**Specification for research project**

Codify the impact of professional driving policies and defining best practice guidance T1305

The draft research specification and assessment criteria that follows is subject to change following supplier engagement. It outlines RSSB’s current proposed approach to “Codify the impact of professional driving policies and defining best practice guidance”.

A pre-tender suppliers meeting has been arranged for 03 May 2022 at 10:30-12:00, to be held remotely on Microsoft Teams. The purpose of this meeting is to:

* Provide an outline of the project proposal
* Provide interested suppliers an opportunity to discuss, understand and inform the research specification
* Provide interested suppliers an opportunity to form partnerships to deliver the research

Suppliers should be prepared to discuss the following:

* What resources and information would suppliers require, to deliver robust outcomes?
* What are the challenges and barriers to delivering this work? What enablers would support successful delivery of the project?
* What is the estimated effort to deliver this work to quality and time?

Please note that following the suppliers meeting, RSSB may amend the document before publishing the invitation to tender.

Suppliers wishing to attend the event must confirm the name and email address of all attendees to Tanja.Odinsen@rssb.co.uk by 12:00 on 29 April 2022, you will then be issued with a link to join the Teams meeting.

1. RSSB overview

RSSB is a membership organisation that supports the GB rail industry by:

* **Understanding safety risk** – Using safety intelligence with the latest risk modelling to inform members and support safe decision making.
* **Guiding standardisation** – Creating, reviewing, and simplifying GB standards; managing the Rule Book and making it easier for the railway to deliver efficiently and safely.
* **Leading the sustainability agenda** - Maintaining and growing rail’s position as Britain’s leading low-carbon and sustainable transport mode by working to address rail emissions and measuring the benefits rail provides to society.
* **Facilitating cross-industry collaboration** – As an independent, cross-industry body, developing industry strategies, and supporting activities that need collaboration, such as supplier assurance schemes and confidential reporting.
* **Delivering new knowledge and solutions** – Undertaking research that addresses the rail industries needs and opportunities, for now and for the future. Developing the new knowledge and solutions needed to inform the future of standards, drive improvements to the industry’s safety performance, and make rapid progress against the rail sustainability agenda.
1. Background

Professional train driving is an established concept designed to improve driver safety and provide consistent performance. It is an approach used throughout the rail industry. Professional driving is a combination of personal mindset, behaviours, culture and driving techniques that minimise the risk of errors.

Every passenger and freight operating company, as well as organisations who operate on-track machines, produce their own professional driving policies which identify good practice for correct and safe driving techniques. The purpose of these policies is to give maximum benefit in terms of safety, performance and passenger satisfaction that complement the requirements of train driving as set out in the rule book and train driving competencies.

Professional driving involves meeting and exceeding the minimum competence requirements and seeking opportunities to train for further improvement in safety performance. They have grown organically over a number of years following advances in relevant research, changes to the Rule Book, the introduction of new rolling stock, the development of the ‘Eco driving’ concept, incident learning, and consultations with drivers and their trade union representatives. As a consequence, there can be considerable variation in driving techniques between operators driving on the same line of route and some policies do not enable the full benefits of the technical capabilities of the train to be realised.

Of note, one development in professional driving policies has been the concept known as “defensive driving”. This requires drivers to drive more cautiously with specific speeds at set distances, such as at the AWS magnet. These were put in place in response to the number of SPADs that the industry was having post privatisation. The situation has also changed with improved braking performance of many trains and uprated train protection including TPWS and in some cases ERTMS and ATP.

The key issue is in fact the interaction of drivers with the system, as there is a perception that driver interaction is sub-optimal resulting in reduced system performance. Consequently, industry is likely to be exposed to higher levels of safety risk and poorer train performance, leading to lower levels of customer satisfaction / confidence which ultimately have an economic impact.

Defensive driving practices are particularly associated with the leaf fall season. Most operators have a policy of braking early under low adhesion conditions, the application of braking and emergency braking differs, which may not make best use of on-train equipment. Industry reports such as the 2006 ‘Goff Report’ previously highlighted how industry did not make the best use of available adhesion’. Recent RSSB research (T1181 and COF-LAD[[1]](#footnote-2)) identified that approximately half of time lost during deceleration on a commuter rail line in autumn 2019 was due to the differences in braking practices. Driving practices were also implicated in the slight losses during the acceleration and cruising phases. One of the key recommendations for industry was to ‘consider a change to driving policy to make the most of the train’s capabilities to make the most of all available adhesion’. To this end RSSB recently published T1221 ADHERE: Low adhesion driving policies [[2]](#footnote-3). It defines best practice autumn driving policies accounting for individual rolling stocks’ systems and capabilities to deal with low adhesion.

Looking at driving policies more widely, Network Rail System Operator are developing the ‘System Utilisation Definition (SUD) and the Time Signal at Red (TSAR) Metric’. The work is investigating how driving practices impact capacity and downstream impacts on performance. It has already shown capacity loss related to inefficient driving practices although the exact level is still being assessed.

Network Rail’s work also clearly identified that timetable models and simulations do not fully account of different driving styles which limits their effectiveness in understanding how efficiently the railway system is being utilised. Some models and simulations will make assumptions on driving style, but they do not accurately represent real-world operation and therefore limits the accuracy of analysis that can be undertaken on system utilisation and how a planned timetable will operate.

