

Impact assessment for withdrawal of Railway Group Standard and new issue of Rail Industry Standard

Version: Publication

Date: June 2018

Withdrawn Railway Group Standard

Title:	Assessment of Route Compatibility of Vehicles and Infrastructure		
Number:	GERT8270	Issue:	Three
Synopsis:	This document sets out requirements and responsibilities for the assessment of route compatibility of vehicles and infrastructure.		

New Rail Industry Standard

Title:	Route Level Assessment of Technical Compatibility between Vehicles and Infrastructure		
Number:	RIS-8270-RST	Issue:	One
Synopsis:	This document sets out requirements and responsibilities for the assessment of technical compatibility at route level for vehicles and infrastructure.		

1 Executive summary

- 1.1 The change has updated Railway Group Standard (RGS) GERT8270 issue three 'Assessment of Route Compatibility of Vehicles and Infrastructure' and replaced it with a new Rail Industry Standard (RIS): RIS-8270-RST issue one 'Route Level Assessment of Technical Compatibility between Vehicles and Infrastructure'.
- 1.2 Following review and analysis, it was concluded that no requirements in GERT8270 issue three fall within scope of National Technical Rules (NTRs) or National Safety Rules (NSRs) and therefore, by definition, cannot be retained in an RGS. Further information on the scope of RGSs can be found in the RGS Code and Standards Manual.
- 1.3 The principle requirements of technical compatibility assessment at route level are not changed in RIS-8270-RST issue one, and the responsibilities of industry remain unchanged.
- 1.4 The key changes from the update are improvements to the guidance explaining the context which the assessment sits in, particularly to recognise that railway undertakings (RUs) and infrastructure managers (IMs) are expected to have processes in their Safety Management System (SMS) to manage changes to their operations. The guidance explains how this document can be adopted to help discharge some of these duties.

- 1.5 The assessment process has been simplified into six steps to aid the usability of the document, and consolidate the guidance supporting the process under each relevant step rather than in appendices as is the case in the current GERT8270 issue three.
- 1.6 To help users identify applicable interfaces and data they require for assessment of technical compatibility, a non-exhaustive list of typical interface parameters has been included, which is based on the outputs of Network Rail's Chief Engineer's Vehicle Introduction Forum (CEVIF).
- 1.7 The content has been updated to reflect the latest legislation and recommendations concerning the placing in service, and putting in use, of vehicles and infrastructure.

2 Initiators of change

- 2.1 Currently, GERT8270 issue three as an RGS is notified as an NSR. However, analysis of the document as part of the Strategy for Standards concluded that its content does not meet the criteria of NTRs or NSRs, as other legislation and mandatory standards already mandate the requirements. Therefore, it cannot be retained as an RGS.
- 2.2 The analysis concluded that, while GERT8270 issue three cannot be retained as an RGS going forward, its content should still be retained for industry to adopt and utilise, as it sets out Great Britain (GB) industry agreed practice in dealing with technical compatibility assessment at route level.
- 2.3 Although Standards Committees supported the analysis, they recommended that before the change in status of the document has been implemented, a subgroup of experts should identify actions that need to be taken to both safeguard the current principles of technical compatibility assessment and improve the current situation, where practical. These actions were subsequently undertaken and noted by the Standards Committees.
- 2.4 The main thrust behind these changes was to ensure that RIS-8270-RST issue one sets out clearly the legislative framework in which route technical compatibility assessment sits, and clarifies parallel activities, responsibilities and issues that are relevant to the introduction of new or changed infrastructure or vehicles. Without such clarifications, there is a potential for industry to be confused as to their duties and requirements, particularly when introducing new or changed vehicles and infrastructure onto the railway network. Such confusion, leading to a misunderstanding of responsibilities, can add unnecessary cost or delay to projects.
- 2.5 The change needs to be completed to ensure that UK National Rules are compliant with the legal framework. Specifically, only requirements in scope of NTRs can be included in mandatory standards such as RGSs. The current Interoperability Regulations have been in force since 2011, and the European Institutions are increasing efforts to scrutinise Member States' compliance with these regulations – in particular, to ensure unnecessary barriers to market are removed.
- 2.6 Outputs from the ongoing CEVIF have also been incorporated, including a list of example parameters to be considered when identifying physical interfaces for assessment.

