

RSSB

Certificate of Derogation from a Railway Group Standard

(in accordance with part 6 of the Railway Group Standards Code)

1. Type of deviation

Derogation

Deviation Number: **10/202/DGN**

2. Details of applicant:

Network Rail (Sussex),
London NW1 2EE

5th Floor, Desk 19, 40 Melton Street,

3. Your reference number:

Tracker No. 8154

4. Status of applicant:

Infrastructure Manager

5. Title of certificate:

Occasions that a COSS takes a Line Blockage (without additional protection)

6a. Details of Railway Group Standard (RGS):

RGS Number:	Issue No:	Issue Date:	Title:
GE/RT8000/HB8	One	September 2010	Handbook 8. IWA, COSS or PC blocking a line

6b. RGS clause(s):

4.1

6c. RGS clause requirements:

“Clause 4.1 - Protection at the site of work

When you have been given the authority number, you must place a red flag or red light on the approach to the site of work if:

- the work will affect the safety of any approaching train, or
- a group is working.

You must make sure that the red flag or red light is placed in the four-foot where it will be clearly visible to the driver of a train approaching on that line.

You must do this in both directions if:

- you are working on a single or bi-directional line
- single line working is in operation on the line concerned.”

7. Scope of deviation:

National coverage. Equipment used will be various but limited to the fact that the activity(s) will not affect the safety of the line. The locations will be specifically authorised by Network Rail.

8. Impacts of complying with the current RGS requirement:

Clause 4.1 requires that when a line blockage authority number has been given, a red flag or red light must be placed on the approach to the site of work if:

- the work will affect the safety of any approaching train, or
- a group is working.

This clause has the effect of removing the existing benefits and opportunities within rule T12 whereby a group working along the infrastructure engaged in an activity that will not affect the safety of trains (e.g. patrol, inspection, testing such as ultrasonic testing, fault finding, surveying, etc.) are able to take signal protection to pass through say, a Red Zone restriction, limited clearance, sighting or other safety related restriction and then give the protection back when they have safely passed that restriction. This arrangement does not currently require any additional protection (i.e. flags or lights) to be placed on the infrastructure and, importantly, it is not practical to do so.

The deviation applies to occasions when a COSS takes a line blockage (without additional protection) and is working in a group, and the activity is confined to patrolling or other mobile tasks such as inspecting or examining where it is impractical to return to remove a red flag/light on the approach to the work group.

This deviation removes the requirement to place a red flag/light when a COSS takes a Line Blockage (without additional protection) and is working in a group and, the activity is one that will not affect the safety of the line.

No immediate action is currently required as this derogation relates to a rule change that is planned, published but not yet implemented (compliance date not yet reached).

As described above, a group taking a Line Blockage in order to pass through a restriction would not, by the very nature of their activity, be able to recover any flag or light when seeking to give the Line Blockage back. It would not be reasonably practical to employ additional staff to remain at the each flag/light when taking a Line Blockage purely to undertake the task of removal when giving the Line Blockage back - and this would introduce risk to the individual(s) concerned.

9. Proposed alternative actions:

As described above, the deviation will only be applied where signal protection is achieved from a Controlled signal.

10. Impacts of the alternative actions:

The above deviation has been discussed with members of RSSB and for the reasons given above, no practical alternative can be found.

During discussions with RSSB it was noted that the new Line Blockage arrangements have been written to permit signal protection from an automatic signal and this is the factor that has lead to the requirement for additional site protection by a red flag or light. This deviation has therefore addressed this issue factor and has been written such that a Controlled signal only may be used - as per. the existing rule T12.

It is considered that the severity/degree of the proposed deviation has no adverse safety risk. Indeed, the proposed deviation is considered to provide improved safety with respect to those activities described in section 2, above.

11. What other options have been considered?

N/A

12. Consultation with affected parties

This deviation affects (or benefits) all functions and businesses within Network Rail. Following acceptance, these arrangements will be briefed across the whole business via. the Director Safety & Compliance.

13. Additional actions/observations:

Upon receipt, the applicant is required to identify affected, interfacing parties and copy this certificate, together with supporting information, to those parties.

14. Method of elimination:

N/A

15. Start and end date:

N/A

16. Signature of applicant:

Head of Operations Principles and Standards

Date of application:

26/10/2010

17. Status in respect of National Technical Rules:

GE/RT8000/HB8 is not on the list of the proposed NNTRs under the Conventional or High Speed Rail TSIs.

18. Status in respect of National Safety Rules:

GE/RT8000/HB8 is not on the list of the proposed National safety Rules under the Conventional or High Speed Rail TSIs.

19. Lead Standards Committee details:

Name of Committee:

Traffic Operation and Management

Date of meeting

09/11/2010

Minute reference:

10/TOM/11/255

Authorised by:

Signed by Steve Roberts on 30/11/2010

Date of Authorisation:

30/11/2010

Steve Roberts

Head of Delivery, Traffic Operation and Management