

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| WH13.5 | <p>There is a documented process to ensure emergency practice drills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are scheduled and carried out on site; • are scenario based and test a variety of the identified potential emergency situations; • are recorded and evaluated for effectiveness; and • incorporate a process for the identification and management of corrective actions. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that emergency procedures/plans are scheduled and practiced on site, that the drills are based on the identified project-specific situations, and that the results are recorded and reviewed for any necessary improvements. Not all scenarios have to be practiced; however, more than just generic evacuation is required. Frequency is as determined by the company. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency drill schedule. • Emergency drill records. • Corrective Actions raised, based on drill outcomes. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An annual drill where project duration is typically less than 12 months will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Generic evacuation drills alone will not satisfy this criterion. 3. Emergency drill records without analysis of the effectiveness of the drill will not satisfy this criterion. 4. Conducting a drill alone will not satisfy this criterion where there is no evidence of a schedule and requirements for frequency. |
| WH13.6 | <p>There is a documented process to ensure a qualified person identifies site first aid equipment and requirements in accordance with relevant legislation, codes of practice and Australian standards.</p> |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that a person who holds the required qualification (as defined by the company) has completed a site-specific review of the first aid requirements (in accordance with the Code of Practice) and has made sure that the first aid arrangements on site are in line with the review. A single assessment covering the requirements of this criterion as well as WH13.7 is acceptable so long as all requirements are captured. Qualified means a person who holds a recognised degree, certificate or professional standing relevant to the activity or works. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company training matrix/register. • Completed training records. • Project first aid assessment. • First aid arrangements on site are as specified in the assessment. • On-site first aid equipment and provisions match what has been identified in the assessment. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presence of first aid persons and equipment alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH13.7 | <p>There is a documented process to ensure a competent person identifies site emergency equipment and requirements.</p> |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that a person who holds the required training (as defined by the company) has completed a site-specific review of the emergency requirements and has made sure that the right equipment is located on site to cater for the identified |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| | emergencies that may occur on the project. Emergency equipment may include extinguishers, equipment specific to potential site emergencies such as retrieval of arrested fall, confined spaces, working around live electrical equipment, stretcher, method of raising alarm, personal floatation devices, remote site requirements etc., and should consider the placement of such equipment. Competent means that a person has been deemed to meet the combination of licences, qualifications, training and instruction as defined by the company or by legal requirements for an activity or works. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company training matrix/register. • Completed training records (internal and/or external). • Evidence of review of project emergency requirements. • Emergency equipment on site as specified in the review. |
| Notes | 1. Review of fire-related emergency equipment alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH13.8 | There is a documented process to ensure inspection, test and maintenance requirements for emergency and first aid equipment are identified, scheduled and undertaken. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that all of the emergency and first aid equipment on site is inspected and maintained, and that any equipment on site is up to date. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency/First Aid Equipment register. • Records of inspection/maintenance. • Current tags/records of inspection. |
| Notes | 1. Inspection of fire-related emergency equipment or first aid equipment alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH13.9 | There is a documented process for managing critical incidents, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the company's definition of a critical incident; • clearly defined roles; • return-to-work of injured workers; • employee assistance/counselling; and • the process for review of the effectiveness of critical incident response procedures. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the type and level of incident that would be regarded as critical by the company, and the process to make sure that any defined critical incidents are managed. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Incident Management Plan. • Return to work procedures. • Critical incident training. • Critical incident drills/reviews. • Employee assistance/counselling contact details/procedures. |
| Notes | 1. General Emergency or Incident management procedures alone will not satisfy this criterion. |

| WH14 Health Surveillance and Exposure Monitoring | |
|---|--|
| WH14.1 | <p>There is a documented process to ensure a competent person completes a site-specific assessment of potential health hazards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • biological; • physical; and • chemical/atmospheric contaminants. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that potential health hazards (e.g. noise, vibration, dust, gases, chemicals, fumes etc.) on the project are assessed, and that based on the potential worker personal exposure levels, a process for managing each health hazard is defined. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project risk assessment/Health risk assessment. • Project Management Plan/Project Safety Management Plan inclusive of health hazard management. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health monitoring/surveillance by a medical practitioner will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Pre-employment medical assessments will not satisfy this criterion. 3. Environmental monitoring will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH14.2 | <p>There is a documented process to ensure that, where identified as required, personal exposure to health hazards is measured and evaluated on the project by a formally trained person.