3 Key changes and implications for industry

3.1 New structure and updated references

- 3.1.1 RIS-8270-RST issue one has been structured differently to GERT8270 issue three as it is now written in the format: Requirement, Rationale and Guidance. This structure aims to provide clearer separation for users on what the actual requirements are, the purpose of the requirements and, where appropriate, supporting guidance. Requirements have been updated so that they are clearer and, where appropriate, retained as guidance, either because previously

they were not strictly requirements and rather reflected industry practice, or because they are now covered by other standards and legislation.

- 3.1.2 The process for assessing technical compatibility at route level is structured in six steps to facilitate user understanding of the process. For each step requirements are included.
- 3.1.3 Notably, some content previously included in appendices has now been included in the main body of the document as guidance directly beneath the relevant requirements, which aims to approve user readability of the document.
- 3.1.4 Updates to references have been made throughout the document to ensure they are current at the time of publication. In particular, references to Commission Recommendation 2014/897/EC, Common Safety Method on Risk Evaluation and Assessment (CSM RA), and the Operation and Traffic Management Technical Specification for Interoperability (OPE TSI) have been strengthened and clarified.
- 3.1.5 There is no change to the principles for technical compatibility assessment at route level and where this is being managed effectively this standards change should have no impact.

3.2 Withdrawal as a Railway Group Standard and inclusion in a new Rail Industry Standard

- 3.2.1 GERT8270 issue three has been reviewed using the ‘Rule Management Tool’ provided in Annex 3 to the [final report](#) of the European Commission’s Task Force on NSRs. The review concluded that, because GERT8270 issue three duplicated European and national railway legislation, it was formally redundant as an NSR and therefore, by extension, as an RGS.
- 3.2.2 Specifically, regarding the change in status of the document:
 - a) Regulation 22.3 of the Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations (ROGS) 2006 requires that:
 - i *‘(3) Every transport operator shall co-operate, insofar as is reasonable, with any other transport operator who operates on the same transport system where that other transport operator is taking action to achieve the safe operation of that transport system.’*
 - ii Therefore, RUs and IMs are already legally required to cooperate with regards to safety, and any proposed change that may affect safety.
 - b) Schedule 1 of ROGS 2006 requires the Safety Management Systems (SMSs) of RUs and IMs include:
 - i *‘... (d) procedures and methods for carrying out risk evaluation and implementing risk control measures when—*
 - (i) there is a change in the way in which the operation in question is carried out; or*
 - (ii) new material is used in the operation in question, which gives rise to new risks in relation to any infrastructure or the operation being carried out;*
 - (f) arrangements for the provision of sufficient information relevant to safety—*
 - (i) within the operation in question; and*
 - (ii) between the operator in question and any other transport operator or an applicant for a safety certificate or a safety authorisation who carries out or who intends to carry out operations on the same infrastructure;’*
 - ii Therefore, RUs and IMs are required to inform each other of proposed changes to their operations and equipment; this includes changes affecting technical compatibility.

- c) The OPE TSI set out in Commission Regulation (EU) 2015/995 requires that:
 - i RUs compose trains that are compatible with both the vehicles that form a train and the infrastructure characteristics of the route.
 - ii IMs provide information to RUs on their infrastructure relevant to the compatibility assessment.
 - iii RUs and IMs inform each other of changes to their equipment that may affect them.
- d) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 402/2013 on the CSM RA requires:
 - i The proposer of change to inform other parties of planned changes that may affect them.
 - ii The proposer to identify and control hazards relating to safety to an acceptable level; this can include managing hazards associated with incompatibility.
 - iii The proposer and other affected parties to cooperate in managing the hazards and implementing control measures at interfaces between subsystems.
- e) Commission Recommendation 2014/897/EU on matters related to the placing in service and use of structural subsystems and vehicles under Directive 2008/57/EC and Directive 2004/49/EC explains that:
 - i IMs have an obligation to provide information on the nature of their infrastructure.
 - ii Assessing technical compatibility at route level is a legally distinct step from seeking authorisation for placing into service, and should form part of an SMS process.

