

RAILTRACK

*Safety & Standards***SAFETY JUSTIFICATION****ISSUE: I****PART A - DOCUMENT INFORMATION**

Document Title:	Registration of Rail Vehicles and Mandatory Data Requirements		
Document No:	GM/RT2453	Issue:	One
Primary Subject Committee:	T&RS		
Other Subject Committee input/ involvement:	None		
Proposed Date of Submission to Subject Committee:	2/7/99		
Submitted by: Standards Project Manager		Date:	02/07/99
Reviewed by: Controller, Safety, Strategy and Planning		Date:	02/07/99
Approved by: Controller, Railway Group Standards		Date:	02/07/99

PART B - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The review of this RGS is being carried out in conjunction with the review of a number of other RGSs and the changes involve the transfer of controls between the RGSs and the clarification of the current requirements. The purpose of the change is to deliver the controls in a more robust way. At the same time the opportunity has been taken to bring the RGS up to date. These changes do not introduce any new controls over and above the accepted controls already in place.

This document sets out to justify the requirements in this RGS utilising qualitative means.

PART C - BACKGROUND**Need for change**

There is a need to:

- include the provision of a Certificate of Authority to Operate to be obtained prior to operation on Railtrack controlled infrastructure
- gather all the Registration requirements into one RGS
- clarify the mandatory data requirements
- include special status for heritage vehicles
- bring the requirements in line with GM/RT3270

Proposed changes

- introduction of the Certificate of Authority to Operate
- clearer definition of scope
- clarification of operational and non operational status on RSL.

Controls and their function

This RGS supports the need to prevent unsafe vehicles from being operated on Railtrack Controlled Infrastructure by mandating a registration process intended to ensure that the RGSs relating to Engineering Acceptance and Route Acceptance are complied with. The overall effect is the reduction of risks from the use of non conforming vehicles.

Alternatives considered

There are obviously a number of alternative ways of providing this specific control but due to the fact that the present arrangements are well established and any alternative would be costly to introduce, it is considered that this method is the most cost effective way of obtaining this risk reduction.

Complementary controls

The controls in this RGS are connected to and work in association with the controls in:

- GO/RT3270 - Route Acceptance of Rail Vehicles
- GM/RT2000 - Engineering Acceptance of Rail Vehicles
- GM/RT2001 - Design Scrutiny for the Acceptance of Rail Vehicles
- GM/RT2003 - Certification Requirements for Registration of Steam Locomotives

Part D - COSTS AND BENEFITS

This RGS mandates managerial requirements for the control of risks. As professional practice is likely to be of a low cost, it is considered that a quantified Cost Benefit Analysis is not appropriate in this case.

The benefit from this RGS (and complementary RGSs) is the reduction of risks from the use of non conforming vehicles. The changes introduced by this Standard will reinforce and clarify these controls and help ensure safe operation.

These controls have been in existence for some time and to date no one has questioned the overall need for them. It is therefore considered that the controls do not form an unreasonable burden to the Railway Group or inhibit innovation.

The changes introduced by this Standard are of an administrative nature and will not introduce any additional costs.

Part E - CONCLUSION

This RGS forms part of a set of controls aimed at the reduction of risks from the use of non conforming vehicles. The proposed changes set out to clarify these controls without introducing any additional costs and it is therefore concluded that the change is justified.

Part F - REFERENCES

None.