

**MEETING:** Traffic Operation and Management Standards Committee – TOM  
Control, Command and Signalling Standards Committee – CCS

**DATE:** 07/12/2021  
20/01/2021

**SUBJECT:** Five-year review of GERT8000-SS2 Issue 5 - Shunting

**SPONSOR:** Gary Portsmouth

**AUTHOR:** Laura Fernandez

---

## **1. Purpose of the paper**

- 1.1 This paper sets out the assessment of the five-year review of GERT8000-SS2 Issue 5 - Shunting. It seeks Standards Committee approval on the recommendation and way forward.

## **2. Background**

- 2.1 GERT8000-SS2 Issue 5 has been reviewed for continued fitness for purpose following its publication in September 2015.
- 2.2 The document was initially updated as part of the December 2015 Rule Book programme. The amendments to the affected modules intended to provide clarity and consistency for those who are required to operate trains and work on ERTMS lines on the GB network.
- 2.3 Subsequent limited releases published – Issue 5.2 published September 2021.

## **3. Impacts of the document(s) following publication/entering into force**

- 3.1 Consideration has been given to the following during the assessment:
- a Business case for change.  
No further feedback has been received since publication.
  - b No deviations.
  - c Current projects or proposals being processed:  
20-REQ-008: Part of project 2021-902.  
20-REQ-030: Proposed changes to SS2 were published as a point release and in 8001/PON.  
These changes were already incorporated to the limited release, so a reissue of the module will only be necessary if further changes are needed.
  - d Limited change releases:  
Issue 5.1: A new requirement has been introduced at section 4.2 to check that both facing and trailing hand-points are in the correct position before a shunting movement commences, which will prevent any movement 'pushing through' trailing points.  
Issue 5.2: This has been further amended in issue 5.2 to state that the practice can continue where local instructions specifically allow trailing points to be pushed through.
  - e No amendments and clarifications.

f Enquiries:

Two enquiries received with regards to clarification of content.

Further issues held on record:

- Section 6.2 second paragraph begins 'However' which has been interpreted as being an exemption from the first paragraph in almost any circumstances. The intended meaning is that the shunter controlling the movement is on the ground while doing so.
- Section 3.2. If this section is to remain and still be valid, its relevance should be applicable to all vehicles. However, the relevance of driver being present is questionable.
- Section 9 (9.3 and 9.4) – Questions raised about the requirement for a red light to be displayed when vehicles are left on a dead-end platform line where permissive working is authorized (this may be after either a train or shunting movement). Where the risk assessment of permissive working concludes that adequate ambient lighting exists, this is not necessary, and a rule reflecting this would clarify the intention. The object of placing a light corresponding to that on the buffer stops in section 9.4 may no longer be universally relevant and a review of the rationale might lead to agreement on a revised rule.

It is recommended all of the above are included when the document is sent for industry consultation.

- g No research projects.
- h No changes in regulations.
- i No changes in technology.
- j No changes to relevant National Technical Specification Notices (NTSNs) and European standards.
- k Published list of NTRs – no impact.
- l No other observations.

## **4. Discussion**

### **4.1 Review assessment**

- 4.1.1 It is recommended that the document is subject to industry consultation as part of its 60-month review and the issues raised in section 3 are included for comment.

## **5. Recommendations**

- 5.1 The Traffic Operation and Management Standards Committee is asked to:
  - a DISCUSS the assessment of the five-year review and the following proposed recommendation:
    - i Action required:  
Carry out consultation with industry as part of the 60-month review including comments made above.

b APPROVE:

The recommendation including consultation with industry.

The next review date – September 2026.

---

RSSB completion: [\[do not delete\]](#)

<i>Lead Standards Committee</i>	<i>Meeting date</i>	<i>Recommendation approved</i>	<i>Minute numbers</i>		<i>Next review date</i>
			<i>Pre-consultation review</i>	<i>Post-consultation review</i>	
Traffic Operation and Management					

## Appendix A    Disposition table for document(s) recommended for withdrawal

### A.1        Document number, title, issue [\[one table per document\]](#)

Clause number	Clause title	Way forward	Comments
		Withdraw	Why the clause is no longer needed