3.2.3 In summary, there already exists legislative requirements that:

- a) RUs and IMs cooperate with regards to safety, and any proposed change that may affect safety.
- b) RUs and IMs inform each other of proposed changes to their operations and equipment.
- c) RUs and IMs ensure their equipment and operations are compatible with each other.
- d) RUs and IMs manage technical compatibility at route level through processes in their respective SMSs.
- e) IMs make available the characteristics of their infrastructure that are necessary for RUs to verify route compatibility of their vehicles and trains.

3.2.4 RIS-8270-RST issue one sets out the industry agreed process to discharge these legislative requirements and consolidates the industry requirements in a single document, which industry can adopt to discharge their obligations.

3.3 Clarification on the scope of this process

3.3.1 The title of RIS-8270-RST issue one has been chosen to reflect that its scope is determining technical compatibility at route level.

3.3.2 This reflects that 'technical compatibility' is a specifically defined concept (see Commission Recommendation 2014/897/EU for definition), which should not be confused with other activities. This aims to provide clarity as to what is explicitly in scope of this document.

3.3.3 RIS-8270-RST issue one is scoped to explain that process is intended to be used to assess technical compatibility between vehicles and infrastructure at route level, but it does acknowledge that vehicle-vehicle compatibility can use the process as well. The document recognises that there are other processes, aside from technical compatibility assessment, that also need to be carried out before an asset can be put into use. These other processes are clarified as not being in scope of the RIS, to avoid confusion of when the process in the RIS

should be applied (such processes include operational interfaces, non-railway specific legislative obligations and commercial aspects).

3.4 Updated guidance on the wider regulatory context

- 3.4.1 Updated guidance is included in Part 2 of RIS-8270-RST issue one, which builds on and aims to enhance the guidance currently included in Part 1 of GERT8270 issue three.
- 3.4.2 Specifically, further clarification is provided on the relationship between technical compatibility assessed at a network level, that is required for authorisation for placing in service, versus technical compatibility assessed at a route level, which is necessary in order to put an asset into use.
- 3.4.3 Clarification on the relationship between the concepts of 'safe integration' and 'technical compatibility' is now included, which aims to explain that there may be synergies between demonstration of these concepts.
- 3.4.4 Reference is made to the OPE TSI, which also contains specific provisions on obligations placed on RUs and IMs in terms of technical compatibility assessment at route level. Specifically, reference is made to Appendix D of the OPE TSI, which describes the information IMs should provide for assessment.

3.5 Inclusion of example list of parameters

- 3.5.1 Appendix B provides updated guidance on interfaces to be considered. This reflects current practice and provides greater clarity of the typical interfaces that should be considered as part of the assessment process and what should not be considered.
- 3.5.2 A new table is included in Appendix B.2, which is based on preliminary outputs from the CEVIF. The table includes a non-exhaustive list of parameters for consideration when identifying physical interfaces that may be affected by a proposed change. It is made clear that the list is not complete and therefore proposers still have an obligation to assess whether there are additional interfaces that need considering. The intention is that the table can be updated periodically to reflect the latest industry view on key parameters.

3.6 Update on guidance for temporary statements of compatibility

- 3.6.1 Guidance on temporary statements of compatibility was included in GERT8270 issue three; however, it primarily provided information for when a temporary statement is needed for testing.
- 3.6.2 In RIS-8270-RST issue one, additional guidance has been added to provide information where operations of a temporary nature, such as charter touristic services or transit moves, require temporary arrangements to be in place to determine technical compatibility for a fixed period.
- 3.6.3 This reflects current industry practice where a temporary statement of compatibility is produced which only covers a fixed duration, usually for a relatively short-term period. It aims to provide guidance to aid consistency as to when temporary arrangements may be more suitable and how different parties may implement temporary arrangements to facilitate a particular operation.
- 3.6.4 The guidance is included in clause 3.8 of RIS-8270-RST issue one.

3.7 Inclusion of guidance on arrangements with a third party

- 3.7.1 The content of the Clarification (reference 8270 issue 3 AM001) that was issued against GERT8270 issue three has been incorporated into Appendix A of RIS-8270-RST issue one.
- 3.7.2 Appendix A of RIS-8270-RST issue one provides an explanation of how third parties, such as manufacturers, may perform some of the tasks that are the responsibility of an RU or IM,

typically as part of a contract. The guidance clarifies, however, that the proposer (either an RU or IM) remains responsible for determining technical compatibility at route level.

