. These included three local authority respondents, as well as one utilities and one individual respondent. Two respondents (6%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q5b below and Table A21, Annex 2.)

Table Q5b: Overall views of question 5b

Response	Number	%
Yes	26	79
No	5	15
Don't know	2	6
	33	

3.46. The full quantitative analysis of Question 5b is presented in tables A19-A21 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

3.47. Almost two thirds of respondents (61%) made additional comments at Question 5b. Most related to the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

3.48. Benefits identified for clarifying that candidates cannot fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor after expiry of registration of their qualification included that it would maintain and improve standards. Local authority and utilities respondents suggested, for example, that it would help: strengthen the competency of the workforce; ensure that operatives and supervisors were re-tested within the validity period of their qualification; and ensure that they had relevant and up to date qualifications.

3.49. Other benefits identified (e.g. by utilities, local authority, individual or regulatory body respondents) were seen to include that it would: improve checking; allow forward planning; take away a "grey area" and help avoid confusion about compliance with the regulations when a card or certificate expires. One training organisation respondent stated that it would also align with other Awarding Body regulations.

3.50. A few respondents stated generally that, once a qualification has expired, it has expired until it is reissued (with one regulatory body respondent, for example, comparing this to an MOT certificate).

Issues and concerns

3.51. A small number of issues or concerns were raised with the proposal. Two local authority respondents, for example, stated that a candidate's competence would not change on expiry of their card, or during a three month period (during which it was reasonable to assume they were trained). Two respondents identified potential staffing problems which may impact upon business operations (e.g. if someone had to be dismissed because they could not get a card; or if there was a lack of qualified operatives or supervisors).

3.52. One local authority respondent stated that (although unlikely) it would be possible to apply for reassessment and continue to push the date back (being technically still qualified having made the application). Another stated that they were unclear about how this proposal would operate.

Additional suggestions

3.53. A small number of local authority and utilities respondents (including those with differing overall views of the proposal) made additional suggestions about the proposal. These included to:

- Allow a short grace period after the end date.
- Issue a reminder to candidates from the SWQR when reassessment is required.
- Notify current employers of the certification date, and the reassessment timescales (on completion of an initial assessment or reassessment) so that their management systems can prompt training requirements.
- Provide further clarity of the timescale for requalification.

Costs and benefits

3.54. Just over a third of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of proposed change 5. Several made no comment, and one stated that this was not applicable to them.

3.55. Where comments were made, a small number of local authority, utilities and training organisation respondents stated that the proposed change would have no impact on them (either cost or benefit).

3.56. Several respondents (particularly local authorities and utilities respondents, but also including an individual) identified additional costs of this proposal (although none were quantified). These were seen to relate to:

- A general financial burden, or additional administrative burden.
- Greater onus on employers to keep staff qualifications up to date.
- Loss of staff (and the potential for unfair dismissal claims), or the inability of staff to fulfil the statutory role of a qualified operative or supervisor.

3.57. Two local authority respondents stated that resources were already stretched.

3.58. The only additional benefits mentioned were that a less complex process would be administratively easier, and there would be benefits from maintaining a competent workforce.

4. Proposed changes 6 and 7

4.1.   This section presents the findings relating to proposed changes 6 and 7, corresponding to questions 6, 7a, 7b and 7c in the consultation document.

Proposed change 6

4.2.   Proposed change 6 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

> **Proposed change 6 – amend the qualification requirements for trained operatives and supervisors within the new regulations to include provision for reassessment.**
>
> **Regulations 3 and 4 of the 1992 regulations set out the prescribed qualifications for trained operatives and supervisors as individuals. This is thought not to be sufficiently robust. When introducing reassessment, we need to distinguish between initial training with assessment, and reassessment.**

4.3.   Question 6 asked:

> *Q6. Do you agree that our proposal to amend the qualification requirements for trained operatives and supervisors to reflect reassessment is relevant and appropriate? Yes/No/Don't Know*

4.4.   Question 6 also asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answer.

Overall pattern of views (Q6)

4.5.   All of the respondents addressed Question 6. The majority (88%) answered "yes", and agreed that the proposal to amend the qualification requirements for trained operatives and supervisors to reflect reassessment was relevant and appropriate.

4.6.   Three respondents (9%) answered "no". These included one local authority, one utilities and one individual respondent. One respondent (3%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q6 below and Table A24, Annex 2.)

Table Q6. Overall views of question 6

Response	Number	%
Yes	29	88
No	3	9
Don't know	1	3
	33	

4.7.   The full quantitative analysis of Question 6 is presented in tables A22-A24 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

4.8.   More than three fifths of respondents (61%) made additional comments. Most related to the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

4.9.   The most common benefit identified for the proposal to amend the qualification requirements for trained operatives and supervisors to include provision for reassessment,

was that this would help to maintain and improve competence. This was mentioned, for example, by local authority, individual and utilities respondents.

4.10. It was suggested that reassessment would help to:

- Keep skills, knowledge and competency up to date.
- Identify if an applicant has maintained or improved on their initial qualifications.
- Reassess people who may have been out of the industry for a long period.
- Ensure that employees work safely, and that sites are maintained in a safe way
- Improve standards.

4.11. A few utilities and local authority respondents mentioned that the proposed change would align with other qualifications, or with the situation in England (and would, for example, remove ambiguity for companies working across borders).

4.12. One local authority and one regulatory body respondent expressed specific support for differentiation between initial training with an assessment, and reassessment. Of these, one stated, for example, that candidates would already have practical experience, having obtained the initial qualification. Additionally, one further local authority respondent welcomed the proposal that the reassessment would be relevant and appropriate.

Issues or concerns

4.13. A small number of respondents (one local authority, one utilities and one individual respondent) identified issues or concerns with the proposal. Comments included that: there was no point in carrying out the work unless there were significant changes to requirements; there was no value in refresher courses; and there were other ways to demonstrate competence (e.g. similar to Continuing Professional Development [CPD] requirements for professional staff).

4.14. One utilities respondent stated that it was unclear what the Scottish Government was seeking to achieve through the proposal.