</p> |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process for a trained person to measure individual worker exposure on the project to the potential health hazards identified in the health assessment (e.g. noise, vibration, dust, gases, chemicals, fumes etc.), and the results of the measurements are compared to the workplace exposure standards (as defined by SWA standards and/or guidance material). Formally trained means a person who has undertaken formal training against a specified training course or plan, with outcomes documented as relevant to the activity or works. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project risk assessment/Health risk assessment. • Reports from measurements taken including comparison to workplace exposure standards and/or guidance material. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health monitoring/surveillance by a medical practitioner will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Pre-employment medical assessments will not satisfy this criterion. 3. Measurements taken with un-calibrated devices (e.g. smart phones) will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH14.3 | <p>There is a documented process to ensure that worker health surveillance/monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is carried out in accordance with identified health hazards; • is carried out in accordance with relevant legislation, codes of practice and Australian standards; and • includes a process for management and communication of health monitoring results and records. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process for identifying any health hazard that a worker may be exposed to that requires a medical practitioner to conduct tests (monitoring/surveillance) to determine the level of exposure to the hazard, in accordance with legislation. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to the health monitoring/surveillance legislation requirements. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process for providing information to workers and maintaining confidentiality. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-employment medical assessments alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH14.4 | There is a documented process to ensure inspection, measuring and test equipment related to health and safety is identified, calibrated, and maintained in accordance with manufacturers' requirements and relevant legislation, codes of practice and Australian standards. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process used to make sure that any equipment used in the measurement of health and safety related hazards is tested as per the manufacturers recommendations. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calibration register. • Calibration stickers. • Testing/Calibration certificates from accredited agencies. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Testing from non-accredited agencies will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Stickers and/or certificates alone will not satisfy this criterion. 3. This criterion does not include equipment that is not used to measure health and safety-related exposures (e.g. lasers, theodolites etc.). |
| WH14.5 | There is a documented process to ensure the management of hazardous chemicals on the project. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to manage all of the hazardous chemicals (including those brought to site by contractors) on the project, including (but not limited to) the provision/use of SDSs; registers; risk assessment; labelling; storage; PPE etc. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazardous chemicals register. • Hazardous chemical risk assessments. • SWMS that include use of hazardous chemicals. • Evidence of management of chemicals on site. • PPE use in accordance with SDS/SWMS. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A hazardous chemical register alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Copies of SDS alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH15 Incident Investigation and Corrective Action | |
| WH15.1 | There is a documented process to ensure all health and safety incidents are reported, recorded, and investigated as defined by the company's system, with external notification completed where required. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that all health and safety incidents are reported and investigated, and where necessary, notification to the relevant regulator/asset owner is completed. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incident report/investigation process and associated forms. • Process for notifying the regulator/asset owner. |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Notes | 1. Incident report forms alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH15.2 | <p>There is a documented process to ensure Investigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are undertaken by a trained person(s); • identify the factor(s) that led to the incident; • incorporate a process for the identification and management of corrective actions; • involve and/or are reviewed by site/senior management as defined by the company's system; and • prompt a review of relevant processes/procedures. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process for making sure that any health and safety investigations are completed by trained people, that the investigation process makes sure that the incident causal factors are found, and that appropriate actions are taken to prevent the incident happening again. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed incident investigations. • Completed investigation recommendations. • Company training matrix/register. • Completed training records (internal and/or external). • Evidence of senior management involvement. |
| Notes | 1. Completed incident reports alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH15.3 | <p>There is a documented process to manage corrective actions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specified target completion dates; • allocated responsibility for addressing corrective actions; • closure of corrective actions by the specified completion date; and • identifying organisation- wide issues and ensuring lessons learnt are communicated throughout the organisation. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that any corrective actions raised by the company are managed so that the actions are completed in a timely manner, signed off by the person responsible and lessons learnt are communicated at the organisational level. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corrective action form/register. • Review of the corrective actions. • Corrective action deadlines met. • Safety Alerts and bulletins generated by the company based on company trends in corrective actions. |
| Notes | 1. A corrective action register alone will not satisfy this criterion. |

