Self-Assessment Report

# Instruction (can be deleted)

This chapter contains some instructions to the use of the self-assessment report which can be deleted. Text in the rest of the report template marked in yellow should be changed or deleted accordingly.

This document is setup as a template for you to record and report the self-assessment team-session. This report should be considered as part of a ‘full report’ on the assessment which would then comprise both the instrument (PROGRESS\_Tool\_VXX.xlsm) and this report. The function of the report is to provide a trace of accountability for yourselves and makes it possible for other assessment teams or follow up assessments to reflect on your decisions and outcomes (repeatability).

**Contributory Factors Assessment**

The tool requires you to assess the contributory factors in the robustness fault tree as presented in the tool. You are expected to identify as a team if a contributory factor is or is not a (significant) issue on your road network based on your expert judgement from the situation in your organisation and road network. This requires brainstorming, discussions and a decision. This document allows and help you to report on these three aspects in:

* Assessment Input: Comments and input from the assessment
* Colour coding
* Motivation: Short motivation for the chosen colour coding

Important: You are **not** expected to write lengthy notes on all inputs. Short notes using keywords or short sentences should however at least cover the essentials of the brainstorm/discussion, like identified issues.

**Countermeasures assessment**

A second part of the self assessment is to assess the organisational level countermeasures currently employed (in the assessed area), to target the identified roadside safety contributory factors. The Excel tool contains a limited set of countermeasures. The countermeasures section in this report can be used to report other countermeasures already employed, that are not in the Excel tool.

**Report Template**

This self-assessment report comes in two templates for you to choose between. You can opt for a ‘classical’ report template or for a table template.

The report templated is structured by the stages (paragraphs) and contributory factors (subparagraphs) in the progress tool. The subparagraphs contain the number (purple box in the progress tool) and name of each contributory factor and are ordered in the same order as the progress tool.

You are free to make your adjustments or additions to the template as desired as it is first and foremost meant to help you to keep a traceable record of your decisions during the assessment.

# Introduction

This document contains the report of the roadside safety assessment session with the *Roadside Safety Organizational Robustness Assessment Tool*, on date.

The following people took part in the road side safety assessment:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Department | Expertise / Role |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The full report of the roadside safety assessment comprises of two parts which supplement each other:

1. The Roadside Safety Organizational Robustness Assessment Tool: PROGRESS-Tool Numbered.xlsm (change name if needed)
2. The self-assessment report: Self-Assessment Report roadside safety PROGRESS.docx (change name if needed)

The Roadside Safety Organizational Robustness Assessment Tool is an instrument aimed to guide users through an assessment of roadside safety in a systematic and logical manner. It helps users to make an expert review of the roadside safety on their network, by systematically addressing the many different aspects of the live cycle of roadsides (including design, implementation and operational live) where problems may occur, resulting in roadside safety issues on your road network.

The assessment is carried out by a team with members that bring together different expertise and roles to review the different aspects on the life cycle of roadsides and its impact on roadside crashes.

All aspects discussed in the assessment are reported by short notes on the input (discussion and brainstorm), a colour coding indicating if a factor is an (important) issue and a short motivation for the colour coding indicating why it is (not) considered an issue.

# Contributory Factors Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Box nr. | Box text | Assessment Input | Colour Coding | Motivation |
| C1 | Data on (RoR) crashes aren’t collected |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C2 | Data on (RoR) crashes aren’t detailed enough |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C3 | Data on (RoR) crashes aren’t reviewed |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C4 | Standard is out of date |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C5 | There is no solution available for some issues |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C6 | Some road users aren’t considered |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C7 | Site constraints aren’t considered |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C8 | VRS product constraints aren’t considered |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C9 | Combined (negative) effects of standards aren’t considered |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C10 | Design standard isn’t followed (user errors) |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C11 | Insufficient internal design checks / peer review / risk and value analysis |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C12 | Site constraints |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C13 | Product Availability |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C14 | Budget Constraints |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C15 | Design isn’t subject to RSA |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C16 | Problem isn’t identified during RSA |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C17 | Recommendations from RSA are discarded / ignored |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C18 | Implementation errors |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C19 | Products provided on site are not the same as tested (material/design) |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C20 | Inadequate contract specifications and incentives |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C21 | Insufficient site supervision |  |  |  |
| C22 | Implementation isn’t subject to RSA |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C23 | Problem isn’t identified during RSA |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C24 | Recommendations from RSA are discarded / ignored |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C25 | Durability issues (corrosion, loose bolts, etc.) |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C26 | Road environment changes (vegetation, erosion, new asphalt layer, etc.) |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C27 | Previous impact damage |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C28 | Changes to road and traffic conditions (speed limit, ADT, HGV%, etc.) |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C29 | Vehicle fleet changes (higher mass, more SUVs, etc.) |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C30 | Inadequate maintenanceplan |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C31 | RSI is not carried out |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C32 | Problem occurred after last RSI |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C33 | Problem is not identified during RSI |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |
| C34 | Identified problem isn’t fixed |  | [ ]  Green[ ]  Orange[ ]  Red |  |

