

Consultation comments received on 20/009 Revision to Vehicle Gauging Standards  
RIS-8273-Rolling Stock Issue 1 Assessment of Compatibility of Rolling Stock and Infrastructure – Gauging and Stepping Distances

Closing date: 06 October2021

- 1. Tom Wilson, WSP
- 2. Stephen Clarke, Angel Trains
- 3. Mick James, Plasser UK
- 4. Mark Molyneux, RDG
- 5. Alexander Hastie, Alstom
- 6. Tim Fuller, TEFgauging
- 7. Ian Hills, SNC-Lavalin
- 8. Steve Cartledge, D/Gauge
- 9. David Galloway, Network Rail

Summary of comments submitted	Number	Comment categorisation key
Consulted		
Critical errors	0	CE
Editorial	0	ED
Typographical errors	0	TY
Observations	0	OB
Total returns		
Classification codes (CC)		
Document change	25	DC
No change	5	NC
Date responses published:		

No	Page	Section	Comment	Proposed revised text	By	Section	Page	Way forward	Way forward	[RSSB draft responses]
1	N/A	N/A	Briefing Note (separate document), first paragraph– unsure of the use of the term “significant cause of passenger harm” when describing the PTI. This language suggests that a high proportion of passengers are harmed, rather than saying that this aspect of the passenger’s end-to-end journey carries an increased risk to their safety.	Is it better described the PTI as “a significant risk factor for passenger safety”?	2				DC	Change accepted. Briefing Note updated.
2	Various	various	The use of the phrase “in order to” is unnecessary in modern text.	Replace all instances of “in order to” with “to”.	1				DC	Text updated as proposed (3 occurrences found)
3	8	G2.1.11	This clause appears to sanction the use of platform gap fillers but the routine gauging measurement of these components is not well thought through or adequately described in Appendix B.	Delete the clause.	1				DC	Additional guidance added here and in Appendix B to highlight the challenges of measuring platform edge if gap fillers fitted.
4	8	G 2.1.11	Missing '/'	Amend to read ‘platform / train’	4			NC		The conventional term used is 'platform train interface'.
5	10	G 2.3.5	“Rolling stock is described by a series of vehicle profiles specific to each vehicle type, which may vary along the length of the vehicle.”  Clearly rolling stock is described by more than just vehicle profiles.	Suggest it should be vehicle profiles combined with associated movements and tolerances.	7			NC		This clause is specifically about profiles, the aspect of vehicle movements is covered in clause G 2.3.9.
6	11	2.4.2 a)	‘traffic’ is not considered to be the correct word in this context.	Amend to read ‘Significant and regular operation on the route(s)...’	4				DC	Test modified as proposed.
7	12	G.2.4.13	The current guidance for OTM actually adds confusion because it could be construed that OTM are too varied to be treated as comparative.	Add additional sentence to existing guidance note:  G 2.4.13 Given the ..... case-by-case approach. It is anticipated that a candidate OTM of the same, or smaller, profile and suspension as a comparator will be cleared for the same routes as the comparator OTM.	3				DC	Further guidance added in line wth proposal.
8	12	G 2.4.15	‘traffic’ is not considered to be the correct word in this context.	Amend to read ‘.....determination of significant and regular operation takes into account a number....’	4				DC	Test modified as proposed.
9	16	G 3.1.19 a) ii)	Text could be improved.	Amend to read: ‘Modify the rolling stock footsteps.’	4				DC	Test modified as proposed.
10	17	G 3.3.2	Missing '/'	Amend to read ‘platform / train’	4			NC		The conventional term used is 'platform train interface'.
11	18	3.4.1	Missing ‘space’	Amend to read ‘.....compatibility, assessment.....’	4				DC	Test modified as proposed.
12	19	G 3.4.6	Text is incorrect, confusing and could be improved	Amend to read ‘ .....Horizontal stepping distances are generally particularly large to a platform on the outside of a curve for doors towards the centre of the vehicle....’	4				DC	Test modified as proposed.
13	19	G 3.4.6	Text is incorrect, confusing and could be improved	Amend to read ‘ .....centre of the vehicle and particularly large to a platform on the inside of a curve for doors at the vehicle ends. Vertical.....’	4				DC	Test modified as proposed.
14	20	G 3.4.14	Missing ‘.’	Amend to read ‘etc.’	4				DC	Text modified to avoid use of etc