| WH17 Health & Safety Management System Audit | |
|---|---|
| WH17.1 | There is a documented process to ensure a health and safety management system audit program is established for the company and project, and audits are scheduled in accordance with the program. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define how management system audits are planned, including the requirement to develop a documented audit schedule at both the company and project level. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit program or procedure. • Audit Schedule. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An Audit Schedule alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Audits at either the company or project level alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH17.2 | There is a documented process to ensure that the audit program defines the audit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scope; • methodology; • reporting requirements; and • process for identifying and managing corrective actions. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process of conducting an audit including setting out the scope of the audit, detailing how the audit will be conducted and managed, what needs to be reported as a result and to whom, and how any corrective actions identified will be addressed. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit Report. • Audit procedure. • Corrective actions process/register. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addressing the scope, methodology, and corrective action process within an audit report alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Reporting requirements without any escalation to senior management will not satisfy this criterion. |
| WH17.3 | There is a documented process to ensure that formally trained personnel undertake audits in accordance with the schedule. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that personnel undertaking the audit are formally trained, and that the audits are completed as per the schedule. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Records. • Training Needs Analysis. • Position Description. • Sign off or review of audit schedule. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The auditor training record alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Copies of audit reports alone will not satisfy this criterion. |

| FP1 Senior Management Commitment | |
|---|--|
| FP1.1 | There is a documented process to ensure that senior managers demonstrate participation in the company HIRAC processes. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to make sure that senior managers are actively involved in HIRAC processes for their area of responsibility. Senior manager means a person responsible for controlling or administering a significant part of the company or group of employees above the project level management team |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of review of risk registers. • Attendance list at risk workshop. • Final approval of risk registers (project and/or company) by senior managers. |
| Notes | 1. The criterion will not be satisfied where there is a failure to identify the senior management roles within the company. |
| FP1.2 | There is a documented process to ensure WHS reports are produced that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • monitor performance against the WHS objectives and targets defined by the organisation; • are regularly reviewed by senior management; and • are communicated to site management. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that WHS performance reports are compiled to review the project and company performance against the objectives and targets set by the company. The reporting process must include a senior management review component and results must be communicated to site management. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHS Objectives and targets. • WHS performance reports. • Evidence of communication to site management. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objectives and targets at project and company levels that are not aligned will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Production and review of WHS reports alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP1.3 | There is a documented process to ensure senior managers, site managers and supervisors are trained in WHS obligations/due diligence, and the company's WHS management system requirements relevant to their role. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure senior managers, site managers and supervisors are trained in their WHS legal duties and the company's WHS management system requirements, relevant to the role. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training program based on WHS due diligence and WHS legal obligations. • Training matrix/records. • Position descriptions nominating minimum training requirements. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training records alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Generic WHS training alone will not satisfy this criterion. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | 3. A general induction safety course will not meet this criterion. |
| FP1.4 | There is a documented process that ensures senior managers regularly visit the site and discuss WHS issues with site management and workers. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that senior managers are required to visit project sites at a nominated frequency and review the relevant WHS hazards/issues with site management and workers. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHS inspection/observation record. • Minutes of meetings where WHS is discussed at the project level. • Schedule or KPIs for senior managers. • Toolbox record with content and attendance. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project Manager and Construction Manager attendance alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Visits to project sites with no record of attendance or records of discussion of WHS will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP2 Integration of Design Issues into the Risk Management Process | |
