**RSSB2726 - T1143 Devices to guide derailed trains**

Tender Question & Answer Document

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplier Question 1**  Page 18 of the ITT mentions "attached specifications". Can you please confirm whether there are any attached specifications and, if so, what they are? |
| **RSSB Answer 1**  There are no other specifications other than the one within the Invitation To Tender (I.T.T). |
| **Supplier Question 2**  Pages 13 and 14 refer to "Section D of Schedule One (a) of Part B of the ITT". Does this actually mean Section 9 of the ITT? |
| **RSSB Answer 2**  Yes this is correct. |
| **Supplier Question 3**  Experience S1 is limited to GB. Can the GB limitation be removed to allow relevant worldwide experience to be cited? |
| **RSSB Answer 3**  RSSB is willing to amend the evaluation criteria for “S1 Experience of the supplier in vehicle – track interaction in the GB mainline railway” to the following:  Pass: The Tenderer provides a brief description of two projects in which the tenderer has delivered vehicle-track interaction activities on any Worldwide Mainline Railway over the last five years. Both projects given by the tenderer will need to have an explanation as to how they are relevant and applicable to the UK Rail Environment. Further the tenderer explains as to how the referenced projects are relevant to RSSB’s needs. Additionally, the two projects stated by the tenderer gives RSSB with a strong degree of confidence in its experience shown in two suitable projects.  Fail: The Tenderer either fails to provide a brief description of two projects in which the tenderer has delivered vehicle-track interaction activities on the Worldwide Mainline Railway over the last five years or has failed to provide an explanation as to how the two projects are relevant and applicable to the UK Rail Environment or has failed to provide a brief explanation as to how these are relevant to RSSB’s needs or the examples provided do not provide RSSB with sufficient confidence in its experience. |
| **Supplier Question 4**  Please provide more details of deliverable 3 (Risk Analysis Tool & user guide) since this is not discussed in detail in the in the main technical section |
| **RSSB Answer 4**  Whist the tool is not explicitly mentioned here, the tool from deliverable 3 refers to the relevant body of text below (areas of particular relevance are highlighted).  *“2.2.2 Understanding of the magnitude of risk and development of a risk based approach*  *It is clear that the wholesale installation of guard rails, or an equivalent system, has a high capital cost, and it will also increase the operational cost of the rail system.*  *It is suggested that this work focuses on the* ***development of a risk based approach which gives the infrastructure manager the ability to target investment. Considerations should be given to both likelihood of an event and impact****, and will likely include, but not necessarily limited to, an assessment of the following:*   1. *Properties of the track including curvature, ballast depth, presence of parallel line and distance of the six-foot interval.* 2. *Line speed* 3. *Type, frequency and crashworthiness of traffic* 4. *Presence of local structures, and height and condition of the structures* 5. *Presence of cuttings and embankments, their geometry and risk of landslides* 6. *Consequential risk in immediate area* 7. *Dead load on the structure* 8. *Clearances to structural members* 9. *The existence of derailment-containment kerbs*   *It is recognised that this work aims to inform decision making from and not recommend a particular spending/policy approach. The result of this work should therefor allow infrastructure managers to apply the* ***approach developed for their network from both a Cost Benefit Analysis or So Far As Is Reasonably Practicable (SFAIRP), and a Fixed funding approach****.”*  The specification deliberately does not prescribe the format of the tool, but the tool should be provided in a suitable format for use by industry practitioners. The successful tender for the project should demonstrate a robust justification and methodology for inclusion of the various influences (some listed above) on both derailment likelihood and impact; and should provide guidance on how this tool can be applied to prioritise/optimise spending on infrastructure devices to guide trains post derailment. |
| **RSSB Clarification 1**  RSSB is currently in possession of document titled “The Common Consequence Tool  Development, Implementation and Demonstration” and is looking to make this available to tenderers.  Due to the confidential nature of this document we are unable to supply this as part of the suite of tender documentation attached to the Contract Notice on Contracts Finder.  However, should tenderers wish to obtain this document please email:  [Shareditt@rssb.co.uk](mailto:Shareditt@rssb.co.uk)  Tenderers should note that the use of the document referenced above is strictly limited to and for the purposes of the procurement exercise “RSSB2726 - T1143 Devices to guide derailed trains”. Tenderers acknowledge that through receipt of the referenced document they will utilise only for the intention and context of procurement exercise “RSSB2726 - T1143 Devices to guide derailed trains”. |