Additional suggestions

4.15. A small number of respondents from regulatory bodies, utilities and training organisations made additional suggestions. These included, for example, the view that reassessment should include practical elements (and two respondents mentioned particular aspects of training for this). Comments included that some operatives and supervisors may be involved in street works operations only infrequently (if at all) and that candidates should be reassessed to the original standard.

4.16. One regulatory body respondent stated that there should be further consultation with the industry, to determine whether reassessment should be practical or theory-based, and to ensure that it is rigorous and "fit for purpose". The same respondent suggested using the term "renewal" or "refresher" instead of "reassessment".

Proposed change 7

4.17. Proposed change 7 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

Introduction of reassessment of competencies every 5 years

The 1992 regulations provide that a qualification could be re-registered for a further period of 5 years provided that an application is received no later than 3 months

---

after the expiry of the previous registration. The proposed regulations will require that an application to re-register a qualification is supported with confirmation that the applicant has passed an appropriate reassessment examination in the relevant qualification.

4.18. Question 7 asked:

> *Q7a. Do you agree that candidates should only be allowed to re-register qualifications if they have passed an appropriate reassessment examination in that qualification?*
>
> *Q7b. Do agree that our proposal to allow early applications to re-register qualifications provides candidates and employers with greater flexibility to plan when and how candidates will take their reassessment examinations?*
>
> *Q7c. Do you agree that that the maximum gap that should be allowed between the lapsed registration of a qualification and an application to re-register that qualification on the basis of a reassessment examination should be 5 years?*

4.19. Questions 7a, b and c asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answers. Additionally, respondents were asked to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed changes.

Overall pattern of views (Q7a)

4.20. All of the respondents addressed Question 7a. The majority (85%) answered "yes" and agreed that candidates should only be allowed to re-register qualifications if they have passed an appropriate reassessment examination.

4.21. Three respondents (9%) answered "no". These included one local authority, one utilities and one individual respondent. Two respondents (6%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q7a below and Table A27, Annex 2.)

Table Q7a: Overall views of question 7a

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
	33	

4.22. The full quantitative analysis of Question 7a is presented in tables A25-A27 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

4.23. Just under half of the respondents (48%) made additional comments. Most related to the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

4.24. The most common benefit identified for the proposal to allow candidates to re-register qualifications only if they have passed an appropriate reassessment examination was that this would maintain and improve competence (as at Question 6).

4.25. Comments by, for example, utilities, local authority and individual respondents included that this proposal would help to:

- Improve and maintain standards, quality and safety.
- Give more relevance to the qualification.
- Demonstrate competence and compliance with requirements.
- Keep the workforce up to date.

4.26. More general comments included that the proposal would benefit candidates, employers and the public, and would lead to a more robust system.

Issues or concerns

4.27. A few respondents (one local authority, one utilities and one individual respondent) identified issues or concerns with the proposal, generally relating to a perceived lack of need for reassessment. Reasons included that: there is little point in this, where an individual can demonstrate that they have been doing this type of work for the previous five years; and reassessment (unless there has been significant change) adds no value, but adds costs. One utilities respondent stated that the cost of reassessment would be significant and would cause an additional burden for the general public.

4.28. Other comments included that, where utilities are guaranteeing work, it is in their interests to ensure that operatives are fully competent; and that there are other ways to demonstrate competence.

Additional suggestions

4.29. A small number of respondents (with differing overall views of the proposal) made additional suggestions. One individual respondent stated that practical assessment and theory should be included, and one regulatory body respondent stated that there should be more detailed consultation to ensure reassessment takes the appropriate form (both of which were raised at Question 6).

4.30. Other comments included that: training and reassessment must be kept up to date; and there should be the facility for suspension or temporary prohibition (e.g. in the event of failure or where work is not acceptable).

Overall pattern of views (Q7b)

4.31. All but one of the respondents addressed Question 7b. Of these, the majority (88%) answered "yes" and agreed that the proposal to allow early applications to re-register qualifications would provide candidates and employers with greater flexibility to plan when and how candidates will take their reassessment examinations. One local authority respondent (3%) answered "no", and three (9%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q7b below and Table A30, Annex 2.)

Table Q7b: Overall views of question 7b

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	88
No	1	3

Don't know	3	9
	32	

4.32. The full quantitative analysis of Question 7b is presented in tables A28-A30 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

4.33. Almost three fifths of those who responded to Question 7b (59%) made additional comments. Again, most related to the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

4.34. Most of the reasons given to support the proposal focused on the benefits of flexibility. Comments (from respondents of different types) included that this was important because:

- It is not always practical to have all staff assessed at the same time.
- Employers could plan and schedule reassessments to meet their business needs and minimise the impact on businesses and customers
- There would be some contingency (e.g. to provide for unexpected circumstances; to ensure a further opportunity for those who fail; and to prevent expiry when moving between projects).

4.35. A small number of utilities respondents stated that the changes would assist organisations and Awarding Bodies resourcing re-registering and reassessment. Additional comments by local authority respondents included that it would reduce some of the administration relating to re-registration, streamline the process and allow a training programme for each individual to be clearly defined.

4.36. A few respondents commented generally that the proposal was logical and practical. One individual respondent identified current difficulties with the timely availability of a refresher course in Scotland. The same respondent stated that, in their view, this change would be forced through without taking account of contractors' views (hence a need for flexibility).

Issues or concerns

4.37. A small number of respondents (with differing overall views of the proposal) raised issues or concerns. Comments from a few individual, local authority and utilities respondents included that: flexibility could be abused; reassessment was not required (as raised previously); and it would be neither possible nor sensible to arrange for all qualifications to expire at the same time. One individual respondent stated that they were uncertain how this proposal would operate.

Additional suggestions

4.38. One local authority and one regulatory body respondent made additional suggestions about the proposal, or mentioned specific requirements. These included that there should be:

- Communication to industry (from Transport Scotland, RAUC / HAUC) alerting them to this, with examples of how it could be managed and could save them money in the long run.
- Consistency across all Administrations wherever possible.

Overall pattern of views (Q7c)

4.39. All of the respondents addressed Question 7c, although one did not specify "yes", "no" or "don't know", but made comments.

