

NAFLIC

National Association For Leisure Industry Certification

Standards & Related Documents Committee

TECHNICAL BULLETIN - MARCH 2002

216. Relating Inspections to the Correct Documents

Periodically NAFLIC hears reports of inspections being carried out without access to the correct set of design documents. Clearly such circumstances make a nonsense of Design Review (DR), but they are also likely to be inappropriate for Assessment of Conformity to Design (ACD), and also Initial Test (IT), before a ride is first used in Great Britain.

One of the objectives of an ACD (as defined in 3.1.1 of its Service Quality Schedule, SQS) is :-

“to determine whether an amusement device has been **constructed in conformity with a properly reviewed design specification** and whether the methods and quality of manufacture are in compliance with appropriate Legislation, Regulations, Codes of Practice, National or International Standards, Guidance, or Amusement Device Certification Schemes.”

The DR SQS requires (10.2) that “All reports shall list the documents and data submitted by the client” and (10.3) that “All reports shall clearly convey the extent and scope of a Design Review”. Similar statements occur as 10.2 and 10.3 of the ACD SQS. The document list and scope statement from a particular Report of DR are therefore crucial in confirming Conformity to Design. Provisional copies of these would normally be available from the Inspection Body (IB) carrying out DR before the work is completed. Similar arguments apply to the witnessing of Initial Test.

The principle is therefore this : The IB carrying out DR obtains from the designer, or otherwise, drawings, instruction manuals etc. to identify the specifications for all safety critical components in sufficient detail, not only for the purposes of checking the safety of the design, but also to enable future checks on compatibility of rides said to be constructed to that design specification. This IB lists these documents in its report and files copies of them for future reference, together with sets of calculations, etc., which it has reviewed. The IBs carrying out ACD and witnessing IT need to be content that the ride they are inspecting is consistent with the design specification and, for this purpose, has the design reviewer’s document list to refer to. If modifications have been carried out without being re-reviewed then it should become clear from the drawings etc. itemised in the DR document list.

Committee Members :- Dr Garry Fawcett (Chairman), Mr Richard Barnes, Mr Peter Smith, Mr Ian Grant, Mr David Geary, Mr Steve Parker, Mr Eddy Price and Mr Mike Preston

© March 2002

PO BOX 752, SUNDERLAND, SR3 1XX
TEL: (0191) 5239498 FAX: (0191) 5239498