| FP2.1 | Where the Principal Contractor is involved in the design or has input into the design, a documented process exists for ensuring risk assessments are undertaken at the design stage to identify, assess and control WHS buildability issues that may arise during construction. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to manage projects that are 'design and construct' (i.e. where the contract held by the PCBU includes a requirement to facilitate and control the design of the structure), including the completion of a risk assessment of the design for buildability issues prior to the construction stage of the project. Where a company can establish that they never have involvement in design, a 'not applicable' for this criterion is possible. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Design Risk Assessment/Project Risk Assessment capturing buildability issues. • Design Management Process. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Risk Assessment that does not consider 'buildability' hazards will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP2.2 | Where the Principal Contractor has no input into the design, a documented process exists for ensuring design-related WHS buildability issues are identified, assessed and controlled at the pre-construction phase. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process for obtaining and reviewing a safe design risk assessment including buildability issues from the designer for 'construct-only' projects (i.e. where the contract held by the PCBU does not include any design duties or control over the design decisions) prior to the construction stage of the project. Where this risk assessment is not received from the designer the company is required to have a process to make sure a risk assessment of the design for buildability issues is completed prior to the construction stage of the project. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Design Risk Assessment/Project Risk Assessment capturing buildability issues. • Design Management Process. • Formal request for Safe Design Risk Assessment. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Risk Assessment that does not consider 'buildability' hazards will not satisfy this criterion. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | 2. Requesting a safe design risk assessment from the designer alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP2.3 | There is a documented process to ensure residual buildability hazards identified in FP2.1 and FP2.2 are transferred and addressed in the project specific risk assessment process. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that any buildability hazards identified in the Safe Design Risk Assessment that cannot be adequately controlled at the design stage are transferred to the Project Risk Assessment/Register. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Design Risk Assessment/Project Risk Assessment alignment. • Design Management Process. |
| Notes | 1. Having a safe design risk assessment and a project risk assessment/register alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP2.4 | There is a documented process to ensure a HIRAC process is conducted on changes to design during construction, with any new hazards or changes to hazard controls communicated to relevant workers. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that any design changes that occur during the construction phase of the project are assessed using the HIRAC process to see whether the change introduces new hazards or changes existing hazards on the project, and that the changes to hazards or controls are communicated to relevant workers. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design change form/RFI process incorporating HIRAC. • Safe Design Risk Assessment review. • SWMS/Toolbox Talk records. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A design change process that does not incorporate HIRAC will not satisfy this criterion. 2. An indication of 'no change required' without assessment of the design change will not satisfy this criterion. 3. Review of design change without communication of resulting changes to relevant workers will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP3 Whole of Project Consultation | |
| FP3.1 | There is a documented process for the establishment of WHS consultation, cooperation and coordination arrangements, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agreement on the establishment of consultation arrangements with workers on site; • consultation with workers or their representatives when WHS issues arise; • a program to ensure regular meetings with minutes of the meetings available to all workers; and • training for health and safety representatives/WHS committee members where requested/required. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to setup consultation arrangements on the project including agreement with workers on how consultation will be conducted and documented, plus training for health and safety representatives and/or committee members. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes where the consultation arrangements have been proposed / discussed / agreed. • Minutes of meetings available. • Training records. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Notes | 1. A consultation process without evidence of agreement with workers regarding the arrangements to be undertaken will not satisfy this criterion |
| FP3.2 | There is a documented process for WHS issue resolution that is communicated to all workers on site. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to resolve any issues related to WHS as per the requirements of the legislation, with communication of the issue resolution arrangements to all workers on the site. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHS Issue Resolution Procedure. • Induction content and record. • Site notice board. |
| Notes | 1. Posting the Issue Resolution procedure on the site notice board alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP3.3 | There is a documented process to ensure workers, or their health and safety representatives, are involved in the development of site safety procedures relevant to the work they are undertaking. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to engage with workers or their WHS representatives when developing health and safety procedures (e.g. SWMS, JHA, SOP etc.) that are within the scope of works being undertaken by the workers. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWMS/JHA/SOP etc. with record of consultation. • WHS consultation with WHS Rep or WHS Committee. |
| Notes | 1. A generic statement that workers have been involved in the development of the procedure will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP4 Management of Subcontractor WHS | |