4.40. Among those who addressed the closed question, the majority (72%) answered "yes" and agreed that that the maximum gap that should be allowed between the lapsed registration of a qualification and an application to re-register that qualification on the basis of a reassessment examination should be 5 years.

4.41. Seven respondents (22%) answered "no". These included four local authority, two individual and one utilities respondents. Two respondents (6%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q7c below and Table A33, Annex 2.)

Table Q7c: Overall views of question 7c

Response	Number	%
Yes	23	72
No	7	22
Don't know	2	6
	32	

4.42. The full quantitative analysis of Question 7c is presented in tables A31-A33 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

4.43. More than half of those who responded to Question 7c (61%) made additional comments. These comments were split relatively evenly between respondents who identified the benefits of this proposal, and those mentioning issues and concerns. A few respondents made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, and reasons to support the proposal

4.44. Among the benefits of, and reasons to support this proposal (identified by respondents of different types) were the alignment the timescale (e.g. with other card schemes and accreditations; and with the process applied in England). A few comments were also made about the general approach (e.g. that the timescale was considered reasonable) and one training organisation respondent stated that the proposal would ensure consistency of approach.

4.45. A small number of other benefits were identified, including that the proposal would: allow for better forward planning; enable workers to stay up to date with changes; and help to clarity the position.

Issues and concerns

4.46. Among the issues and concerns raised (by respondents with differing overall views), the most common were about the length of the proposed maximum gap (5 years) between lapsed registration and an application for re-registration on the basis of a reassessment.

4.47. A few local authority and individual respondents who disagreed with the proposal stated that this seemed a lengthy period away from this type of work (although one local authority respondent added that it depended on the content of the reassessment). It was also suggested that a lot could have changed in the time (e.g. in terms of industry standards and materials). One regulatory body respondent (who agreed with the proposal

overall) stated that the timeframe had the potential for someone to pass their qualification, leave the industry for nine years and return for a reassessment only (with no practical knowledge gained in between times).

4.48. A few respondents raised concerns about costs. One utilities respondent, for example, questioned whether the proposal was good value for money. One individual respondent noted that someone who changed jobs and wanted to return to a job requiring a qualification at a later stage would then either be disadvantaged or may have to pay for a course. One regulatory body respondent raised a concern that the "anniversary model" being proposed in Scotland would differ from that in England (which would add to processing requirements and could lead to costs and resource issues for candidates, centres and SWQR).

4.49. A small number of respondents expressed the view that there was not sufficient flexibility (nor a "grace period"). One individual respondent raised specific queries about how the time period would operate, and how the process would be controlled on site, while one local authority respondent reiterated their view that there were more flexible ways to demonstrate competence.

Additional suggestions

4.50. A few respondents made additional suggestions, which included that there should be:

- A shorter time period (e.g. 2-3 years).
- An additional, or "grace" period for flexibility (e.g. 5 years and 3 months).
- A single model for calculating reassessment card expiry dates across all nations delivering this.

4.51. One local authority respondent stated that the HAUC(UK) TAG was considering the issue of the time limit after lapsed registration, and looking at whether reassessment could be offered after any number of years, if all the Administrations agreed.

Cost and benefits

4.52. Fewer than a third of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of these proposals. Several made no comment, and one stated that this was not applicable to them.

4.53. Among those who made comments, two local authority and one utilities respondents stated specifically that the proposal would have no impact, or a neutral impact on them.

4.54. A small number of respondents identified costs. One local authority respondent, for example, stated generally that the introduction of mandatory reassessment would bring an additional cost to their organisation. One individual respondent stated that Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) would be the main sector affected (as larger contractors would not employ operatives directly, and subcontractors would meet the costs of such a scheme) and they would find the cost and administration burdensome. One utilities respondent stated that there would be an increase in training requirements, both for operatives and supervisors.

4.55. One utilities respondent provided an anticipated figure per reassessment (based upon lost production, course fees, travel and administration); an estimated annual cost to their own organisation; and an estimated annual cost to Scotland overall. One individual respondent stated that the cost would be thousands of pounds per employee.

4.56. A small number of additional benefits were also identified. These were:

- A general positive impact overall.
- Improved safety.
- Improved scheduling of assessment and reassessment.

5. Proposed changes 8 and 9

5.1.   This section presents the findings relating to proposed changes 8 and 9, corresponding to questions 8a, 8b and 9 in the consultation document.

Proposed change 8

5.2.   Proposed change 8 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

> **Revised qualification structure**
>
> **The 1992 regulations prescribe qualifications for operatives and supervisors that are made up of separately defined units of competence. The proposed regulations seek to revise this structure, making *Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus* and *Signing, Lighting and Guarding* mandatory qualifications in their own right and not to have expired for any other qualification to be deemed valid.**

5.3.   Question 8 asked:

> *Q8a. Do you consider that our proposal to revise and clarify the system of units and qualifications in the manner described at Annex A is a more straightforward way for the qualifications to be listed?*
>
> *Q8b. Do you consider our proposal to make "Signing, Lighting and Guarding" and "Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus" qualifications in their own right and a mandatory requirement for any other qualification to help promote safety and plant protection to be logical and appropriate?*

5.4.   Questions 8a and b asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answers. Additionally, respondents were asked to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed changes.

Overall pattern of views (Q8a)

5.5.   All of the respondents addressed Question 8a, although one did not specify "yes", "no" or "don't know", but made comments.

5.6.   Among those who addressed the closed question, the majority (84%) answered "yes" and agreed that the proposal to revise and clarify the system of units and qualifications would be a more straightforward way for the qualifications to be listed.

5.7.   Three respondents (9%) answered "no". These included one local authority, one regulatory body and one individual respondent. Two respondents (6%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q8a below and Table A34, Annex 2.)

Table Q8a. Overall views of question 8a

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	84
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
	32	

5.8. The full quantitative analysis of Question 8a is presented in tables A34-A36 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

5.9. Under a third of respondents (30%) made additional comments. A small number in each case commented on: the benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal; issues or concerns; and additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

5.10. A few local authority, utilities and training organisation respondents made comments about the benefits of revising and clarifying the system of units and qualifications. Comments included general support for the proposal, as well the view that it would improve clarity and standards. A small number of utilities respondents stated specifically that "Signing, Lighting and Guarding" and "Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus" should be mandatory, and that this would raise their importance.

