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Introduction

- 4th Rail Package
- Cooperation arrangements between NSAs and ERA
- Revision of the CSM for Conformity Assessment and CSM Supervision
- Common Occurrence Reporting
- ERA railway indicators
4th Rail Package

- Trilogue – Commission, Parliament and Member States
- Latvian presidency keen on progressing the 4th Package – intend to complete Technical Pillar by summer
- Technical Pillar – safety, interoperability and ERA regulation directives
- Discussion now focused on the ‘market’ and ‘political’ pillars
- EC still planning to keep package together and not implement the technical pillar separately
- Some NSAs have raised the possibility of a graduated introduction of particular aspects of the technical pillar
- ORR working with other NSAs on future cooperation arrangements with ERA
Cooperation arrangements with ERA

- 4th package will require cooperation between NSAs and ERA around on certification/supervision
- NSAs have been meeting to discuss and seeing what can be learned from the aviation industry
- Harmonisation of standards and processes has a long history in aviation
- NSAs arranging a meeting with representatives of EASA
Revision of the CSM for Conformity Assessment and CSM Supervision

- **CSM for Conformity Assessment**: common approach for the assessment of applications for safety certificates and authorisations

- **CSM Supervision**: common approach by NSAs to overseeing duty holder compliance with their safety certificates/ authorisation

- ERA want to simplify and harmonise NSA decision making

- The revision of the CSMs is partly to account of recent legislative changes

- Keep as separate CSMs

- Most of the work taking place in 2015

- The earliest the revision might be completed is early 2017
Common Occurrence Reporting

- UK has the NIR system
- Occurrence reporting is seen as taking a system-wide and data-driven approach to accident prevention
- A common EU approach to occurrence reporting and analysis has been in place in both aviation and maritime for several years
- ERA are exploring whether a similar system would be possible for railways
- ERA also looking into the reporting of suicides, particularly how they are distinguished from accidents involving an unauthorised person/ trespasser
ERA railway indicators

- ERA is developing a series of metrics (Railway Indicators) they will use to measure performance in delivering ERA-related activity.

- There will be approximately 20 railway indicators divided into 4 operational activity areas:
  - Harmonised safety framework
  - Removal of technical barriers
  - Single EU train control and communication system
  - Simplified access for customers

- ORR and RSSB have been working to influence ERA to adopt suitable indicators.
Summary

- Technical pillar of the 4th Rail Package nearly complete – but little progress on the market and political pillars
- ORR leading work on exploring cooperation arrangements between NSAs and ERA
- Revision of the CSM for Conformity Assessment and CSM Supervision
- Common Occurrence Reporting
- ERA railway indicators
Level crossings update for RIHSAC

Tracy Phillips

4 February 2015
Purpose

- Provide an update to RIHSAC members on level crossing policy issues discussed at 13 October meeting

- In particular, implementation of Law Commission proposals

- If time
  - remaining action from Transport Select Committee inquiry into level crossings
  - ORR guidance on ORR policy and approach re new level crossings
Implementation of the Law Commission proposals
Position as at Oct RIHSAC meeting

- Law Commissions had published their report including 86 specific recommendations (Sept 2013)

- Government was due to provide its final response (normally within 12 months of publication)

- Response actually sent 13 October, published next day

- Members of the original Law Commission Advisory Group were alerted by DfT and next steps explained
Content of Government response

In summary Baroness Kramer’s 13 October letter to the Law Commission Chairman:

■ accepted the case for reform of legislation and procedures governing management of level crossings

■ gave a firm commitment to produce an action plan by the end of 2014 outlining the areas for further consideration/work and how this would be taken forward

■ provided an “accept”, “modify” or “reject” position against each of the 86 recommendations

■ made a commitment to consult stakeholders further on some of the detailed proposals
Development of action plan

- DfT, ORR, Law Commissions, Transport Scotland and Network Rail reps met 6 Dec to review Department’s draft action plan
- Plan seen as firm commitment to do *something*
- Focuses on areas/recommendations where Department believes further thinking and/or stakeholder engagement is required
- These can be grouped into proposals covering
  - Move to a HSWA based regime
  - Closure
  - Access
  - Improved co-operation
  - Disapplication of level crossing legal provisions
  - Signage
Development of action plan continued

- *Working in partnership* strong theme of action plan

- Indicative timetable provided, described by DfT as “challenging”

- Not “published” but sent to original Advisory Group asking for their continued assistance
Policy areas DfT wish to explore

- Recommendations 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 14 – safety at level crossings to be governed entirely by HSWA
  - how might this be implemented? are there particular issues for the heritage sector? how would highway authority duties be reflected? how would a duty to consider convenience work? if Orders go should anything replace them? should ORR be able to produce ACoPS?

