Scaffolding Erection RAMS

Scanned 2 Aug 2026 / 15 KB / Review time 1m 25s

3	8	5	8
Critical	Needs attention	Minor	Done well

Overall assessment

This is a well-structured and detailed RAMS that covers the majority of required content to a good standard; however, several specific gaps were identified including an incomplete revision history narrative, a missing dedicated reviewed-by signature field, absence of respiratory protective equipment for cutting operations, an undocumented supervisory arrangement for the trainee scaffolder, and some cross-document consistency issues that require review before the document is considered ready for final sign-off.

15 sections checked / 24 findings

01 / Critical

01.01 / Section 8 - Control Measures (Hazard Register Row: Cutting Operations)

RPE listed in plant section but absent from hazard register and control measures

The plant and equipment section references RPE as a requirement for the cut-off saw operator, and RPE is associated with cutting operations. However, the hazard register contains no hazard entry for inhalation of metal dust or concrete dust arising from tube cutting, and no control measure addresses this exposure pathway. The PPE table also does not list RPE as a required item despite it being referenced in the plant section.

Why this matters

Inhalation of metal swarf and dust from tube cutting is a real exposure risk; without a corresponding hazard entry, likelihood and severity rating, and a control measure following the hierarchy of control, the document provides no assurance that this risk has been adequately assessed or communicated to operatives.

01.02 / Section 10 - Training and Competence

No named supervisor identified for the trainee scaffolder

One operative is identified as a CISRS Trainee requiring supervision, but the document does not name the specific individual responsible for supervising them, does not state the required ratio of trained scaffolders to trainees, and does not describe any restriction on the tasks the trainee may undertake. The method statement makes no reference to supervision arrangements for trainee operatives.

Why this matters

CISRS trainee scaffolders must work under the direct supervision of a qualified scaffolder at all times; without a named supervisor and defined supervision arrangements documented in the RAMS, there is no auditable assurance that the trainee will be adequately supervised during high-risk erection activities.

01.03 / Section 15 - Sign Off

No independent reviewed-by signature field present

The sign-off section contains fields for Prepared by, Approved by and Received by. There is no separate Reviewed by or Checked by signature field with a date, despite a named checker being identified in the document control section at the top of the document. That review is noted in the revision table but is not formally captured with a dated signature in the sign-off block.

Why this matters

Without a dated checked-by signature in the sign-off section, there is no auditable record that the document was independently reviewed before approval and issue, which undermines the document control process.

02 / Needs attention

02.01 / Section 1 - Document Control / Revision History

Revision 3 description does not match the stated trigger for re-issue

The user notes confirm that Revision 3 was triggered by the client structural engineer confirming tie points on 10/07/2026, which resulted in an update to the scope including the tie pattern verified against structural drawing RD-STRUCT-119 in Appendix F. However, the Revision 3 description in the document control table states only 'Updated for revised site access route following client instruction'. The access route change and the structural tie confirmation appear to be two separate changes, but only one is described in the revision record.

Recommended improvement

Update the Revision 3 description in the document control table to accurately capture all changes made in this revision, including the incorporation of the structural engineer's tie point confirmation dated 10/07/2026 and reference to Appendix F, so that the revision history gives a complete and accurate account of all changes made.

02.02 / Section 3 - Scope of Works and Section 5 - Hazard Register (Cross-document)

Day 2 scaffold extension activity not represented as a distinct hazard scenario

The scope of works describes a scheduled Day 2 extension of 6 metres along the east elevation as a distinct activity. The method statement provides step 12 covering this extension. However, the hazard register does not distinguish between initial erection and the extension activity. The extension involves erection adjacent to an already-occupied live scaffold, re-establishment of an exclusion zone in a potentially more constrained area, and connection to an existing structure - all of which carry specific risks not explicitly captured in the generic erection hazard entries.

Recommended improvement

Add a specific hazard row or annotation in the hazard register to address the Day 2 extension scenario, particularly the risk of working adjacent to an occupied scaffold, the re-establishment of the exclusion zone, and the tie-in to the existing structure, with corresponding control measures.