Issues or concerns

5.11. One local authority, one regulatory body and one individual respondent raised issues or concerns, mostly about the potential for confusion. A regulatory body and an individual respondent suggested, for example, that "Units" 1-16 had been a consistent feature of the classification to date, and any re-numbering may lead to confusion, queries and mistakes (which could, in turn lead to missed deadlines or workers with incorrect cards).

5.12. It was also suggested that the new numbers would be out of alignment with the old ones (e.g. the old Unit 2 for operatives would now be "01" and the others would also be misaligned), which could lead to mix up and confusion between qualifications. One local authority respondent expressed concern that the proposal was different to that for England.

5.13. A regulatory body and an individual respondent questioned the general need for, or benefits of such a change.

Additional suggestions

5.14. A small number of additional suggestions were made. One, by an individual respondent, was about the nature of numbering (i.e. to start the numbered lists with "02" and "S2" if using "LA"). The other, by a local authority respondent, was to provide uniformity across all administrations, to ensure consistency.

Overall pattern of views (Q8b)

5.15. All of the respondents addressed Question 8b. Almost all (91%) answered "yes" and agreed that "Signing, Lighting and Guarding" and "Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus" should be qualifications in their own right, and a mandatory requirement for any other qualification. One local authority respondent (3%) stated "no", and two respondents (6%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q8b below and Table A39, Annex 2.)

Table Q8b. Overall views of question 8b

Response	Number	%
Yes	30	91
No	1	3

Don't know	2	6
	33	

5.16. The full quantitative analysis of Question 8b is presented in tables A37-A39 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

5.17. Just over half of respondents (52%) made additional comments. Almost all of these focused on benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

5.18. The most common reasons to support having "Signing, Lighting and Guarding" and "Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus" as qualifications in their own right and mandatory for other qualifications (identified by respondents in almost all of the categories) related to the importance of these. Both areas were identified as being "high risk" (e.g. potentially for operatives, supervisors and the public).

5.19. Comments included that the proposed change would promote appropriate behaviour, as well as the protection of the plant and avoidance of apparatus damage. It was also suggested that it would reinforce the general safety message and improve standards. One individual respondent stated that these issues would be relevant to any type of civil engineering or building contract.

Issues or concerns

5.20. One local authority respondent expressed the view that this proposed change could reduce flexibility with operations teams and make programming of work more difficult.

Additional suggestions

5.21. A small number of respondents (drawn from the local authority, regulatory body and individual categories) made additional suggestions about the proposal. These included to extend coverage and make the qualifications mandatory for all of those working on the road and service networks; and to provide further clarity about the differences between the qualifications for operatives and supervisors. A further comment was also made (as at para 5.13 above) about a need to renumber the qualifications, to align these and avoid confusion across administrations.

Costs and benefits

5.22. Under a third of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of these proposals. Several made no comment, and two stated that this was not applicable to them.

5.23. Among those who made comments, a few local authority and utilities respondents stated that there would be no impact on their organisation and one utilities respondent stated that, as they already promoted safety, there would be little increase in cost.

5.24. Three respondents mentioned that there would be an additional cost of refresher and reassessment provision, and one individual respondent stated that this would be thousands of pounds.

5.25. Four respondents identified benefits (including some raised earlier) relating to reduced damage; up to date knowledge and improved safety.

Proposed change 9

5.26. Proposed change 9 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

Cross-border recognition of road works qualifications

There is a need to recognise road work qualifications registered:

a) elsewhere in the UK (in England, Wales and Northern Ireland); and
b) elsewhere in the European Union.

5.27. Question 9 asked:

Q9. Do you agree that this is required, or have any concerns about the proposal?

5.28. Question 9 asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answer and to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change.

Overall pattern of views (Q9)

5.29. All of the respondents addressed Question 9, although one did not specify "yes", "no" or "don't know", but made comments.

5.30. Among those who addressed the closed question, the majority (88%) answered "yes" and agreed that cross-border recognition of road works qualifications is required. One local authority respondent (3%) answered "no" and three respondents (9%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q9 below and Table A42, Annex 2.)

Table Q9. Overall views of question 9

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	88
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
	32	

5.31. The full quantitative analysis of Question 9 is presented in tables A40-A42 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

5.32. Just over half of respondents (54%) made additional comments. Most of these focused on benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

5.33. Some respondents stated generally that the proposal to have cross-border recognition of road works qualifications made sense. A few local authority, utilities and individual respondents made comments on the benefits of enabling cross-border working, including that:

- Operatives and supervisors would have a qualification valid across the UK, which would benefit the many UK wide organisations operating across borders and with workers employed by contractors from outwith Scotland.
- Organisations working close to borders would not require different squads for each side, or two qualifications for the same activity.

- Companies could support unexpected events (e.g. storms).
- There should be a standard as good as, or better than, any European country.

5.34. Other benefits included that the proposed change would: enable consistency and quality (e.g. in standards and safety); ensure a level playing field for all staff; and lead to a simpler and cost-effective process.

5.35. Two utilities and one local authority respondents, while supporting the proposal to recognise road work qualifications from countries within the UK, stated that there should be further assessment for those from elsewhere in the EU.

Issues or concerns

5.36. A few respondents raised issues or concerns with the proposal. Comments by one utilities and one local authority respondent included how to ensure the equivalence of qualifications, particularly from other parts of the EU (e.g. how to ensure that all operatives and supervisors were working safely; and how an inspector on site would determine whether a qualification was suitable).

5.37. One regulatory body respondent raised specific questions about whether the proposed change meant that candidates from the EU wishing to operate in Scotland could provide evidence of their qualifications and their currency / reassessment, and gain registration on the SWQR (and, if so, how this would be managed, and which organisation would determine relevance).