- Recommendations 15 and 16 – improved co-operation
  - how would a duty to co-operate work? could the ROGS model be applied? how would you enforce it? how do road-rail partnerships work in practice?

- Recommendations 21, 22, 23 and 24 – disapplication of existing/conflicting provisions
  - need to understand how this would work
Policy areas DfT wish to explore continued

- Recommendation 26 – statutory system for closing crossings
  - is a bespoke system needed? could the TWA process deliver the intentions of the Law Commission proposals?

- Recommendation 72 to 83 – access
  - plan to discuss with Scottish Government

- Recommendation 86 – signage
  - will review results of RSSB research and consider whether changes to regime required
Moving forward

- DfT own the action plan but stakeholders will play a key role in ensuring its delivery

- ORR has offered assistance with the governance of the project and with helping prepare discussion papers (safety related recommendations)

- Lack of corporate memory at DfT – ORR, Law Commissions and members of the Advisory Group can help

- Opportunities to get involved in planned stakeholder workshops and through other mechanisms
Moving forward continued

■ Wide range of stakeholders crucial to monitor progress, identify and explore areas of interest and hold Department to account

■ Next meeting ??? but commitment to hold stakeholder workshop “in the spring”

■ Wider public consultation may be needed

■ Aim is to finalise proposals Dec 2015 and secure Parliamentary slot during 2016

■ Please get involved/keep up the momentum
Transport Select Committee and ORR guidance on new crossings
Transport Select Committee inquiry

Key remaining action from Oct 2013 inquiry –

1. Rail industry, Government and ORR stop using the term “misuse” when referring to incidents

2. Parties to work together to develop and adopt improved terminology

The Level Crossings Strategy Group (involving NR, RSSB, Union representatives, LAs, TOCs, BTP, RAIB, DfT and ORR) has undertaken some work re 2.

Further meeting this week to discuss draft text
New level crossings

- New Rail Guidance Document produced and published by ORR covering new level crossings

- Sets out our policy and approach to handling requests for new or re-instated crossings

- Provides clarity and transparency for applicants on how ORR’s high level policy of “no new level crossings unless exceptional circumstances” will be interpreted and applied

- Ensures a consistent approach across ORR and the mainline and heritage networks

- Published on ORR website since early January; Ian Prosser shortly to write to stakeholders alerting them to its presence
Safer Trackside Working CP5 Programme

Mark Prescott
Senior Programme Manager
100 years of ‘Tolerable’ Track Worker Loss.

1907 UK Rail Companies reject the UK Board of Trade recommendation to issue whistles to track workers to warn of approaching trains.

1914 A UK Government debate on the need for action to reduce deaths was defeated despite 420 railwaymen killed in the previous year. 102 were track workers.

1985: 11 Track workers Fatalities

2009 ~ 2014: 3 Track worker Fatalities

2014 ~ Network Rail Target: Zero Fatalities & Zero Major Injuries

Struck by train: 2009~2014
By 2014 develop a track work access strategy involving higher integrity systems of work than are captured in the current Red/Green Zone distinctions.

We will invest in new technology to make a step change in the safety of our people who work on the track. This will include providing additional protection when we need to undertake work whilst trains are still running.

During CP5 we will develop and progressively deploy innovative technology such as warning systems integrated with signalling systems.
Trackworker Safe Access Strategy
Trackworker Safe Access Strategy

New Tech Of higher integrity
Retro-Fit to Existing Infrastructure
Safety by Design
Innovation & New Technologies

Safe System of Work Planning (019)
Hierarchy of Controls (SIL Risk)
Availability of Resources (Track Plans)

Plant

Hierarchical Deployment
Optionereering
Tactical + Strategic

Place

Access Point Design/Location
AOL Working & Safety of the Infrastructure
Right protection method for local environment

Competence & Non Technical Skills
Behaviours and Decision Making
Sizing of Workgroups (right number)
Local resources – fatigue management

People

Short term action plan
Long Term action Plan
(aligned to Digital Railway Timescales)