## Appendix B Associated information to support the review

Deviations	List current deviations: Nil	List deviations in progress: Nil
Request for Help	<p>Outcome of resolved Requests for Help:</p> <p>20-REQ-008: Part of Project 2021-902, but not supported by OPG.</p> <p>20-REQ-030: Proposed changes to SS2 published as a point release and also publish the changes in 8001/PON every quarter until revision of the module.</p>	
Proposals	List approved proposals: Nil	List proposals not yet approved by the standards committee: Nil
RSSB Standards Programme	This document is currently not on the RSP.	
Amendments or clarifications	Nil.	
Limited change releases	<p>Issue 5.1: A new requirement has been introduced at section 4.2 to check that both facing and trailing hand-points are in the correct position before a shunting movement commences, which will prevent any movement 'pushing through' trailing points.</p> <p>Issue 5.2: This has been further amended in issue 5.2 to state that the practice can continue where local instructions specifically allow trailing points to be pushed through.</p>	
Enquiries	See Appendix C.	
Business case for change	<a href="#">15-IA13</a>	
Information from RMDB Note: update RMDB to reflect action/decision	Nil.	

### Related documents:

Process procedure for the 12 month and five-year review of Railway Group Standards and other documents

## Appendix C    Enquiries

**CAS-03162-F5K8C9** from TfW - Application of Rules Module ss2 9.3/9.4 and TW1 14.2

RfW is currently undergoing scoping work around stabling trains on a running line at TfW due to depot redevelopment.

There is currently debate around the requirements to put a red light on the rear of the train when these units are stabled other than the integrated tail lights, which there is uncertainty of how long the train battery would sustain them.

I am of the understanding that 9.3 and 9.4 of SS2 would apply - that we have a requirement to ensure an illuminated tail lamp (or repeater against a white block) are shown when stabling trains on a running line. This is also being challenged by some quarters on the grounds that its not shunting, however, I believe this rule would still be applicable.

There are a number of sites selected as potential locations.

In the main they are within the terminus platforms of single lines against the stop block, all of these show a red light (so my understanding is that the lighting should repeat that)

There are a couple of locations where, similarly, the trains would be attacked in bay platforms of mainline stations against the stop block and my understanding is that the same as above would apply.

There is another couple of locations, one being a bi directional through platform (red both ends?) and one single direction through platform (red at rear?) and then one slight anomaly, stabling at the first station on a single line, just after the line branches off (dropping behind what would become the exit signal after changing ends) my assumption on this is that reds both end or repeat the stop block (albeit 2 miles away) would apply, presumably the former.

Where the rules were challenged was around the word "shunting" in the title of SS2, with some parties trying to insist that we had no requirement to use a tail lamp. The trains obviously have built in tails, but the battery would not sustain the lights for the length of time the train is stabled. For clarity all of these locations are running lines, not sidings or depots.

I mainly wanted to clarify that there wouldn't be any circumstances where we didn't need to provide and ensure end lighting, my understanding is that we would of some description at all these locations.

RSSB's response on 10/05/2021:

This is not just a matter of saying that stabling trains is not part of shunting and therefore, the rules in module SS2 do not apply.

What needs to be done is a risk assessment at each location where you intend to out stable the trains. This is required because the Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations (ROGS) (as amended), place obligations on Transport Operators to undertake risk assessments and reduce risk to an acceptable level.

The Risk assessment should be a joint venture between yourselves and the Infrastructure Manager. If Network Rail are the Infrastructure Manager, they have a template risk assessment described in one of their standards which will be of assistance to you.

RIS-0744-CCS Permissive Working Risk Assessment and Risk Controls is concerned with permissive worked lines and will help in defining the risks that you need to mitigate against.

**CAS-01693-B1Q7G0** from MTR - Class 345s & module SS2 9.4 (11/10/2019)

Clarification requested of clause 9.4 with regard to stabling a vehicle.

Clause 9.4 would be fine were it not for the fact that class 345s will default to showing red lights when the cab is shut down, it is impossible to safely stable the trains with the marker lights illuminated.

At three locations on our route, we have stabling sidings with white lights above the buffer stops as they are adjacent to a running line.

The problem is the buffer stops require the correct illumination (in this case a white light) but the trains cannot replicate that when stabled.

Class 345 may not be the only train to have this issue; it will and does affect several train types (Siemens Desiro's / Bombardier Electrostars / Hitachi Azumas).

A number of drivers are now stating that they are unwilling to stable a train in a siding that they cannot replicate the stop lights shown.

We don't have enough portable lamps, and to place one on the train will incur unnecessary risk and won't extinguish the tail lights.

Taking the above into account, should a deviation be sought? Should NR be requested to participate in a risk assessment to assess the local implications of trains exhibiting red lights instead of white lights bearing in mind the operational risk is relatively low?