| FP4.1 | There is a documented process to ensure details from the Principal Contractor's WHS plan and/or project risk assessment are provided to subcontractors as applicable to the scope of works they are undertaking prior to the commencement of work. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure relevant details from their WHS Plan, Project Risk Assessment, site rules etc. are provided to subcontractors prior to commencing onsite. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transmission record in electronic system/email showing relevant content provided to subcontractors. • Tender requirements including relevant details. • Subcontractor engagement pack including relevant details from the Principal Contractor's WHS Plan, Project Risk Assessment, site rules etc. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing this information at induction alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Providing the whole management system will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP4.2 | There is a documented process to ensure HIRAC is applied in subcontractor selection/procurement. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure safety forms part of the requirements considered when selecting subcontractors to be engaged on site. |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preferred supplier list based in part on safety requirements. • Subcontractor pre-commencement evaluation. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review of subcontractor performance on site alone will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Review without management actions will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP4.3 | There is a documented process to ensure SWMS are developed for all high-risk construction work as defined in relevant legislation, codes of practice and Australian standards, and these are reviewed by the Principal Contractor against company defined criteria prior to the commencement of work. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that site-specific SWMS are developed for all high-risk activities, with a specific review completed by the Principal Contractor to make sure the SWMS meets the company requirements. If a company's system requires SWMS for further activities, or if a subcontractor utilises SWMS for further activities, the requirement to review them prior to work commencement would still need to be met. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWMS available for high-risk activities on the project. • SWMS review and revision record. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A SWMS without a documented review completed by the Principal Contractor prior to works starting will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Identified issues in the SWMS not addressed prior to work commencing will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP4.4 | There is documented process to ensure a common system of site induction for all subcontractors and workers. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to provide a standard system of induction training to all workers on the project. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Induction Agenda. • Induction Record. • Induction Register. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use of an induction or sign-in register alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP4.5 | There is a documented process to ensure subcontractors participate in undertaking WHS inspections with the Principal Contractor. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure the company and subcontractors complete inspections on the project together. This criterion requires subcontractors to participate in inspections on more than just their own immediate work area. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspection record identifying subcontractor participation. • Inspection program. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence that subcontractors have been inspected will not satisfy this criterion. 2. This criterion does not require subcontractors to participate in all inspections on the project. 3. Evidence of subcontractors participating in inspections of their own work area alone will not satisfy this criterion. |

| | |
|--|---|
| FP4.6 | There is a documented process to ensure work is undertaken in accordance with SWMS. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to review the work activities being undertaken to make sure works are being completed in accordance with the controls specified within the SWMS. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWMS review/Task observation. • Inspection/audit record. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A site inspection process without criteria for the evaluation of SWMS compliance will not satisfy this criterion. 2. An inspection record that doesn't include the details of the SWMS against which the work is being reviewed will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP5 Project Performance Measurement | |
| FP5.1 | There is a documented process to ensure WHS performance reports are produced at a project level and incorporated into the company WHS reporting process. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to prepare WHS reports that review the project WHS performance, and how the report/outcomes are included into the company WHS reporting processes. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project WHS report. • Division or company WHS report inclusive of project reports. • Performance indicators. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A project level WHS performance report alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP5.2 | There is a documented process to ensure that a project-specific WHS management plan is developed for each project that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is signed off/authorised by the senior management position allocated overall WHS responsibility for the project; • clearly defines the WHS roles and responsibilities for the project; • outlines the scope of works for the project and how they will be managed; and • includes specific prompts for review and evaluation. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to develop and approve the site-specific WHS Management Plan for the project. The WHS Management Plan must be specific to the project and include prompts for review to make sure it remains up-to-date. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHS Management Plan. • Project Management procedure/s. • Evidence of a WHS Management Plan authorisation and review process. • Amendment register. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generic WHS Management Plans that are not specific to the project will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Sign off of the WHS Plan without definition or position description of who has overall WHS responsibility for the project will not satisfy this criterion. |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| FP5.3 | <p>There is a documented health and safety inspection program that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • defines intervals and criteria for inspections; • uses workplace specific checklist(s) to monitor compliance; and • incorporates a process for the identification and management of corrective actions. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to make sure that inspections of all work activities are completed to assess that works are being undertaken in accordance with the project WHS requirements, with a process for management of any identified non-compliances. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWMS reviews/Task observations. • Inspection records. • Corrective action records. |
| Notes | 1. Inspection criteria that do not consider hazards associated with the project scope of works will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP6 Training Arrangements | |