Additional suggestions

5.38. A few respondents of different types made additional suggestions about cross-border recognition of road works qualifications, including that:

- Anyone working in Scotland should have to comply with Scottish regulations.
- Awarding Bodies should give "credit" for what candidates have done in other countries, which may require some additional qualifications to meet Scottish requirements.
- There should be an assessment process for those holding EU certification, to ensure that it meets Scottish requirements (with no automatic right of equivalence).
- RAUC(S) and HAUC(S) should produce and / or update a table of legislative changes for operating on a cross-border basis in the UK.

Costs and benefits

5.39. Fewer than a quarter of respondents commented on potential costs and benefits of this proposal. Several made no comment, and one stated that this was not applicable to them.

5.40. Of those who made comments, two local authority and one utilities respondents stated that there would be no impact on their organisation.

5.41. One local authority respondent commented on costs, stating that these were difficult to quantify, and depended on staff turnover and whether someone sat a qualification outwith Scotland.

5.42. A few respondents identified additional benefits, including that the proposal would:

- Provide flexibility for cross-border work, without the cost of additional training or assessment.
- Reduce the down time that operatives are away from work being trained.
- Promote competence among operatives.

6. Proposed changes 10 and 11

6.1. This section presents the findings relating to proposed changes 10 and 11, corresponding to questions 10, 11a and 11b in the consultation document.

Proposed change 10

6.2. Proposed change 10 was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

Scottish Fire and Rescue Service exemption

Introduce an explicit exemption from the regulations for Scottish Fire and Rescue Services when checking fire hydrants only.

6.3. Question 10 asked:

> Q10. Do you consider our proposal to introduce an explicit exemption from the regulations for Scottish Fire and Rescue Services to be appropriate?

6.4. Respondents were asked to explain the reasons for their answer and to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change.

Overall pattern of views (Q10)

6.5. All of the respondents addressed Question 10, although one did not specify "yes", "no" or "don't know", but made comments.

6.6. Among those who addressed the closed question, the majority (69%) answered "yes" and agreed that the proposal to introduce an explicit exemption for SFRS, when checking fire hydrants, was appropriate.

6.7. Seven respondents (22%) answered "no". These included three local authority, three utilities and one regulatory body respondents. Three respondents (9%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q10 below and Table A45, Annex 2.)

Table Q10. Overall views of question 10

Response	Number	%
Yes	22	69
No	7	22
Don't know	3	9
	32	

6.8. The full quantitative analysis of Question 10 is presented in tables A43-A45 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

6.9. More than half of the respondents (58%) made additional comments, with a relatively even split between those who identified benefits, or reasons to support the proposal and those who raised issues or concerns. The most common theme, however, was the identification of additional suggestions (by respondents with differing overall views).

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

6.10. Among the benefits mentioned (by respondents of different types) for the explicit exemption of SFRS when checking fire hydrants, comments included that this: made sense; would align with other Administrations; and would explicitly detail the exemption (which was less clear previously). Two utilities respondents stated that SFRS would consult with utilities to assist, if required.

6.11. A small number of respondents stated explicitly that the exemption should be limited to checking hydrants, and should not cover their repair (as per proposed change 10).

Issues or concerns

6.12. The issues or concerns raised (particularly by local authority, utilities and regulatory body respondents who disagreed with the proposal) related to safety, with the view that this should be considered for all works on the public road. Comments included that: fire hydrants are located on footways, footpaths and carriageways and can be in challenging locations; and there is no difference between inspecting a fire hydrant and inspecting a manhole.

6.13. Additional comments included that the point of the Signing, Lighting and Guarding (SLG) qualification is to ensure safety, and having qualified SFRS staff would ensure a minimum safety standard (particularly for hydrants in traffic sensitive locations). One regulatory body respondent stated that a proportion of the SFRS work is not emergency and should be planned appropriately.

Additional suggestions

6.14. Several respondents, with differing overall views of the proposal made additional suggestions. The most common was that the exemption should only apply to the checking of fire hydrants (as stated in proposed change 10) and not to repairs or maintenance. Additional suggestions included that:

- If SFRS were to be exempt when lifting hydrant covers, then anyone simply lifting a manhole cover should be exempt.
- At least one person on site when working on a road should have an appropriate qualification.

6.15. A few respondents commented on the nature of qualifications that should be required by the SFRS. Two local authority respondents suggested, for example, having SLG as a minimum, or having a Street Works Qualification with SLG where necessary. One utilities respondent stated that, if there were to be an exemption, there should be an equivalent qualification to satisfy health and safety requirements.

6.16. One training organisation respondent stated that, where SFRS are stopping for short stop duration works, they should have sufficient training on the interpretation of a particular section of the "Safety at Street Works and Road Works" Code of Practice.

6.17. It was also suggested by two utilities respondents that these qualifications should apply to the Roads Authority operatives and supervisors (an issue discussed at Question 11 below).

Costs and benefits

6.18. Fewer than a third of respondents commented on the potential costs or benefits of the proposed change. Several made no comment, and one stated that this was not applicable to them.

6.19. Of those who made comments, four (including local authority, utilities and training organisation respondents) stated that there would be no impact on their organisation.

6.20. No respondents identified costs, but one local authority respondent stated there may be more complaints from the public if an appropriate standard of signing and guarding was not in place.

6.21. The only additional benefit identified was that there would not be a need to train and assess all staff, which would have an impact on organisational capacity.

Supplementary Question (11)

6.22. The consultation asked a supplementary question (Question 11), which proposed two further changes. This was expressed in the consultation document as follows:

> **Supplementary questions – possible future extension of some qualification requirements to roads authorities and a new module on communication with members of the public**
>
> **The proposed regulations seek to make those qualifications that relate to safety and plant protection mandatory. Although NOT part of these regulations, we would like to take this opportunity to take soundings on whether it would also make sense to extend these mandatory qualifications in the same way to Roads Authority operatives and supervisors, in a scenario where the Safety at Street Works and Road Works code of practice (the so called "red book") is made applicable to Roads Authority road workers.**
>
> **In the same way, we would also be interested in hearing views on whether the curriculum for Signing Lighting and Guarding should be adapted to include an element or module on how best to engage and communicate with members of the public with whom they come into contact with during the undertaking of road works.**

6.23. Question 11 asked:

> *Q11(a). Do you consider it to be a good idea to extend the requirement for certain qualifications to roads authority operatives and supervisors?*
>
> *Q11(b). Do you consider it to be a good idea to add content to Signing Lighting and Guarding on how best to engage and communicate with members of the public with whom they come into contact with during the undertaking of road works?*

6.24. Questions 11a and b asked respondents to explain the reasons for their answer. Additionally, respondents were asked at Question 11a to quantify the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change.