Process

TRUST Passport

New Hierarchy Linked to Procienct
Safer Trackside Working Programme

Highly Reliable WARNING Systems

Enhanced or Highly Reliable PROTECTION systems

Safer Trackside Working Programme

National Operating Strategy
Traffic Management
Faster Isolations
Telecomms
ETCS/ERTMS

Plan Delivery & Safe Work

CP5 Commitments
£10M Ring fenced fund
Transforming Safety & Wellbeing Strategy Commitments

National Trackworker Safe Access Strategy
National Strategy for Deployment
Reduced Trackworker Fatalities & Major Injuries
Time on Tools Efficiencies
New hierarchy of controls, (risk based, replaces 019)

Solution Development; Workforce Engagement

NR S&SD Executive
Track Worker Safety Group
Industry wide

ORR
National Safety Council
Trade Unions
## Principals of Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Enabler or Visit Reduction</th>
<th>Trackworker Safety as Primary or Secondary Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain Line Pattern Recognition</td>
<td>Visit Reduction</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;C Video Inspection Train</td>
<td>Visit Reduction</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Based Maintenance</td>
<td>Visit Reduction</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Delivery of Safe Work</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Trackside Working</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Leadership &amp; Culture Change</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOS Traffic Management</td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERTMS/ETCS</td>
<td>Visit Reduction</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROTECTION SYSTEMS

WARNING SYSTEMS
Hierarchy of Safe Systems of Work:
Is Green Zone always better than Red???
Draft European Hierarchy prEN 16704
Hierarchy of Safe Systems of Work: Is Green Zone always better than Red???
Risk based Hierarchy (replaces 019)

The new system under development is based on the following three categories,

- **DEPENDANT:** Warning (low integrity human system),
- **INTERDEPendant:** Protection (medium integrity with human interaction)
- **INDEPENDENT:** Protection (High Integrity System).

- Categories have an **overall system score**, (based on the integrity level, resilience, human factors & risk modifiers.)
- System score is modified by a hazard weighting for each Risk Modifier
- Risk Modifiers include:-
  - line speed, trains per hour, junctions, sighting distance, bidirectional lines, adjacent lines open, number of personnel, task type etc.

- **Work system Score = System Risk X Risk Modifiers.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No trains running</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60 to 80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60 to 80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Greater than rule</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>As Rule Book</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Less Than Rule Book</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Simple converging</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Complex, multiple, through lines</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Complex, multiple, throats</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Disused</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Busy</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L (1 to 5ph)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M (6 to 10ph)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>H (11 to 15ph)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>VH (&gt;15ph)</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No trains running</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;2m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25 to 2m or additional time required</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 man</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 man</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;3m fenced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 to 3 m</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2 to 1.25m</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;3m fenced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 to 3 m</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3 to 1.25m</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;3m fenced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 to 1.25m</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.25 to 2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;3m fenced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25 to 2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&gt;1 bi-directional</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;3m fenced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;1 bi-directional</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes =1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;3m fenced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes &gt;1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes &gt;1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;2m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;1.25</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>&gt;1 bi-directional</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;2m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes &gt;1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Yes &gt;1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;2m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;2m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes &gt;1.25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes &lt;1.25</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workforce Exposure Risk**

- **Safety Integrity of System**: 1
- **Workforce Risk Modifier**: 56601
- **Log10 WFRM**: 4.752824104
- **No. of Personnel**: 6
- **Total Hours trackside**: 6 36
- **Workforce Exposure Score**: 4.8
- **Workforce Exposure Measure**: 171.10

**Potential Tolerance Limit (TBA)**
STW
Possible Solutions
Protection & Warning
Signal Controlled Warning System (SCWS)
High Integrity Warning System: SCWS UK national solution

TMS

RIF

Interlocking

ETCS

SCWS

GSM-R/GPRS

Portable Site Warning Unit

COMPASS
Signalling Controlled Warning System
Retro-fit solution

Location Cabinet
Interlocking Interpreter
Black Box 1
SCWS Warning Processor
Black Box 2
Site Interface and Site Warning Units
**Tactical: High integrity Warning**

**SCWS**

SCWS Prototype currently installed at Paddock Wood training centre.
Remote Disconnection Device
Tactical: Enhanced Protection System

RDD

RDD Prototype currently installed at Paddock Wood training centre.
Traffic Management Protection Systems
Traffic Management: Protection Solutions

- Traffic Management is the new Signalling Control System of the future.

