

**MINUTES OF SURVIVE GROUP EXECUTIVE**  
**MEETING HELD ON 28<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2016**

**Present** David Bizley – RAC (acting Chairman)  
Lucy Davis – Direct Line / Green Flag  
Andy Eade – Highways England  
Derek Firminger – RHA  
Mary Hill – RAC  
Steve Ives - AA  
Damon Jowett - Direct Line / Green Flag  
Andrew Reeve – Secretary

**ACTION  
BY**

**1 Apologies for Absence**

Rob Gifford  
Melanie Clarke – Highways England  
Brian Drury – AVRO  
Simon Henrik - Direct Line / Green Flag  
Dave Jones - NPCC

DB then welcomed Andy Eade to the meeting who was standing in for Melanie Clarke.

**2 Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016**

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted and approved as a true record of the meeting.

**3 Matters arising not covered on the Agenda**

**3.1 NPCC representative on the Executive**

AR advised that David Snelling had now retired and therefore Dave Jones from the National Roads Policing unit would now represent the NPCC on the SURVIVE Executive.

DJ had confirmed to AR that the National Roads Policing Strategy Group was still in existence and was chaired by DCC Garry Forsyth.

**3.2 HE AVIS information to Third Parties**

AE reported that HE were currently in the process of scoping out the requirements for information that could be provided to third parties. The involvement of WG1 from SURVIVE in this process would be welcomed and it was agreed that AE would liaise with SI to progress this.

**AE / SI**

**3.3 Guidance for Attending Vehicles in an ERA and Lane Closures**

MH advised that WG2 felt that there should be more guidance for technicians when they were attending casualty vehicles located in an ERA plus when and how a lane closure should be requested.

It was agreed that MH would request from WG2 members their specific areas of concern and advise SI for consideration of updating the Best Practice Guidelines.

**MH / SI**

### 3.4 “Surviving the Hard Shoulder Leaflet”

SI advised that it was still work in progress on the update to this leaflet and how best the information should be communicated to the motoring public.

### 3.5 AVRO or FoVRA representation on the Executive

AR reported that no reply had been received from AVRO regarding which of the two organisations should be represented on the Executive.

DF advised that as from the beginning of July he would be the new CEO of AVRO and therefore would in future be representing AVRO on the Executive. DF also advised that he had recently taken over as the Chairman of ERRI.

It was then agreed that an approach should be made to the RHA to ascertain a suitable replacement for them on the Executive.

**AR**

MH advised that she had recently received a letter from Sean Coole, Chairman of the RRRRA, addressed to SURVIVE and requesting that consideration now be given to RRRRA becoming a member of the SURVIVE Executive.

After some discussion it was agreed that the two largest Recovery Associations should continue to have representation on the Executive and AR was asked to try and ascertain the current membership numbers for AVRO, RHA and RRRRA. It was agreed that a holding response will be sent to RRRRA.

**AR**

**RG / AR**

## 4 Working Group Reports

### 4.1 SURVIVE Working Group 1 (Practices and Procedures)

SI reported that the House of Commons Transport Select Committee had recently taken evidence from the AA, RAC and other organisations during their inquiry into All Lane Running on motorways. The Committee Report was being published on Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> June and would be available on the Transport Committee website.

SI commented that WG1 were still campaigning for more ERA's on motorways, especially in the light of an increase in the number of motorists who were now stopping on motorways due to perceived tyre problems notified to them by their vehicle's tyre pressure warning system.

AE advised that HE were looking to update the specifications for Smart Motorways and ALR sections, which could include ERA spacing, signage and a communication plan.

DF commented that the current size of the ERA's now being constructed was still regarded as inadequate, especially when used by an HGV, and that this was considered to be a safety issue. There was a possibility of a 'mock up' trial of the HGV recovery process and ERA size requirements being held at the Fire College in Moreton-in-Marsh. DF agreed to circulate details of the trial to the Executive when they became available.

**DF**

AE also agreed to look into including the size of the ERA's in the HE review of the specifications for Smart Motorways and ALR sections.

**AE**

SI then reported that the next version (v4) of the Best Practice Guidelines would most probably be produced in an electronic format in order to save on printing and publication costs and would correct a few inaccuracies that had appeared in the latest version (v3).

AE suggested that consideration be given to the use of MOODLE software, an on-line training package, for possible use with the electronic version of the BPG's. SI and AE agreed to discuss this within WG1

**WG1**

SI advised that no real progress was being made regarding vehicle lighting issues and therefore it had been decided that WG1 would maintain a watching brief and keep an eye on advances in technology etc.