4 Predicted impacts

- 4.1 The new structure of RIS-8270-RST issue one aims to improve its usability through linking the requirements and process set out in the document with the legislative obligations that it can help discharge.
- 4.2 Recognising the status of the document as the GB industry-agreed process for assessing technical compatibility aims to reinforce that the document continues to describe the method in which the proposer of a change engages with affected parties. Conversely, it describes the expectations that a proposer has of how affected parties will collaborate when making a change.
- 4.3 Changing the status from an RGS to a RIS should not impact what industry is expected to do in terms of determining technical compatibility at route level, as the requirements in RIS-8270-RST issue one do not differ materially from the current GERT8270 issue three. Industry can continue to adopt the existing process as they currently do to manage assessment of route technical compatibility.
- 4.4 Instead, the change in status recognises that legislation already sets out requirements that RUs and IMs should have processes in their SMSs to perform this assessment, rather than the process itself being mandated by the state. RIS-8270-RST issue one documents and codifies the agreed process in an industry standard. Therefore, RUs and IMs are expected to adopt RIS-8270-RST issue one through their SMSs and other internal standards as the method for assessing technical compatibility at route level.
- 4.5 Clarification of the scope of the document to assessing technical compatibility at route level, and recognising that there are other parallel and synergic processes when putting into use, aims to reduce ambiguities and inconsistencies that proposers and affected parties may encounter, largely as a result of different expectations. Improved guidance in this area aims to lead to a more efficient process and more collaborative approach when determining technical compatibility.
- 4.6 Inclusion of an example list of parameters in RIS-8270-RST issue one aims to provide industry with a common set of considerations when identifying interfaces that may need to be assessed when making a change, whilst recognising this list is not exhaustive. This should have a positive impact and makes transparent the outputs of the industry's work in this area, developed through CEVIF and other fora. This should help proposers better identify relevant interfaces and improve efficiency of the process, as they will be able to better identify affected parties who can provide information on the identified interfaces.
- 4.7 RIS-8270-RST issue one does not aim to fundamentally alter the process for assessing technical compatibility at route level, but rather aims to provide enhanced guidance and, where appropriate, refine requirements to better align with legislative obligations. The main benefit of RIS-8270-RST issue one, aside from describing the industry process for assessing technical compatibility, is that it provides a single document which informs the user of the various key regulations associated with the process. This aims to facilitate a proposer's requirement capturing process.