- Remote Possession Management
  - provides the ability to deploy a protection system from a remote location, controlling the signals directly at site.
Possessions: - A new future?

Possession Planning

Isolation Planning

Trackworker Protection

Possession Management/Delivery

Traffic Management
Workforce Engagement
Workforce Engagement and the Trust Passport Process

Trust Passport is a live document throughout the process; work undertaken / issues / are logged to ensure visibility and transparency. Version control is maintained.
Model for development of Trust in Innovation
Systems for Trackworker Safety

everyone home safe every day
ORR’s health and safety priorities for 2015 - 16

Ian Prosser, HM Chief Inspector
4 February 2015
Our Goal is continuous reduction in harm…

- **Vision**: Zero industry caused fatalities and ever-decreasing health and safety risk
- Through the industry achieving excellence in:
  - culture
  - health safety and asset management
- It is about continuous improvement for us and the industry
We check compliance and push excellence in management…

- Checking legal compliance
  - control of risks
  - every day
  - by businesses.

- Pushing for excellence in management, both by individual railway duty holders and across the system as a whole:
  - because excellent management means
    - more likelihood of compliance every day.
    - more likelihood of control of risks every day.
Assessing safety performance….

Figure 1. Pyramidal model for railway safety management:

- **Context**
- **Risk regulation regime**
- **Content**
  - **Risk indicators**
    - KPIs, incidents, near-misses
  - **Processes, action, programmes, KPIs**
  - Culture, values, norms
- **Performance indicators**
  - Outcomes
  - Costs
Revised risk priorities and enablers

## Risk Areas & their work programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level crossings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train control / protection technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure e.g. track, structures, drainage etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface system safety e.g. platform train interface, signals passed at danger, adhesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce occupational health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Enablers & their work programmes

| Long term H&S vision        |
| Leadership and Culture      |
| Safety by design            |
| H&S management              |
| Management of change        |
| Competence                  |

**Note:** new areas in green

**Risk areas and enablers are** analysed and described in the strategic document; and our resourcing is guided by the approach set out in the strategic document.
### Business Plan – 2015-16 priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR Project teams</th>
<th>NR route teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level Crossings – passive crossing strategy; AHBs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Projects – safety by design, site discipline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Track &amp; Off-track (including drainage)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintenance – safer, sustainable, innovative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical and worker safety</strong></td>
<td><strong>Worker safety – SWL – embedded?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civils and future signalling (such as ERTMS jointly with RPP and Operators):</strong></td>
<td><strong>NR HQ – emphasise monitoring &amp; assurance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthwork</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PTI at stations (all duty holders)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Channel Tunnel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Crossrail / HS2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPADS / Driver management</strong></td>
<td><strong>HSE MoU modifications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More on freight (Interaction / risk, Track &amp; standards</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change Management (BCR / SWL / New TOCs)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less on Light rail / Heritage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ongoing policy work inc RSPG upgrades and RSD Management system process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Help draw up scope of future signalling work</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAU</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory (TDL, LX orders, Certificates)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reactive work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Safety management system maturity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our operational resources by sector for 2015-16

Breakdown of RSD FTE

- Management and Business Support: 1.3%
- Europe: 4.2%
- CTSA: 8.1%
- Policy: 9.9%
- Statutory (Inc. RAIB): 10.1%
- Learning and Development: 8.4%
- Reactive: 10.7%
- Occupational Health: 3.7%
- Non-RSD activities: 0.4%
- Proactive: 43.4%
Proactive inspection by sector and project

Proactive RSD FTE by sector and project

- TOCs: 7.86
- Level crossings: 4.72
- Light rail: 0.49
- Occupational Health: 0.36
- Freight: 4.00
- Heritage: 3.85
- LUL: 1.67
- Other TfL: 1.71
- NR civils and future signalling: 3.55
- Network Rail (NR) - Track and off-track: 1.16
- NR electrical and worker safety: 17.73
- NR routes: 1.17
- 0.67
Health and safety related prosecutions of individuals by ORR

ORR’s enforcement policy as it affects individual workers
What the law says about responsibilities of individuals

- **HSWA s37:**
  - When an offence committed by a body corporate is proved to have been committed with the consent, connivance... or negligence on the part of any director, manager, secretary... or similar officer, he is well as a body corporate, shall be guilty of that offence;

- **HSWA s 7:**
  - It shall be the duty of every employee while at work to take reasonable care for the health and safety of himself and of other persons who may be affected by his acts or omissions at work and co-operate with his employer.... so far as is necessary to enable ...compliance with the law.

