Impact Assessment for Changes to Railway Group Standards

Version: **Final**

Date: 23 September 2009

Relevant Railway Group Standard

Title: Engineering Acceptance of Rail Vehicles

Number: GM/RT2000 **Issue:** 3

Synopsis: This document defines the Engineering Acceptance process by which conformance to Railway Group Standards is confirmed for rail vehicles which are required to access Railtrack Controlled Infrastructure.

Executive Summary

GM/RT2000 issue 2 is affected by the Railways and Other Guided Transport (Safety) Systems Regulations 2006 and The Railway (Interoperability) Regulations (2006).

Deviation 06/156/NC against GM/RT2000 issue 2 has led to proposal 09/046 to revise the Railway Group Standard. The non-compliance was submitted because the Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 (ROGS) and the Railway (Interoperability) Regulations (2006) (RIR) came into force. It removed the mandatory need for the railway undertaking to follow GM/RT2000 issue 2.

The justification for Engineering Acceptance of rail vehicles – the legal requirement for the infrastructure manager to assure itself that vehicles operating on the managed infrastructure are safe, no longer applies. Under ROGS, the infrastructure manager and railway undertaking is now responsible only for their respective parts of the system. The responsibility for ensuring that trains comply with mandatory requirements rests with the railway undertaking. GM/RT2000 issue 3 has been revised to reflect these changes.

RIR and ROGS place the responsibility of Engineering Acceptance of rail vehicles directly on duty holders. According to the regulations the duty holder implementing the change (railway undertaking or infrastructure manager) is responsible for both assessing the compatibility of the change in co-operation with the other duty holders and authorising the operation of the vehicle.

The requirements of GM/RT2000 issue 3 only apply when the Engineering Acceptance process, using Vehicle Acceptance Bodies (VAB) and Conformity Certification Bodies (CCB), is used to confirm that a rail vehicle conforms to the relevant mandatory requirements of Railway Group Standards.

1 Initiators of change

GM/RT2000 issue 2 is the subject of proposal 09/046. GM/RT2000 issue 2 is affected by the Railways and Other Guided Transport (Safety) Systems Regulations 2006 and The Railway (Interoperability) Regulations (2006).

Proposal 09/046 identifies that deviation 06/156/NC is in force against GM/RT2000 issue 2. The deviation permits alternative processes to be used by other than those accredited by VABs and CCBs due to ROGS and RIR coming into force.

Proposal 09/046 clarifies that railway undertakings do not need to follow GM/RT2000 issue 2, unless the Engineering Acceptance process using VAB and CCBs forms part of their safety management system.

2 Summary of changed controls and implications for industry

The justification for Engineering Acceptance of rail vehicles – the legal requirement for the infrastructure manager to assure itself that vehicles operating on the managed infrastructure are safe, no longer applies. Under ROGS, the infrastructure manager and the railway undertaking is now responsible only for their respective part of the system. The responsibility for ensuring that trains comply with mandatory requirements rest with the railway undertaking. ROGS and RIR came into force and removed the mandatory need for the railway undertaking to follow GM/RT2000 issue 2.

The scope of GM/RT2000 issue 2 has been revised to address deviation 06/156/NC. Alternative processes for confirming that a rail vehicle conforms to all relevant mandatory standards are permitted, subject to the requirements of Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 (ROGS), and Railway Interoperability Regulations (2006) (RIR).

3 Impacts

There is no change to the duties placed on railway undertakings.

RIR and ROGS place the responsibility of Engineering Acceptance of rail vehicles directly on the duty holder. According to the regulations the duty holder implementing the change (railway undertaking or infrastructure manager) is responsible for both assessing the compatibility of the change in co-operation with other duty holders and authorising the operation of the vehicle. This is an essential change from current mandatory requirements according to which the duty holder (railway undertakings for the purpose of GM/RT2000) can only use a limited number of organisations to assess Engineering Acceptance of railway vehicles.

The withdrawal of these requirements do not in itself cause the railway undertaking to alter the way risk is controlled in relation to the Engineering Acceptance of rail vehicles.

4 Relevant strategies and compliance with decision framework

GM/RT2000 issue 2 falls outside the scope of Railway Group Standards as the document is in whole single duty holder responsibility. Further proposals are being developed (under project 06/131 - Vehicle Acceptance and Registration Package) for the long term application of this standard.

Section 4.2, 'Scope', of the RGS Code states that:

4.2.1 A measure shall be within the scope of RGS only if all of the following apply:

a) It is railway specific

b) It applies to duty holders

c) It relates to an asset or process over which duty holders have control,

d) It involves co-operation between any two or more duty holders.

Section 8.4, 'Legislation' of the Standards Manual states that:

8.4.1 A measure shall not:

a) Repeat legislation

b) Require action or inaction from duty holders which would knowingly put them in breach of legislation.

4.1 Alignment with relevant strategies approved by the RSSB Board relevant to RGS

Section 4.3.1c)iii) of the RGS Code issue 3 requires that 'the measure(s) align with any strategies approved by the Board as relevant to RGS'. The Strategy for Standards Management falls into this category and the requirements of the Strategy are fully delivered by applying the RGS Code issue 3.

4.2 Decision framework

The revision to the scope of GM/RT2000 issue 3 meets the Decision Framework as the risk intended to be managed by the Engineering Acceptance of rail vehicles is managed by an alternative means, for example ROGS and RIR.

5 Conclusions

There are no impacts associated with the application of the deviation 06/156/NC as GM/RT2000 issue 3 will advise railway undertakings that other processes may be followed to comply with legislation for example ROGS and RIR.