

Consultation comments and responses

Document Title: Operation of Heritage Trains

Document number: RIS-3440-TOM

Consultation closing date: 19th January 2024

1. Responders to consultation

No	Name	Company
1	Justin Monk	Network Rail
2	James Gibbons	Hastings Diesels Ltd
3	James Gibbons	Hastings Diesels Ltd
4	James Gibbons	Hastings Diesels Ltd
5	James Gibbons	Hastings Diesels Ltd

2. Summary of comments

Code	Description	Total
-	Consulted	
CE	Critical errors	
ED	Editorial errors	
TY	Typographical errors	
OB	Observations	
-	Total comments returned	

Classification codes for a way forward:

- DC – Document change
- NC – No change

3. Collated consultation comments and responses

No	Page	Clause	Comment	Suggestion	By	Way forward	Page	Clause	Response
1	2	3.1 (i)	Additional projects on ECDP include also fitting at least two heritage diesels (class 55 and class 47).	The section should reference selected steam and heritage diesel locomotives.	1	DC	2	3.1(i)	Added reference to diesel locomotives in this clause.
2	7 and 21 of RIS-3440-TOM	G2.1.1.1.1 and Appendix A3.3 [e] (i)	The requirement for stopping marks is not included except in the general heading of train lengths, standages and platform arrangements. Various TOCs have stopping marks, and it begs the question of heritage trains.			NC	7 and 21 of RIS-3440-TOM	G2.1.1.1.1 and Appendix A3.3 [e] (i)	RIS-3782-TOM Car Stop Markers Provision on Station Platforms + RIS-3703-TOM Passenger Train Dispatch and Platform Safety Measures both apply.
3	7 and 8 of RIS-3440-TOM	G2.1.1.2.3 and G2.1.1.9	Do Network Rail keep and have the ability to use historical data for route clearance? Historic traction is no longer listed in the Sectional Appendix.			NC	7 and 8 of RIS-3440-TOM	G2.1.1.2.3 and G2.1.1.9	RSSB (Rail Safety and Standards Board) cannot comment on NR (Network Rail) process and policy so response will need to be forwarded to NR Ops.
4	13 of RIS-3440-TOM	G4.1.5	Conflicts with RIS-4472-RST Clause 7.2.2.1 which requires an FTR to be conducted independently.			NC	13 of RIS-3440-TOM	G4.1.5	<p>Graham Nicholas consulted and responded thus:</p> <p>Both are correct in their way, so perhaps some clarification is called for.</p> <p>‘Independent’ can mean second party or third-party independence.</p> <p>Where the RU (railway undertakings) does not own the rolling stock being examined (e.g.: locomotive) then an FTR examiner, either employed by or under contract to the RU, would be regarded as ‘third party’ (provided they had no association with the loco owning group) in relation to the rolling stock being operated. This is the DB Cargo (e.g. ‘Tornado’) or GBRf (Hastings’ diesel) model.</p> <p>Where the rolling stock is owned by the RU, then the examiner would at least have to be independent from others in the RU organisation who had prepared the locomotive for its charter working. This would be regarded as ‘second party’ independence. This is the West Coast Railways or LSL TOC model.</p>

No	Page	Clause	Comment	Suggestion	By	Way forward	Page	Clause	Response
5	18 of RIS-3440-TOM	G4.9	<p>Compliance with Issue GERM8000, Issue 7 should be mandatory. Because heritage trains are 'one-offs' station operators sometimes fail to comply with the rule book requirement. In some cases, the SO has withdrawn despatch staff rather than deal with the train.</p> <p>There is also evidence that the planning process fails to display the heritage train on train departure indicators signifying that the planning process is incomplete. On one occasion the HDL train's platform was changed at the last minute and passengers attempted to join the train as the display was not altered.</p>			NC	18 of RIS-3440-TOM	G4.9	RIS-3703-TOM Passenger Train Dispatch and Platform Safety Measures apply and is the operator's responsibility to make sure correct dispatch plans are set out.