Therefore, individuals are duty holders under HSWA.
ORR’s prosecution policy for individuals

■ ORR will normally prosecute, or recommend prosecution where one or more of the following circumstances apply;

■ Relevant circumstances for individuals, may include the following:
  – The gravity of an alleged health and safety offences, taken with the seriousness of any actual or potential harm warrants it;
  – There has been reckless disregard of legal requirements;
  – False information has been supplied wilfully, or there has been an intent to deceive in relation to a matter which gives rise to serious risk;
  – Inspectors have been intentionally obstructed by the duty holder in a way that prevents them from carrying out their lawful duties.
How often does ORR prosecute an individual?

Since 1 April 2006, around 7% of prosecutions taken by ORR for health and safety offences have been against individuals:

- Two passenger train drivers;
- One JCB excavator driver
- One steam boiler inspector.

The rest of our prosecutions have been corporate bodies for failings in the safety management system.
Summary

- There are legal duties on individuals of equal weight to those on companies;

- ORR seldom prosecutes individuals for health and safety offences;

- We will prosecute individuals where there has been a serious breach of the law due to that person’s own actions or omissions whether as a senior officeholder in a company or as an individual worker.

- It is a very serious matter for any individual to deliberately mislead or to obstruct an inspector.
Disabled people’s protection policy

John Trippier

Presentation to RIHSAC meeting
4 February 2015
Brief History of DPPP

■ ORR - 1994
■ Strategic Rail Authority – 2002
  Author of original ‘modern’ Guidance on what should be in a DPPP
■ DfT - 2005
  Reviewed Guidance in 2008 – with extensive industry consultation
■ ORR - 2013
  Took responsibility in October 2013 – approval and enforcement role unchanged from DfT’s Guidance

ORR’s policy objective is to use our role here to
  “… help empower passengers to make confident journeys.”
How things have changed

“When I was younger boarding a train was a degrading and humiliating experience for me. Due to lack of space and facilities etc I used to have to travel in the 'guards compartment' alone with just bikes and a cup of very questionable liquid in the corner on the floor for company, and for some reason there were always bars on the windows.

As well as this, I would sometimes miss my stop as I had no way of knowing which station I was at because I couldn't see through the window and had no interaction with anyone to ask them.

However, in the last few years since the introduction of both new disability access legislation and new trains, my experience in getting a train could not be more different since those days.

I still have to phone Assisted Travel prior to my journey, but I do not mind this as it is a small price to pay for the excellent service I receive.”

Eve Butcher – Kent and Sussex Courier

Featured on ATOC's 'Disability Onboard' website (http://www.disability-onboard.co.uk/news/a-travel-service-for-the-disabled-thats-on-track/)
What is DPPP
Part 1 – The Passenger document

What help can older and disabled passengers expect to receive?

– **Passenger Assist** – A scheme to allow passengers to book assistance for their journey. Single point of contact
  
  • Planning journey – Buying tickets – help getting on and off trains – changing platforms – making connections

– Provision of **ramps** at staffed stations

– Maintain and make available up-to-date **information about the accessibility of facilities and services** at stations

– **Alternative Accessible Transport** – where stations are inaccessible to the individual passenger

– **Tickets and fares** – disabled passengers able to buy tickets on-board/at destination if they cannot access origin facilities

– Commitments to provide **aural and visual information at stations**

– Clear policies on the transport of mobility **scooters**

– Assistance with **luggage**
What is DPPP
Part 2 – The Policy document

- A more general policy document – aimed at ORR
- It should include:
  - operator’s strategy;
  - management arrangements;
  - monitoring and evaluation;
  - working with others; and,
  - communications strategy.

- Policies must convincingly demonstrate that the operator has embedded arrangements to deliver in the interests of disabled passengers
First 18 months with ORR

- Getting to know our stakeholders
  - TOCs and representative groups
- Conference
- Regulatory Statement
- Review of policies (c. 50%)
- Open Letter – December 2014

Issues:
- Policies not reflecting all obligations of the 2009 Guidance
- Management arrangements not convincingly demonstrating policies are embedded
- Little evidence of active monitoring by operators
Next steps

- Re-approval of all TOC DPPPs
- Monitoring of delivery
- Transparency through publication of monitoring data
- Increasing awareness of the available assistance
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