Overall pattern of views (Q11a)

6.25. All respondents addressed Question 11a. The majority (82%) answered "yes" and agreed that it would be a good idea to extend the requirement for certain qualifications to Roads Authority operatives and supervisors.

6.26. Three respondents (9%) answered "no". These included two local authority and one individual respondents. Three respondents (9%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q11a below and Table A48, Annex 2.)

Table Q11a. Overall views of question 11a

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	82
No	3	9
Don't know	3	9
	33	

6.27. The full quantitative analysis of Question 11a is presented in tables A46-A48 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

6.28. More than half of respondents (64%) made additional comments. Almost all of these focused on benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns, or made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

6.29. One of main benefits identified of extending the requirement for certain qualifications to Roads Authority operatives and supervisors was that this would promote fairness, parity and consistency, with all of those working on the roads holding the same qualifications and training, and no "them and us" attitude. This was highlighted by some local authority, utilities and individual respondents. One individual respondent stated that, although some authorities would voluntarily follow the qualifications, they would sometimes "pick and choose" when, where and how.

6.30. It was also suggested that, given that Roads Authority employees worked in the same environment carrying out similar tasks to utility staff, there should be no differentiation between them. One utilities respondent noted that Roads Authority operatives and supervisors in England are required to hold the SLG qualification; and that the Safety Code of Practice applies equally to authorities and utilities and their contract partners.

6.31. Several respondents (including local authority, utilities, regulatory body and individual respondents) suggested that the proposal would also have a positive effect on competence. Comments included that: all operatives and supervisors involved in road works should be suitably trained and competent, and hold an appropriate qualification; and should work to the same standards. Other comments included that it would improve the level of compliance and would provide an additional audit and enable the contractor to be evaluated (in terms of ensuring that road works and signage was correct).

6.32. Some utilities, regulatory body and individual respondents mentioned improved safety as a further reason to support the proposal. Comments included that: working on roads and pathways is a high risk area; safe working (and the safety of the public) should be a key aim; and there should be minimum safety standards for all. It was also suggested that the public would benefit if all sites looked the same and that they would not discriminate between Roads Authority, utility or other works in terms of their opinion of these or the safety of the sites.

6.33. One individual respondent expressed surprise that Roads Authorities were not included already. One local authority respondent stated that HAUC(UK) TAG1 was committed to developing new proposed Certificates for Highway Inspectors and EToN Administrators (but they believed there was no intention, as yet, to bring these into Regulations).

Issues or concerns

6.34. A small number of respondents raised issues or concerns with the proposal. One local authority stated that it should be Roads Authorities who determine the best and most efficient way to ensure their staff are competent. Another stated that the proposal would impose unnecessary costs on Roads Authorities to obtain paper qualifications.

Additional suggestions

6.35. Two respondents made additional suggestions. One utilities respondent commented on the nature of the qualifications needed (mentioning both the SLG and Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus). One regulatory body respondent mentioned their own potential role in taking this forward.

Costs and benefits

6.36. Under a third of respondents commented on the potential costs or benefits to their business of the proposed change. Several made no comment, and one stated that this was not applicable to them.

6.37. Among those who made comments, one utilities respondent stated that there would be no impact on their organisation.

6.38. A few respondents identified costs. Three local authority respondents, for example stated that there would be additional costs for them (and one stated that this was against a background of already stretched budgets for delivering a roads service). One utilities respondent stated that they were unable to quantify the costs that Roads Authorities would incur in obtaining the qualifications required for operatives and supervisors.

6.39. Several respondents identified additional benefits of the proposal. These were seen to include:

- Improved safety, better standards and promotion of best practice.
- Administrative benefit through preventing unqualified Roads Authority Inspectors assessing reinstatements incorrectly.
- A better service to those undertaking Street Works training and assessment.

6.40. One utilities respondent stated that any costs of qualification and assessment would be outweighed by the costs (social, financial and reputational) of the injury or death of an employee, contractor or member of the public, or damage to underground apparatus.

Overall pattern of views (Q11b)

6.41. All of the respondents addressed Question 11b. The majority (64%) answered "yes", and agreed that it would be a good idea to add content to Signing Lighting and Guarding on how best to engage and communicate with members of the public when undertaking road works.

6.42. Four respondents (12%) stated "no". These included two local authority, one utilities and one individual respondents. Eight respondents (24%) stated "don't know". (See Table Q11b below and Table A51, Annex 2.)

Table Q11b. Overall views of question 11b

Response	Number	%
Yes	21	64

No	4	12
Don't know	8	24
	33	

6.43. The full quantitative analysis of Question 11b is presented in tables A49-A51 (Annex 2).

Additional comments

6.44. More than half of the respondents (52%) made additional comments. Most focused on benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal. A small number of respondents identified issues or concerns and a few made additional suggestions.

Benefits of, or reasons to support the proposal

6.45. The main benefit of adding content on engagement and communication, identified by some local authority, utilities and individual respondents) was that this would improve relationships between members of the public and those carrying out road works. It was suggested, for example, that this would allow the Operational Teams to explain the reasons for the disruption more effectively, and avoid any frustration caused by lack of information. It was also suggested that it would improve the profile and reputation of organisations undertaking road works.

6.46. A few respondents stressed the general importance of positive engagement and good relationships with the public (as some interaction, for example, could lead to misunderstandings and complaints).

6.47. A small number of utilities and training organisation respondents stated that the proposal would enhance the content of the SLG training, delivering appropriate customer service skills.

Issues or concerns

6.48. A small number of local authority and utilities respondents raised issues and concerns, most commonly stressing the importance of organisations' own practice in promoting positive engagements, to meet their own varying needs.