Appendix A Disposition Table – GERT8270 issue three to RIS-8270-RST issue one

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
		Withdrawn No change Redrafted Revised Converted to guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No longer in document - Kept as is - Same material requirement, editorial update only - Updated with modifications - Converted to guidance
1.2.1 – Introduction - Background	2.1 – Background to the regulatory framework	Revised	This guidance has been updated to update references to regulatory bodies and provide additional guidance on changes that do not require a new or updated authorisation for placing in service.
1.2.2 – Introduction – Placing in service	2.2 – Placing in service	Revised	Guidance has been updated to explain that demonstration of technical compatibility and safe integration for authorisation to place into service is required at a network level rather than route specific level.
1.2.3 – Introduction – Safe Integration	2.4 – Safe Integration and Route Technical Compatibility	Revised	The guidance on safe integration has been updated to provide greater clarification of the synergies with route technical compatibility assessment. The content on CSM RA has been transferred to a specific guidance section.
1.2.4 – Introduction – Technical Compatibility	2.2 – Placing in service and 2.4 – Safe Integration and Route Technical Compatibility	Revised	Elements of the guidance on technical compatibility has been updated and split across section 2.2 relating to placing in service and section 2.4 relating to safe integration.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
1.2.5 – Introduction - Compatibility process covered by this document	1.2.1 and B.2	Revised	Content explaining the processes not covered has been retained in the Part 1 section. Other parts are now incorporated in the table on example list of parameters included in B.2.
1.2.6 – Introduction – Commercial Arrangements	1.2.6	Redrafted	Content on commercial arrangements has been updated and included 1.2.2.
2.1.1 – Responsibilities of parties proposing any change	3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 – Step 1 - Identifying the need for assessment of technical compatibility at route level	Revised	Requirement has been split into two clauses, one applicable to vehicle changes and one applicable to infrastructure changes. The requirements have been reworded to clarify that changes that affect route technical compatibility need to follow the assessment process.
2.1.2 – Responsibilities of parties proposing any change	3.3 – Step 2 – Identify Affected Parties	Redrafted	The requirement to identify affected parties has been redrafted with additional associated guidance included, as well as reference added to ROG 2006.
2.1.3 – Responsibilities of parties proposing any change	3.6.1 – Step 5 - Review of the assessment by affected parties	Redrafted	This requirement to decide and inform the affected parties of the method of engagement is materially unchanged with only editorial modifications made.
2.1.4 – Responsibilities of parties proposing any change	3.6.1 – Step 5 - Review of the assessment by affected parties	Redrafted	This requirement to decide and inform the affected parties of the method of engagement is materially unchanged with only editorial modifications made.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
2.1.5 – Responsibilities of parties proposing any change	3.6.6 – Step 5 - Review of the assessment by affected parties	Revised	This requirement has been modified to reflect that common GB practice is for engagement to be managed through correspondence and meetings, and that a compatibility review forum is usually an escalation where parties cannot agree through conventional means. This does not impact on responsibilities for engagement, nor prevent eventual escalation to the ORR, if necessary.
2.1.6 – Responsibilities of parties proposing any change	3.6 – Step 5 - Review of the assessment by affected parties	Revised	The requirement for the affected party to respond to the proposer is encompassed throughout Step 5. No material change has been made to this requirement.
2.2 – Assessment of Compatibility	-	Withdrawn	Signpost to technical compatibility assessment requirements is no longer relevant as document restructured.
2.3 – Compatibility File	3.5.2 – Step 4 – Undertaking the assessment of technical compatibility and 3.7.6 – Step 6 – Outputs from the process	Revised	Requirements on putting together and completing the compatibility file have been retained with editorial changes. Requirement to put together file is set out in Step 4, and the requirement to include the file once finalised in the technical file is set out in Step 6.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
2.4.1 – Review of assessment of compatibility	3.5.1 – Step 4 – Undertaking the assessment of technical compatibility and 3.6.2 – Step 5 – Review of the assessment by affected parties	Revised	Requirement to draft Statement of Compatibility has been retained. It is now clarified that the proposer is to send the relevant parts of the Compatibility File, including the draft Statement of Compatibility, to affected parties in Step 5. This reflects current GB practice and aims to avoid unnecessary information being sent to affected parties. Affected parties still can request further information, as appropriate.
2.4.2 – Review of assessment of compatibility	3.6.3 and 3.6.4 – Step 5 - Review of the assessment by affected parties	Redrafted	Requirement to define a timeframe for review and agree this with affected parties has been retained. Guidance explains what is considered when selecting this timeframe.