No	Page	Section	Comment	Proposed revised text	By	Section	Page	Way forward	Way forward	<a href="#">[RSSB draft responses]</a>
15	21	G A2.2	Grammar – “A margin of safety related to...” For ease of reading, the use of “safety related” might cause confusion. It has become a colloquial term in its own right (often hyphenated) used to attribute a role, object, or process, as having a bearing on the overall safety of an activity. However, this specific sentence is being used to link two things: the ‘margin of safety’ with the ‘local risk regime’.	Propose to replace “related” with “relative”. e.g. “A margin of safety relative to the local risk regime...”, instead of “A margin of safety related to the local risk regime...”	2				DC	Text modified to use 'appropriate' in place of 'related'.
16	25 to 29	Appendix B	The decision process to arrive at the “agreed datum positions” may be well intentioned but the implications for accurate measurement make this entirely impractical. Where platform gap fillers are fitted and for all cases where the datum (for either assessing gauging clearance or stepping distance) has been determined (using the flowcharts) as the copier edge, the datum measurement is highly likely to be inaccurate. The deployment of standard platform gauge depends on accurate measurements being recorded when the gauge is placed in plane-of-rails and in contact with the platform edge and a direct reading of horizontal and vertical measurements can be obtained. Fitment of platform gap fillers will prevent the correct deployment of the standard platform gauge in all cases where the datum point has been determined as the copier edge - unless the gap filler is removed to allow the readings to be made and then replaced.	Review the practicalities of the guidance provided and delete the Appendix. As an alternative, revise the text and provide additional guidance regarding the method of obtaining accurate measurements for platform horizontal and vertical offsets in cases where the measurement datum has been determined as being the copier edge and where platform gap fillers have been fitted.	1				DC	Additional guidance added to highlight the challenges of measuring the platform edge position if gap fillers are fitted.
17	30	Definition: comparative gauging	Text could be improved	Amend to read ‘.....to be able to use that route.’	4				DC	Change accepted.
18	31	Definition: section of track	For consistency with the ‘route’ definition this should be amended.	Amend to read ‘track section’	4				DC	Change accepted.
19	32	Documents Referenced in the text: GKRT0028	GKRT0028 is not referenced in the text.	Delete the reference to GKRT0028.	4				DC	Reference deleted - thnak you for spotting this!
20	32	Documents Referenced in the text: T1080	Missing '/'	Amend to read ‘platform / train’	4			NC		The conventional term used is 'platform train interface'.
21	9	G 2.1.18	The statement as written is incorrect. Draft GMRT2173 states G.2.2.20 A set of track irregularity files, named 'Track for Gauging' (TfG) can be obtained from Network Rail. Draft RIS-2773-RST states G 2.6.4.10 Network Rail has a suitable set of track irregularity files, named ‘Track for Gauging’ files. The track geometry is 20 km in length and is speed band related (60 mph, 70 mph, 90 mph, 100 mph, 125 mph and 140 mph). The vertical and lateral standard deviation values are set at the maintenance intervention limits for each given speed band and thus represent worst case conditions. Contact details for obtaining the files can be found by searching for '2773' in the RSSB standards catalogue. Neither of these are the same as the infrastructure manager will provide track data and is only listed as guidance in the standards.	Track data for gauging calculations is described in GMRT2173 and RIS-2773RST	5				DC	Text modified in line with proposal.
22		G 3.2.11	This statement doesn’t really make sense or add anything. I don’t think setting copers to an existing alignment would be the biggest cause.	One of the biggest causes of variation in the step / gap dimensions occurs where the platform edge is variable along the platform length. This may be the case at older platforms, but can be an issue for newer platforms too, particularly if the copers are set out to a poor track alignment	5				DC	Text modified as proposed.

No	Page	Section	Comment	Proposed revised text	By	Section	Page	Way forward	Way forward	[RSSB draft responses]
23		2.2	See G 2.4.11 for a suitable guidance to 2.2.3	2.2.3 Vehicles can only be compared to those Standard Gauges applicable to the vehicle. That is, freight vehicles should not be compared to a Standard Passenger Gauge.	6			NC		Sec 2.2 covers use of standard vehicle gauges, not comparative gauging. If a vehicle is built to a standard gauge then it complies with that gauge, what it is carrying is not relevant in this case.
24		G 3.2.14	A height / offset gauge can be taken as referring to a platform gauge (that sits on the rails and measures the relative platform coper position) or to a stepping distance gauge (that sits on the platform surface and measures the relative train step position). Which one are you referring to (I think I know, but the clause is therefore ambiguous)?		6				DC	The clause has been modified to improve clarity. Reference to the use of height / offset gauge have been removed.
25		G 3.3.10	Add the word ‘coper’	.... laterally along the platform/coper top ....	6				DC	Text modified in line with proposal.
26		G 3.1.9	Guidance should be given as to whether the standard cases should include canted track cases. This will affect the stepping distances as G 3.3.4 states that the distances should be measured in a global (gravitational axis system).		8				DC	Cant is not considered in assessing the footstep position relative to the standard platform position. The relevant actual cant is used for assessing the stepping to any specific platform.  The following new guidance clause G 3.1.5 has been added to GMRT2173:  "Industry practice is to not include track cant when assessing the footstep position."
27		G A.3.7	There are no longer a “significant” number of different types of rolling stock. Suggested to use text such as “whilst there is still rolling stock with opening windows...”. Perhaps include a comment regarding the ultimate withdrawal of such units, but consideration may still be required for heritage trains.		8				DC	Text modified in line with proposal.
28		Definitions	Would be useful to include a definition for ‘Asset’ as used in G 2.1.7 to clarify that it can refer to either vehicles or infrastructure.		8				DC	Proposal not accepted. "The term asset is understood to apply to either rolling stock or infrastructure (or both), when gauging assessments are undertaken"
29	11	2.4.3	Proposal to add an additional factor to be considered as part of the assessment.	New item e) "The assumptions and methodology used in developing the swept envelopes."	9				DC	Proposal accepted. The list has been updated to include this new item.
30	12	G 2.4.12 G 2.4.13	Proposal to modify the guidance for locomotives and OTM in the selection of suitable comparator vehicles when undertaking comparative gauging.	G 2.4.12 A locomotive may be comparatively gauged with a comparator locomotive of similar layout and suspension as the candidate locomotive, with a profile the same as or larger than the candidate.  G 2.4.13 Given the range of On-Track Machines and their potential network-wide but less frequent in-traffic running, comparative gauging assessments for such candidate and comparator vehicles are undertaken on a case-by-case approach. An OTM vehicle may be comparatively gauged with a comparator OTM vehicle of the same layout and suspension as the candidate vehicle, with a profile the same as or larger than the candidate.	3				DC	Proposal accepted. The clauses has been modified as per the suggested text.