SI reported that the development of the best practice flat towing guidelines was still ongoing, with a draft having now been produced. It was proposed that these guidelines, along with those currently being prepared for dealing with shed loads be include within the BPG's.

SI reported that there was still an issue regarding HE Traffic Officers leaving the scene soon after the technician had arrived to attend the casualty vehicle. AE requested that he be advised of the specific details regarding such incidents so that HE could investigate then and take appropriate action.

**WG1 / AE**

SI also advised that the Traffic Officers had now been issued with high pitched whistles which could be used by motorists at the scene to help warn those present of potential dangerous approaching vehicles. The RAC had also recently carried out a trial using similar whistles, which had proved to be a great success with both members and technicians. WG1 were now considering including this safety procedure within the Best Practice Guidelines.

**WG1**

#### **4.2 SURVIVE Working Group 2 (Standards)**

MH reported that a WG2 meeting had been held in April to identify the main changes required for the 2017 update of PAS 43. Two new members from RRRRA and IVR were now included in the Working Group but there was still no news of the SVRA replacement for Alex Robb. DF agreed to contact SVRA to progress this.

**DF**

MH advised that WG2 had discussed a number of issues that had arisen following the publication of PAS 43:2015. Queries had arisen regarding the need for some assessors to attend the VR24B course because of their existing qualifications, experience etc. The aim of the course had been clarified and agreed by WG2 to ensure that all Certification and Inspection Body assessors have the same understanding and interpretation of PAS 43, so that there was a uniform rationale when assessing against the standard.

Feedback from recovery operators showed that they have difficulties in accessing information and that there is little support to help them understand the implications of PAS 43. WG2 had discussed the role of the Trade Associations, who although they do not publish all relevant information, do provide advice and guidance to operators on request, and it was agreed that they should consider what more they could do to help the operators.

It was also felt that SURVIVE could assist in this area by publishing details of the main legislation affecting recovery operators on the SURVIVE website. It was agreed that WG2 would identify which legislation was appropriate and then advise WG3, who would work with AR to have the website updated with the required information. It should also be stated that guidance was also available from the Trade Associations.

**WG2 /  
WG3 / AR**

Regarding the VR24 training course, MH advised that there had still been concern regarding the ability of Certification and Inspection Body assessors to attend the course by the deadline of May 2016. It was agreed that WG2 would now approach UKAS to ascertain if a new deadline of the end of May 2017 could now apply.

**WG2**

MH advised that WG2 felt that the section of PAS 43 covering technician training was confusing and that some elements which should possibly form part of induction training were not included in the minimum content.

It was also felt that this section, along with the sections covering Customer Service and Disabled/Vulnerable Customers/Children Pets and Domestic Animals, should be discussed with WG1 in order to establish what their exact contents should be and where they should sit, either in PAS 43 or in the Best Practice Guidelines in order to provide more clarity and guidance.

**WG2 /  
WG1**

MH reported that an approach has been made to WG2 from a group which has been formed to produce minimum standards for fuel patrols in terms of vehicles, equipment and operative training. This group has requested that these standards be included in PAS 43.

WG2 had discussed this request and the consensus of opinion was that this standard should be referenced in PAS 43 in the same way as the REACT standards for tyre fitters, but as a stand-alone document. WG2 had agreed that if this standard was to be referenced in PAS 43, that this should be reviewed and endorsed by WG2. It was agreed that a draft of this standard should be referred to WG1 for comment.

**WG2 /  
WG1**

Regarding the promotion of PAS 43, MH commented that WG2 had agreed that some promotional work would be required in order to increase the number of organisations certificated/inspected to PAS 43. WG3 were therefore requested to work with WG2 regarding this.

**WG2 /  
WG3**

AR commented that the number of recovery organisations currently listed on the PAS 43 database on the SURVIVE website, may not truly reflect the actual number who held accreditation. It was agreed that the Certification and Inspection Bodies who supplied SURVIVE with the information should be asked to check that all their current clients were listed on the database and to provide the details of any that were missing.

**AR**

MH reported that WG2 had asked the Executive for their view on changing PAS 43 to a British Standard. DB noted that a PAS was owned by the industry and that a Standard would be more restrictive. In addition, a British Standard was only reviewed every 5 years. After a short discussion it was agreed that it should remain as a PAS for the time being.