2.4.3 – Review of assessment of compatibility	3.6.4 – Step 5 – Review of the assessment by affected parties	Revised	Affected parties are required to review the assessment according to the agreed timeframe. The proposer is required to send the relevant parts of the Compatibility File to the affected parties.
2.4.4 – Review of assessment of compatibility	G3.6.10 – Step 5 – Review of the assessment by affected parties	Converted to guidance	Guidance clarifies that affected parties can request further information necessary for the review in agreement with the proposer.
2.4.5 – Review of assessment of compatibility	Appendix C – Guidance on Operation of a Compatibility Review Forum	Converted to guidance	Guidance based on GB practice for Compatibility Review Forums is retained in Appendix C. It sets out that the forum reviews the relevant parts of the Compatibility File, including the draft Statement of Compatibility.
2.4.6 – Review of assessment of compatibility	3.6.5 – Step 5 -Review of the assessment by affected parties	Redrafted	Requirement retained for the proposer to respond to comments made by affected parties at the review step.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
2.4.7 – Review of assessment of compatibility	G.3.6.7 – Step 4 -Review of the assessment by affected parties	Converted to guidance	The objective of the review by affected parties is retained as the rationale for Step 5.
2.4.8 – Review of assessment of compatibility	3.6.6, G3.6.11 and G3.6.12 – Step 5 -Review of the assessment by affected parties	Revised	<p>Escalation steps are retained where the proposer and affected party(s) cannot agree. However, the escalation steps are clarified. The proposer or affected party can first request a Compatibility Review Forum be established; where consensus cannot be reached through this method, escalation to the ORR under duty of cooperation can be requested. The ORR expects all industry processes to be exhausted before getting involved.</p> <p>Reference to Standards Committees and System Interface Committees are removed as these are not the appropriate fora for escalation of these issues.</p>
2.5 – Operation of a compatibility review forum	Appendix C - Guidance on Operation of a Compatibility Review Forum	Converted to guidance	Content on operation of a compatibility review forum has been retained in Appendix C as guidance.
2.6.1 – Statement of Compatibility	3.7.2 - Step 6 - Outputs from the process and issuing of Statement of Compatibility	Redrafted	Requirement of proposer having to finalise a Statement of Compatibility has been retained. It has, however, been clarified that a draft Statement is produced at Step 4, and then it is finalised at Step 6 once technical compatibility has been determined.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
2.6.2 – Statement of Compatibility	3.5.1 – Step 4 - Undertaking the assessment of technical compatibility	Redrafted	Requirements on the draft Statement of Compatibility and its contents are retained with minor editorial modifications.
2.6.3 – Statement of Compatibility	G3.7.10 – Step 6 - Outputs from the process and issuing of Statement of Compatibility	Converted to guidance	Content has been retained explaining it possible for a Statement of Compatibility to be issued against a single vehicle or installation or group/type.
2.6.4 – Statement of Compatibility	3.7.3 - Step 6 - Outputs from the process and issuing of Statement of Compatibility	Revised	Requirement for proposer to allocate a reference to the Statement of Compatibility has been retained; however, it has been clarified that reference must be unique rather than sequential.
2.6.5 – Statement of Compatibility	3.7.7 – Step 6 - Outputs from the process and issuing of Statement of Compatibility	No change	Requirement to send finalised statement of compatibility to affected parties has been retained with no change.
2.6.6 – Statement of Compatibility	3.7.8 – Step 6 - Outputs from the process and issuing of Statement of Compatibility	Redrafted	Requirement for proposer to send Statement of Compatibility to Network Rail, as publisher of the Sectional Appendix, has been retained. Minor editorial change made to refer to RIS-3215-TOM rather than GORT3215.
2.7 – Outputs from the compatibility process	3.7 – Step 6 - Outputs from the process and issuing of Statement of Compatibility	Revised	This section has been substantially restructured to provide greater clarity on what the outputs of the assessment process are, including the finalisation of statements, updating of relevant technical files and databases, and sharing of information with affected parties, as appropriate.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
2.8 Testing	3.8 – Guidance on Technical Compatibility Assessment at Route Level for Temporary Changes	Revised	Guidance on how the process set out in RIS-8270-RST issue one can be used for testing is included.
2.9 – Vehicles having a keeper other than railway undertaking	-	Withdrawn	Signpost to section has been withdrawn, as document is restructured.
2.10.1 – Provision of data for assessment of compatibility	4.1.1 – Ongoing Responsibilities	Redrafted	Requirement has been retained for RUs and IMs to make available data relating to technical compatibility, as appropriate.
2.10.2 – Maintaining compatibility	4.1.2. – Ongoing Responsibilities	Revised	Requirement has been retained for RUs and IMs to maintain their assets according to the characteristics that technical compatibility depends upon. Guidance has been included explaining that where they are proposing a change they are required to ensure technical compatibility continues following the change, and that, where appropriate, temporary performance restrictions may be necessary.