6.49. It was stated, for example, that organisations would have different methods (and strategies or policies) for how operatives should engage (or not) with the public, and they would carry out their own stakeholder management and assessment, depending on the nature of works.

6.50. It was suggested that new requirements may conflict with organisations' own approaches, with no "one size fits all" solution. It was also stated that organisations were committed to stakeholder engagement and good customer relations, and this would drive relationships. One local authority respondent stated that the decision about this proposal would depend on the content, and whether any cost savings could be achieved through providing a consistent approach.

6.51. One individual respondent (in response to Question 11a) expressed the view that members of the public should be guided by signage, and should not have to engage with road workers, stating that any complaints should be directed to an operative's employer. One local authority respondent, while recognising the importance of communication, questioned whether the proposed change could be made within the current context of Road Works Accreditation in Scotland without causing confusion in the other Administrations.

6.52. A few utilities respondents and one individual respondent made additional suggestions, some of which related to the content of future training, or how to determine this. One utilities respondent, for example, stated that there should be a module covering how to assist disabled people and vulnerable people. Other suggestions included that: any additional content should be based on assessing the customer impact of proposed works; and that industry should determine what should be in their qualifications.

6.53. A few respondents described their own customer service training, and one utilities respondent mentioned a document prepared by the National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) called "Principles of Good Communication", which they offered to share with the Scottish Government when finalised.

6.54. One utilities respondent suggested that the SLG training could require operatives and supervisors to communicate effectively with the public during road works, but the method could be left to individual companies and their Roads Authority colleagues (to allow flexibility to adapt to individual circumstances). An individual respondent stated that the inclusion of minimal detail in the Code of Practice would lead to the actions required quickly becoming the norm. One utilities respondent suggested a joint initiative in Scotland to review the level of communication permitted onsite.

Other comments made in the consultation

6.55. A small number of respondents made other comments as part of the consultation process (e.g. by making more general comments at a particular question, or providing additional information in a letter or written submission).

6.56. Among these, a few reiterated their support for the proposals overall (or for specific proposals). Comments were also made about the overall importance of addressing issues relating to road works, and the need for quality training and minimum standards (and the enforcement of these).

6.57. A few respondents stated that there needs to be a close relationship between all Administrations, and alignment of requirements, to avoid confusion.

6.58. One road user organisation respondent commented on how there could be greater consideration of the needs of cyclists in road works, by having better qualified operatives and a more professionalised workforce. They made the following suggestions, raised previously in a 2014 Transport Scotland consultation[6], that:

- Cycling routes due to undergo works should be treated in the same way as on-carriageway road works, and operatives' qualifications could be revised, to ensure they are properly trained to carry out works in an appropriate way, and pay suitable attention to cyclists and other vulnerable road users.
- A traffic management pilot could be carried out to test reallocation of road space and alternative traffic management techniques (with details of the nature of this). The respondent suggested that this would rely on operatives having an understanding of how the temporary alterations could be set up, maintained and managed (which related to training, qualifications and increased professionalism).

---

[6] Transport Scotland (2014) *Strategic Consultation on Works on Scottish Roads* Edinburgh: Scottish Government

6.59. The respondent also provided details of a one-day Practical Cycling Awareness Training course and suggested that consideration should be given to extending a modified form of this to those carrying our road works.

6.60. One utilities respondent provided further information about their organisation and role, and noted whose views were represented in their response. They also stated that they would welcome the opportunity to support Transport Scotland and RAUC(S) in finalising the Regulations and considering the application of the mandatory elements to Roads Authorities.

Annex 1: Questions

Q1. Do you agree with the proposed change of ordering in the title and within the regulations?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q2a. Do you agree with the process described in paragraphs 2.4 – 2.5 to allow the Scottish Ministers to recognise Awarding Bodies?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q2b. In helping the Scottish Ministers to reach a view we propose to consult with RAUC(S), SQA Accreditation, the Scottish Road Works Commissioner and HAUC(UK). Are there any other organisations you consider it would be helpful for the Scottish Ministers to consult?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Q3. Do you agree that the proposal to simplify the process for recording and registering qualifications will improve on the current system?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q4. Do you agree that the proposed change clarifies when the expiry dates of the registration of qualifications will fall?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q5a. Do you agree that we should continue to provide a two month "grace period" during which someone who has passed their exams can fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor even though they have not yet received confirmation of the successful registration of their qualification?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Q5b. Do you agree with our proposal to clarify that candidates are not able to fulfil the statutory role of a trained operative or supervisor once the registration of their qualification has expired?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q6. Do you agree that our proposal to amend the qualification requirements for trained operatives and supervisors to reflect reassessment is relevant and appropriate?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Q7a. Do you agree that candidates should only be allowed to re-register qualifications if they have passed an appropriate reassessment examination in that qualification?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Q7b. Do agree that our proposal to allow early applications to re-register qualifications provides candidates and employers with greater flexibility to plan when and how candidates will take their reassessment examinations?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Q7c. Do you agree that that the maximum gap that should be allowed between the lapsed registration of a qualification and an application to re-register that qualification on the basis of a reassessment examination should be 5 years?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q8a. Do you consider that our proposal to revise and clarify the system of units and qualifications in the manner described at Annex A is a more straightforward way for the qualifications to be listed?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Q8b. Do you consider our proposal to make —Signing, Lighting and Guarding‖ and —Location and Avoidance of Underground Apparatus‖ qualifications in their own right and a mandatory requirement for any other qualification to help promote safety and plant protection to be logical and appropriate?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q9. Do you agree that this is required, or have any concerns about the proposal?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q10. Do you consider our proposal to introduce an explicit exemption from the regulations for Scottish Fire and Rescue Services to be appropriate?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q11(a). Do you consider it to be a good idea to extend the requirement for certain qualifications to roads authority operatives and supervisors?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Please quantify the potential costs or benefits you think that this proposed change may have on your business

Q11(b). Do you consider it to be a good idea to add content to Signing Lighting and Guarding on how best to engage and communicate with members of the public with whom they come into contact with during the undertaking of road works?

We welcome your comments on whether you consider that our proposals above are appropriate and relevant. Please explain the reasons behind your answer.