| FP6.1 | There is a documented process to identify minimum WHS training, competency, qualification and licensing requirements for workers on the project. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that any specified WHS training, competency, qualification and licensing requirements are identified and documented for the workers on the project. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training needs analysis. • Training matrix/register/records. • Site induction requirements. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For some activities, training or licences alone may not satisfy this criterion; for instance, a verification of competency process may need to be undertaken. 2. Evidence of training/licences alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP6.2 | There is a documented process to ensure identified minimum WHS training, competency, qualification and licensing requirements are verified. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that all requirements specified for workers are completed. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of qualifications and licences. • Training matrix/register/records. • Training database. • Verification of Competency records. • Site induction records. |
| Notes | 1. Overdue minimum training requirements that are booked but not yet delivered will not satisfy this criterion. |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| FP6.3 | There is a documented process to ensure workers are inducted in the site safety procedures relevant to the work they are undertaking. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to ensure that all workers are instructed in the site safety procedures of the work they are undertaking, including but not limited to SOPs, SWMS, permits etc. Inducted means company specific instruction provided to a worker related to a task, activity or process, with evidence of worker acknowledgement of instruction provided. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWMS/JHA/SOP induction. • Site induction. • Toolbox/training record. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Induction that only captures some of the site safety procedures relevant to the work being undertaken will not satisfy this criterion. 2. Induction with no evidence of worker acknowledgement of instruction provided will not satisfy this criterion. |
| FP6.4 | There is a documented process to record WHS training provided to employees. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to define the process to make sure that any training provided to employees is recorded in accordance with the company and/or project training requirements. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training matrix/register/records. • Training database. |
| Notes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A training record alone will not satisfy this criterion. |
| H1 Working at Heights | |
| H1.1 | The risks associated with the potential for a person falling are identified, assessed and controlled in accordance with the Falls from Height Hierarchy of Control. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to utilise the project HIRAC process to identify the potential activities on the project where a person may fall from height, and implement controls consistent with the specific Falls from Height Hierarchy of Control. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Risk Assessment. • SWMS. • Specific work at heights risk assessment. • Controls utilised have been selected consistent with the Falls from Height Hierarchy of Control. |
| H1.2 | The risks associated with the potential for falling objects are identified, assessed and controlled in accordance with the Hierarchy of Control. |
| Scope | This criterion requires the company to utilise the project HIRAC process to identify the potential activities on the project where objects may fall from height, and implement controls consistent with the Hierarchy of Control. |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Risk Assessment. • SWMS. • Specific falling objects risk assessment. |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| H1.3 | <p>Safe systems of work have been developed to ensure fall prevention systems/structures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • verified as installed in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions and relevant legislation, codes of practice and Australian standards; and • subject to regular documented inspection as per the relevant legislation, codes of practice and Australian standards. |
| Scope | <p>This criterion requires the company to make sure that any systems/structures in place to prevent falls are installed and inspected according to the specifications required by the manufacturer, and any other relevant legal and other requirements.</p> |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Risk Assessment. • Procedure for the management of work at heights. • SWMS. • Specific work at heights risk assessment. • Completed inspections/permits. • Installation records and handover certificates. • Manufacturers' guidelines/specifications. |
| H1.4 | <p>Safe systems of work have been developed to ensure that where fall restraint/fall arrest equipment is being used on site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • workers have been formally trained in the use of such equipment; • there is a maintenance and inspection schedule for the equipment; • attachment points are designed and certified by a qualified person; and • attachment points are installed by a trained person and regularly inspected by a competent person. |
| Scope | <p>This criterion requires the company to develop and maintain systems for the management of fall restraint/fall arrest equipment, and to make sure that the equipment being used is used by formally trained persons, appropriately maintained/inspected, and attached to points that are certified to be adequate to sustain the potential force of a falling person.</p> |
| Possible Evidence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Risk Assessment. • SWMS. • Specific work at heights risk assessment. • Controls utilised have been selected consistent with the Falls from Height Hierarchy of Control. • Manufacturers' guidelines/specifications. • Permit to work. • Inspection/maintenance records. • Installation certification. • Training records for workers. |
| H1.5 | <p>The system ensures that work processes are instigated to prevent working from ladders.</p> |
| Scope | <p>This criterion requires the company to have a process in place to make sure that ladders are the last resort when selecting work platforms for activities and that, if ladders are the only option for works, controls are in place to manage the risks associated with ladders. Platform ladders are not considered ladders for the purposes of this criterion and can therefore be utilised.</p> |