2.11 – Guidance on Part 2 – Process of assessment of compatibility	-	Withdrawn	Signpost to section has been withdrawn as document is restructured.
3.1 – Changes requiring an assessment of compatibility	3.4 – Step 3 – Information required for assessment	Revised	Requirements have been retained and updated on the proposer needing to identify relevant interfaces, assessment criteria and where further interface data from affected parties is needed.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
3.2 – Assessing compatibility	G.3.5.5, G3.5.6, G.3.5.7 and G.3.5.8 – Step 4 – Undertaking the assessment of technical compatibility	Converted to guidance	Content has been retained as guidance explaining how technical compatibility at route level can be determined.
3.3 - Assessing compatibility between vehicle and vehicle, or infrastructure and infrastructure	2.8 - Assessing Technical compatibility between vehicle and vehicle, or infrastructure and infrastructure	Converted to guidance	Content on assessing technical compatibility between vehicle and vehicle, or infrastructure and infrastructure, has been retained as guidance with minor editorial changes.
3.4 - Guidance on Part 3 – Technical requirements for undertaking an assessment of compatibility	-	Withdrawn	Signpost to section has been withdrawn as document is restructured.
A.1 - Compatibility process flowchart	-	Withdrawn	Flowchart has been withdrawn and replaced by simplified diagram set out in Figure 1.
A.2 – Responsibilities of parties proposing change	3.3 – Step 2 – Identify Affected Parties	Redrafted	Content explaining responsibilities of the proposer regarding identification of affected parties has been retained and redrafted in Step 2 as guidance.
A.3 – Operation of a compatibility review forum	Appendix C - Guidance on Operation of a Compatibility Review Forum	Revised	Signpost to GERT8270 section 2.5 Operation of a compatibility review forum has been removed. However, guidance on affected parties suggesting improvements through a compatibility review forum has been retained unchanged.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
A.4 – Review of assessment of compatibility	G.3.6.13 – Step 5 -Review of the assessment by affected parties	Redrafted	Guidance explaining the responsibilities of the proposer remain unchanged in terms of determining technical compatibility following the review is retained.
A.5 – Outputs from the compatibility process	-	Withdrawn	This guidance is withdrawn as outputs from the assessment is covered in Step 6.
A.6 – Vehicles having a keeper other than a railway undertaking	-	Withdrawn	It has now been clarified that legally only an RU (for vehicles) or IM (for infrastructure) can ultimately determine technical compatibility at route level. However, Appendix A clarifies how third parties can perform some of the assessment work on behalf of an RU or IM.
A.7 – Data used to describe asset characteristics	4.1 – Ongoing Responsibilities	Redrafted	Content on the data used to describe asset characteristics is retained as guidance under the requirements concerning ongoing responsibilities, including provision of data.
B.1 – Assessment of compatibility flowchart	-	Withdrawn	Flowchart has been removed, as options for determining technical compatibility are explained in Step 4.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
B.2. – Types of Interfaces and B.3 – Operational Interfaces	Appendix B – Guidance on Interfaces	Revised	<p>The content on interfaces has been substantially updated and restructured in Appendix B.</p> <p>Appendix B clarifies the scope of the interfaces in scope of the document; these are those concerning technical compatibility and not operational interfaces such as those concerning staff rules implemented through the Rule Book.</p> <p>A list of example parameters (non-exhaustive) relating to technical compatibility has been provided to help users identify relevant interfaces.</p>
B.4 - Specific requirements in Railway Group Standards relating to the assessment of compatibility	-	Withdrawn	Relevant RGSs are identified in the list of example parameters set out in the proposed new Appendix B.2.
Appendix D – Assessment of Electromagnetic	-	Withdrawn	Content concerning EMC in this section is withdrawn as GERT8015 is being superseded. Reference has been made to EMC in Appendix B as a potential interface for consideration when determining technical compatibility.
-	2.3 – Putting into use	New	New guidance has been included explaining the putting into use stage and what checks for technical compatibility are made at this stage.
-	2.5 – Practical Application on the GB Mainline Railway	New	New guidance has been included explaining that whilst putting into use and placing in service are legally distinct they often happen in parallel for project management reasons.

Current Documents	Document	Way forward	Comments
GERT8270 issue three	RIS-8270-RST issue one		
-	2.6 – OPE TSI	New	New guidance has been included on aspects of OPE TSI that relate to technical compatibility assessment at route level.
-	2.7 – Common Safety Method on Risk Evaluation and Assessment (CSM RA)	New	New guidance has been included on how the CSM RA relates to the assessment process for route technical compatibility.
-	Appendix A – Guidance on arrangements with a third party	New	Guidance has been incorporated from the clarification issued against GERT8270 issue three on arrangements with a third party. This was previously published as a separate document but is now incorporated in RIS-8270-RST issue one.