## Comments on positive and negative conditions

The assessment focuses on the contributory factors. The table below may however be used if the conditions are discussed during the assessment to report on valuable inputs / comments.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Box nr. | Box text | Assessment Input | Comments |
|  | There are known RoR issues which aren't covered in design standard |  |  |
|  | There are solutions which are not clearly defined or does not take constraints into account |  |  |
|  | Recommended design can't be applied - Departures from standard |  |  |
|  | Implementation/Installation do not comply with the design |  |  |
|  | Implemented design no longer valid |  |  |
|  | Harm Resulting from RoR Incidents |  |  |
|  | For reasons and mechanisms of ROR harm which are understood |  |  |
|  | For known RoR problems which are covered in design standard |  |  |
|  | For solutions which are clearly defined and take constraints into account |  |  |
|  | When design standard is followed with no user error |  |  |
|  | For designs which can be applied with no departures |  |  |
|  | For designs which pass design stage RSA without outstanding issues |  |  |
|  | For implementations / Installations which comply with the design |  |  |
|  | For implementation which pass the RSA without outstanding issues |  |  |
|  | When RSI was carried out |  |  |
|  | For problems which were identified in RSI |  |  |

# Countermeasures Assessment

The countermeasures sheet in the excel contains a limit set of possible countermeasures. You can use this table to report on other implemented countermeasures than described in the excel.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Box nr. | Box text | Other Countermeasures | Comments |
| C1 | Data on (RoR) crashes aren’t collected |  |  |
| C2 | Data on (RoR) crashes aren’t detailed enough |  |  |
| C3 | Data on (RoR) crashes aren’t reviewed |  |  |
| C4 | Standard is out of date |  |  |
| C5 | There is no solution available for some issues |  |  |
| C6 | Some road users aren’t considered |  |  |
| C7 | Site constraints aren’t considered |  |  |
| C8 | VRS product constraints aren’t considered |  |  |
| C9 | Combined (negative) effects of standards aren’t considered |  |  |
| C10 | Design standard isn’t followed (user errors) |  |  |
| C11 | Insufficient internal design checks / peer review / risk and value analysis |  |  |
| C12 | Site constraints |  |  |
| C13 | Product Availability |  |  |
| C14 | Budget Constraints |  |  |
| C15 | Design isn’t subject to RSA |  |  |
| C16 | Problem isn’t identified during RSA |  |  |
| C17 | Recommendations from RSA are discarded / ignored |  |  |
| C18 | Implementation errors |  |  |
| C19 | Products provided on site are not the same as tested (material/design) |  |  |
| C20 | Inadequate contract specifications and incentives |  |  |
| C21 | Insufficient site supervision |  |  |
| C22 | Implementation isn’t subject to RSA |  |  |
| C23 | Problem isn’t identified during RSA |  |  |
| C24 | Recommendations from RSA are discarded / ignored |  |  |
| C25 | Durability issues (corrosion, loose bolts, etc.) |  |  |
| C26 | Road environment changes (vegetation, erosion, new asphalt layer, etc.) |  |  |
| C27 | Previous impact damage |  |  |
| C28 | Changes to road and traffic conditions (speed limit, ADT, HGV%, etc.) |  |  |
| C29 | Vehicle fleet changes (higher mass, more SUVs, etc.) |  |  |
| C30 | Inadequate maintenanceplan |  |  |
| C31 | RSI is not carried out |  |  |
| C32 | Problem occurred after last RSI |  |  |
| C33 | Problem is not identified during RSI |  |  |
| C34 | Identified problem isn’t fixed |  |  |