02.03 / Section 8 - Plant and Equipment

HIAB LOLER certificate last inspection date is older than other plant items and predates Revision 1

The HIAB delivery vehicle's last LOLER thorough examination is recorded as 20/05/2026, which predates the document's initial issue date of 02/06/2026 and is now over two months old at the time of planned works on 28/07/2026. Standard LOLER intervals for lifting equipment used for non-thorough examination purposes are 12 months, but for equipment carrying persons or with a statutory 6-month interval the certificate should be confirmed. The certificate number for the HIAB examination is not referenced, unlike the gin wheel which references a certificate number.

Recommended improvement

Confirm the applicable LOLER examination interval for the HIAB, verify the certificate remains valid at the time of planned operations, record the certificate reference number in the plant table or as a named appendix, and confirm the examination is in date for 28/07/2026.

02.04 / Section 6 - COSHH Assessment

Dust from cutting operations not assessed as a COSHH substance

The cut-off saw is listed in the plant section with a note that RPE is required, implying dust or fume generation during cutting. However, the COSHH section addresses only cutting fluid and diesel. Metal dust from tube cutting is a substance hazardous to health under COSHH Regulations 2002 and should appear as a COSHH entry with an identified exposure route, applicable WEL reference, and control measures including RPE specification.

Recommended improvement

Add a COSHH entry for metal dust generated during tube cutting, reference the relevant Workplace Exposure Limit, specify the class of RPE required (minimum FFP2 or P2 filter), reference the SDS or substance data, and ensure this is reflected in both the hazard register and the PPE table.

02.05 / Section 9 - PPE Requirements

PPE table references EN471 for hi-vis but this standard has been withdrawn and superseded

The PPE table cites EN471 as the standard for hi-vis vest and jacket. EN471 was withdrawn and superseded by EN ISO 20471:2013 (with amendment 2016). While garments manufactured to EN471 may still be in service legally, a current document should reference the current standard to ensure operatives and procurement are directed to compliant current-standard PPE.

Recommended improvement

Update the hi-vis standard reference in the PPE table from EN471 to EN ISO 20471:2013+A1:2016 to ensure the document references the current applicable standard.

02.06 / Section 11 - Emergency Procedures

Fire evacuation procedure does not describe actions to be taken - only states the assembly point

The emergency procedures section identifies the fire assembly point, which is site-specific and appropriate. However, there is no description of the actions operatives should take in the event of a fire - for example, raise the alarm, call 999, do not use lifts, leave tools, proceed immediately to assembly point. The procedure does not state who takes roll call, who liaises with the fire service, or what the process is for accounting for all personnel including the trainee operative.

Recommended improvement

Expand the emergency procedures section to include a step-by-step fire evacuation procedure, identify the person responsible for roll call at the assembly point, and describe the process for confirming all named operatives are accounted for before emergency services arrive.

02.07 / Section 11 - Emergency Procedures

No incident reporting procedure described

The emergency procedures section covers first aid, rescue, and fire assembly but does not describe how incidents, near misses or accidents are to be reported. There is no reference to the RIDDOR Regulations 2013, no description of the internal reporting chain, and no mention of who is responsible for completing an accident book entry or notifying the client and principal contractor.

Recommended improvement

Add an incident reporting procedure to the emergency section covering: completion of the accident book, internal notification to the SHEQ manager and the site manager, RIDDOR reporting obligations and the responsible person for making statutory notifications, and the requirement to preserve the scene following a serious incident.

02.08 / Section 13 - Legislation References / Monitoring and Review

Legislation section references only one regulation; core legislative framework is absent

Section 13 references only the Work at Height Regulations 2005 in the context of inspection frequency. The document does not include a dedicated legislation section listing the core legislative framework applicable to the works. At minimum, a scaffolding RAMS of this nature should reference: Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, CDM Regulations 2015, Manual Handling Operations Regulations 1992, COSHH Regulations 2002, LOLER 1998, PUWER 1998, Noise at Work Regulations 2005, and PPE at Work Regulations 1992 (as amended 2022).

Recommended improvement

Add a dedicated legislation and guidance references section listing all applicable regulations and relevant industry guidance including TG20:21, NASC guidance notes, and HSE guidance documents relevant to scaffold erection, to demonstrate that the legal framework underpinning the risk assessment has been properly considered.

03 / Minor

03.01 / Section 1 - Document Control

No document reference prefix convention explained; RAMS-SCF-014 suggests this is the 14th RAMS document

Consider including a brief note on the document numbering convention to aid future document control audits and ensure the reference is traceable to the project and site.