### 4.3 SURVIVE Working Group 3 (Communication)

LD reported that the draft of the combined press release covering the issue of both the new Best Practice Guidelines and PAS 43:2015 had been produced and was awaiting sign off from WG1. SI agreed to action this as soon as possible.

SI / WG3

### 5 Reduction in Hard Shoulder Incidents

DB advised that a reply had been received from Daryl Lloyd at DfT regarding his enquiry regarding available data from Stats 19. It was agreed that a copy of this response would be circulated with the minutes.

AR

AE advised that the HE Command and Control system may also be able to provide some information but not specifically related to the hard shoulder. A qualitative review of the data would be required which would unfortunately be quite time consuming.

It was noted that in addition to Stats 19 and HE data sources, other organisations may hold relevant data.

It was agreed that AE would look at progressing the SURVIVE requirements and that MH / DB would talk to HSE to see if they had access to any relevant information. DF also agreed to talk to the recovery industry benevolent societies to see if they could also assist.

AE  
MH / DB  
DF

### 6 Smart Motorways – Communication and Compliance

DB reported that RG had attended a meeting with DfT and HE, the notes of which and a copy of the presentation had been circulated before the meeting.

Another meeting was planned for 19<sup>th</sup> July and RG had requested that the Executive members advise him of any issues regarding Smart Motorways that they wished him to raise at the meeting.

All

AR advised that RG had also questioned if technicians were aware when despatched to a vehicle, what type of motorway it was located on. DB advised that most technicians knew the motorways in their locality so were usually aware as to what to expect. SI also commented that the call taker should be aware of the type of motorway involved and if necessary obtain further information from the caller.

AE agreed to look at the consultation process when new sections of ALR and Smart motorways were planned, to try and ensure that recovery operators were also included

AE

A short discussion then took place regarding the publication of the HE guidance regarding driving on smart motorways. It was agreed that WG1 should look at incorporating this guidance into the revision of the “Surviving the Hard Shoulder” leaflet.

WG1

### 7 Recovery Operators Licensing Scheme

DF gave a presentation detailing the proposed Recovery Operators Licensing Scheme (ROLS). DF advised that DfT did not wish to regulate the recovery industry and that they would much prefer self-regulation. However, if this was not forthcoming then DfT could impose the Operator Licence or alternative requirements on the industry.

There then followed a general discussion on the pros and cons of the scheme and it was generally accepted that, as with PAS 43, the 'good' recovery operators would sign up to the scheme whereas the 'bad' ones would most probably not.

Based on bilateral discussions between some of the organisations represented on the Executive and DfT, there appeared to be differing views on the extent to which DfT were concerned about the current arrangements, whether which they were content with PAS 43 certification or whether they were looking for a voluntary accreditation scheme based on more demanding standards.

DB agreed to try to set up a meeting with appropriate officials to seek clarification on their views. If he is able to set this up, he will issue an invitation for other Exec members to attend.

DB

DB concluded the discussion by thanking DF for the detailed presentation and stating that the meeting fully understood and supported the objectives of ROLS, however there were some concerns over the way forward.

DF stated that he would be happy to arrange a meeting with DfT for the SURVIVE Executive members to discuss the scheme more fully if this would be useful.

## **8 Any Other Business**

### **8.1 Renewal of the SURVIVE Trademark**

DB advised that as SURVIVE was not a registered company, that the registration of the SURVIVE trademark had been registered by the RAC. This had recently been renewed by the RAC at a cost of £950, inc VAT and DB enquired if AA and GF would be able to assist as usual in contributing to the cost.

SI and DJ confirmed that they would be able to help share the cost, which equates to £316.66 each. DB asked that the invoicing and payments etc. be arranged outside of the meeting.

DB / SI / DJ

### **8.2 ITSSAR Teaching Training Qualification**

DF advised that an Independent Training Standards Scheme and Register (ITSSAR) teacher training qualification was required by an IVR trainer in order to deliver training modules. At present this involved a period of some 2 weeks full time training in order to gain the qualification.

PAS43 includes a section on trainer competence and it would therefore be useful to understand and if necessary engage in talks with ITSSAR in order to ascertain whether other options are available which avoid the need for this period of full time training.

MH

## **8 Date of the Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the SURVIVE Group Executive will take place on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October at 11.30am, being hosted by RAC at their offices in Walsall.

DB closed the meeting by expressing the grateful thanks of the Executive to DJ and Direct Line / Green Flag for hosting the meeting and for their kind hospitality.