Annex 2: Tables

This section summarises the quantitative information for Questions 1-11, including sub questions.

Question 1

Table A1: Question 1 (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	32	97
No	0	0
Don't know	1	3
NA[7]	0	0
Total	33	

Table A2: Question 1 (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	32	97
No	0	0
Don't know	1	3
	33	

Table A3: Question 1, breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category[8]	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	14	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total	32	97	0	0	1	3	0	0	33

---

[7] In each table, NA means the number of respondents who did not answer the closed question (i.e. did not tick "yes", "no" or "don't know")

[8] Alphabetical order for categories is used throughout this annex.

Question 2

Table A4: Question 2a (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	82
No	4	12
Don't know	2	6
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A5: Question 2a (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	82
No	4	12
Don't know	2	6
	33	

Table A6: Question 2a breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	11	79	3	21	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	2	67	0	0	1	33	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	8
Total	27	82	4	12	2	6	0	0	33

Table A7: Question 2b (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	17	52
No	11	33
Don't know	4	12
NA	1	3
Total	33	

Table A8: Question 2b (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	17	53
No	11	34
Don't know	4	13
	32	

Table A9: Question 2b breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	4	80	0	0	0	0	1	20	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	6	43	5	36	3	21	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	1	33	2	67	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	5	63	3	38	0	0	0	0	8
Total	17	52	11	33	4	12	1	3	33

Question 3

Table A10: Question 3 (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	29	88
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A11: Question 3 (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	29	88
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
	33	

Table A12: Question 3 breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	14	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	2	67	0	0	1	33	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total	29	88	1	3	3	9	0	0	33

Question 4

Table A13: Question 4 (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A14: Question 4 (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
	33	

Table A15: Question 4 breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	12	86	1	7	1	7	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	8
Total	28	85	3	9	2	6	0	0	33

Question 5

Table A16: Question 5a (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	30	91
No	2	6
Don't know	1	3
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A17: Question 5a (excluding "not addressed")

Response	Number	%
Yes	30	91
No	2	6
Don't know	1	3
	33	

Table A18: Question 5a breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	14	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0	8
Total	30	91	2	6	1	3	0	0	33

Table A19: Question 5b (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	26	79
No	5	15
Don't know	2	6
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A20: Question 5b (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	26	79
No	5	15
Don't know	2	6
	33	

Table A21: Question 5b breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	11	79	3	21	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	8
Total	26	79	5	15	2	6	0	0	33

Question 6

Table A22: Question 6 (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	29	88
No	3	9
Don't know	1	3
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A23: Question 6 (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	29	88
No	3	9
Don't know	1	3
	33	

Table A24: Question 6 breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	13	93	1	7	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	8
Total	29	88	3	9	1	3	0	0	33

Question 7

Table A25: Question 7a (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A26: Question 7a (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
	33	

Table A27: Question 7a breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	13	93	1	7	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	8
Total	28	85	3	9	2	6	0	0	33

Table A28: Question 7b (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
NA	1	3
Total	33	

Table A29: Question 7b (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	88
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
	32	

Table A30: Question 7b breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not addressed")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	12	86	1	7	1	7	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	2	67	0	0	0	0	1	33	3
Road User orgs	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total	28	85	1	3	3	9	1	3	33

Table A31: Question 7c (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	23	70
No	7	21
Don't know	2	6
NA	1	3
Total	33	

Table A32: Question 7c (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	23	72
No	7	22
Don't know	2	6
	32	

Table A33: Question 7c breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	10	71	4	29	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	2	67	0	0	1	33	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	8
Total	23	70	7	21	2	6	1	3	33

Question 8

Table A34: Question 8a (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	82
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
NA	1	3
Total	33	

Table A35: Question 8a (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	84
No	3	9
Don't know	2	6
	32	

Table A36: Question 8a breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	12	86	1	7	0	0	1	7	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total	27	82	3	9	2	6	1	3	33

Table A37: Question 8b (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	30	91
No	1	3
Don't know	2	6
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A38: Question 8b (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	30	91
No	1	3
Don't know	2	6
	33	

Table A39: Question 8b breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	13	93	1	7	0	0	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total	30	91	1	3	2	6	0	0	33

Question 9

Table A40: Question 9 (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	85
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
NA	1	3
Total	33	

Table A41: Question 9 (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	28	88
No	1	3
Don't know	3	9
	32	

Table A42: Question 9 breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	12	86	1	7	0	0	1	7	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	2	67	0	0	1	33	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	0	0	1	13	0	0	8
Total	28	85	1	3	3	9	1	3	33

Question 10

Table A43: Question 10 (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	22	67
No	7	21
Don't know	3	9
NA	1	3
Total	33	

Table A44: Question 10 (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	22	69
No	7	22
Don't know	3	9
	32	

Table A45: Question 10 breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes		No		DK		NA		Tot
Individuals	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	10	71	3	21	0	0	1	7	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	4	50	3	38	1	13	0	0	8
Total	22	67	7	21	3	9	1	3	33

Question 11

Table A46: Question 11a (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	82
No	3	9
Don't know	3	9
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A47: Question 11a (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	27	82
No	3	9
Don't know	3	9
	33	

Table A48: Question 11a breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	11	79	2	14	1	7	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	7	88	0	0	1	13	0	0	8
Total	27	82	3	9	3	9	0	0	33

Table A49: Question 11b (including "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	21	64
No	4	12
Don't know	8	24
NA	0	0
Total	33	

Table A50: Question 11b (excluding "not answered closed question")

Response	Number	%
Yes	21	64
No	4	12
Don't know	8	24
	33	

Table A51: Question 11b breakdown by sector of respondent (excluding "not answered closed question")

Category	Yes	%	No	%	DK	%	NA	%	Tot
Individuals	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5
Local authorities or joint bodies	9	64	2	14	3	21	0	0	14
Regulatory / qualifications bodies	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3
Road User orgs	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	2
Training orgs	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Utilities	5	63	1	13	2	25	0	0	8
Total	21	64	4	12	8	24	0	0	33