03.02 / Section 4 - Sequence of Works

No reference to TG20:21 compliance sheet in the sequence for the Day 2 extension

Step 12 describes the Day 2 extension but does not confirm whether the extension is covered by the same TG20:21 compliance sheet reference C1-3T or whether a separate compliance sheet applies to the extended configuration; this should be clarified to ensure the extended scaffold remains within a checked design.

03.03 / Section 8 - Plant and Equipment

Scaffold boards listed with visual pre-use inspection only - no reference to BS EN 12811 or relevant board standard

Consider adding a reference to the applicable standard for scaffold boards (BS 2482 for timber boards) and confirming the inspection criteria used, to provide a clearer competency and compliance reference for the operative conducting daily inspections.

03.04 / Section 15 - Sign Off

Appendix A handover certificate is dated 30/07/2026 but the sign-off block is dated 24/07/2026

While it is expected that the handover certificate would be completed after erection, consider adding a note in Appendix A that the date represents the handover date and is not the document approval date, to avoid any future confusion about the document timeline during audit.

03.05 / Section 14 - Toolbox Talk Attendance

Toolbox talk attendance dates are pre-populated as 28/07/2026 in what appears to be a prepared document

Confirm that the toolbox talk attendance record is completed on the day by operatives and not pre-populated during document preparation; pre-population of attendance records undermines their evidential value as proof of briefing.

04 / Done well

04.01 / Section 3 - Scope of Works

Meets expectations

The scope is specific, detailed and clearly describes the exact activities to be undertaken including the number of lifts, board configuration, tie specification, staircase access tower, Day 2 extension, and reference to the TG20:21 compliance sheet. It is directly traceable to a specific structure on a named site and avoids generic language entirely.

04.02 / Section 4 - Sequence of Works / Method Statement

Meets expectations

The method statement is sequenced logically and includes specific safety-critical steps such as the advance guardrail system, prohibition on partially-boarded lifts overnight, green-tag and red-tag access control, independent inspection before handover, and the Day 2 extension procedure. These are not generic statements but reflect real operational control steps appropriate to scaffold erection.

04.03 / Section 5 - Hazard Register (Risk Assessment)

Meets expectations

The risk assessment includes pre-control likelihood, severity and residual risk ratings consistently applied across all hazard rows using a numerical matrix, with further action identified for the majority of hazards. The ratings are credible and proportionate to the described controls rather than being uniformly optimistic. The collapse hazard correctly carries a severity of 5 reflecting the potential for fatal consequence.

04.04 / Section 6 - COSHH Assessment

Meets expectations

The COSHH section identifies specific substances relevant to the actual works rather than a generic list, includes exposure routes, references SDS documents and includes a spill kit entry for diesel. The level of detail is appropriate for a scaffolding operation of this nature.

04.05 / Section 10 - Training and Competence

Meets expectations

The training and competence section names every operative individually, records their specific CISRS card level and expiry date, and confirms that card copies are retained on the site file. The inclusion of the first aid qualification holder with expiry date is particularly good practice and directly supports the emergency procedures section.

04.06 / Section 11 - Emergency Procedures

Meets expectations

The emergency procedures section names the nearest hospital with a specific address and telephone number, names the site first aider with a direct contact number, and includes a site-specific rescue plan for fall arrest events in Appendix D that references suspension trauma management in line with HSE guidance. This level of specificity is well above the industry average for scaffold RAMS.

04.07 / Appendix F - Structural Tie Reference

Meets expectations

The inclusion of Appendix F referencing the consulting structural engineer's drawing RD-STRUCT-119 dated 10/07/2026 directly addresses the user-noted scope update and provides a clear auditable trail linking the tie pattern to a professional structural assessment.

04.08 / Section 1 - Document Control

Meets expectations

The document control table is complete, with revision descriptions, named authors and named approvers for all three revisions, and a defined next review date tied to a specific calendar date as well as change-triggered review conditions. This provides a clear and auditable version history.

Software support. Human judgement.

Valify is a software product, not a law firm or a health and safety consultancy. Findings are potential concerns for qualified personnel to review. This report does not constitute a professional safety assessment, compliance certification or sign-off. Your qualified personnel retain responsibility for all final decisions.