T1305 will build on these initiatives to define best practice driving policies and practices that better account for rolling stock and infrastructure systems and capabilities (work package one). Using the analysis and findings from which will underpin best practice driving policies, this work seeks to improve timetable and capacity modelling (work package two). Here, the project will identify and codify the aspects of professional driving policies and practices that materially impact the reliability of service deliverable.

1. Project objectives

This objective of T1305 is to enable the creation of more homogenised professional driving policies based on evidenced best practice and define an approach for codifying existing and future policies so that they can be used to inform more accurate modelling and simulation of the network, such as by TSAR. This research will deliver key outputs through two work packages:

1. Work Package 1: T1305-01 - Guidance for developing and adopting best practice driving policies and other instructions that influence driving practice
2. Work Package 2: T1305-02 An approach to codifying driving policies that is useable by modelling and simulation tools, such as TSAR

*Progression to Work Package 2 is gated. RSSB and the project steering group will decide on progression to Work Package 2 before acceptance of the work package 1 deliverables.*

1. **Project** scope

This research project will develop guidance on designing a best practice professional driving policy and an approach for codifying professional driving policies so that they can inform more accurate models and simulations. The work will be undertaken through the PERFORM research programme, tendered as a single project split into two work packages:

**Work Package 1 (T1305-01)** **– Creating Guidance for Best Practice Professional Driving Policies**

The aim of this work package is to provide the GB rail industry with guidance and evidence on suitable professional driving policies to enable a more consistent and effective approach to reducing the risk of operational incidents whilst also ensuring high levels of train performance. The project shall identify how drivers can make the best use of available on-train equipment, producing separate guidance and evidence for:

1. Train Operating Companies (TOCs)
2. Freight Operating Companies (FOCs)
3. On-Track Machine (OTM) operators

This work package will also collate and examine the different sources that influence driving policy, such as local instructions and the sectional appendix, to provide a more holistic view and ensure the driving policy is not considered in isolation of other factors.

The desired outcome for this work package will be guidance on creating a professional driving policy that maximises the performance capabilities of modern rolling stock and the signalling capacity while still providing effective management of the train accident risk. The deliverables will also include focussed learning materials to support training and cultural change to facilitate implementation by operators.

**Work Package 2 (T1305-02) – Codifying Professional Driving Policies**

The aim of this work package is to codify the different elements contained within a professional driving policy to enable driving behaviours to be accurately modelled / simulated. This will enable a better understanding of:

1. The whole system performance and safety impact that a professional driving policy has
2. How different driving policies by operators on the same route interact with each other and the effect this has on whole system performance and safety
3. Whether driving policies are making the best use of network capacity

The desired outcome of this work package is a means of accurately modelling / simulating different driving policies to understand their impact on the wider network and to enable operators to quantify what the impact would be if they changed elements of their driving policy. It is intended for the outcomes to feed directly into the TSAR project that is being developed by Network Rail but should also be useable by other modelling and simulation tools

In scope

The supplier should establish an approach, utilising existing documentation and knowledge which should include, as minimum[[3]](#footnote-4):

* Professional Driving Policies
* Local and national instructions (e.g., instructions in the Sectional Appendix)
* Training and competence management approaches
* Performance regime Schedule 8 protocols
* Rolling stock specific considerations
* Industry strategies
* Incident reports
* Academic studies
* Previous RSSB funded research (e.g., T1221)

The supplier shall undertake the following tasks for TOCs, FOCs and OTM operators:

* Identifying a list of goals required from a driving policy, notably:
	+ Safety
	+ Performance
	+ Sustainability
	+ Maintainability of the asset (e.g., wheel tread damage)
* Assessing how these goals relate to one another and the trade-off between them
* Grouping the goals relative to different types of train and operators that are different in nature
* Assessing the extent and confidence to which operators believe those goals are achieved
* Assessing the variability of driving instructions across comparable operators (i.e., same class/family/generation of rolling stock and same type of services (metro, etc))
* Assessing and comparing how organisational culture[[4]](#footnote-5) is embedded in organisational policies related to safety-critical events and close calls
* Production of guidance and evidence on driving policies, to enable duty holders to implement a more consistent and effective approach on traction and braking that achieves the recognised and agreed goals.

The above tasks include the following scope:

* Traction type, to include (but not be limited to):
	+ Passenger trains
		- EMUs
		- DMUs
		- Loco-hauled
		- Multi-mode trains
		- Battery trains
	+ Freight trains
	+ On-track machines
	+ Multi-purpose vehicles
	+ Number of cars per train (e.g., short formation trains, etc)
* Operator type, to include (but not be limited to):
	+ Metro (passenger)
	+ Regional (passenger)
	+ Long-distance (passenger)
	+ High Speed (passenger)
	+ Freight
	+ OTM

Out of scope

* Updating company driving policy documents
* Road-rail machines
* In-service trial of new driving policies
* In-service trial of training initiatives

On-going requirements

In addition to the above, the supplier will be required to undertake the following tasks during delivery:

* Attendance at project kick-off meeting (to either be held remotely[[5]](#footnote-6), or at RSSB’s offices (London))
* Attendance at four steering group meetings (to either be held remotely, or at RSSB’s or the supplier’s offices)
* Presentations to four cross industry groups[[6]](#footnote-7) (to either be held remotely, or at central London locations)
* Creation and maintenance of project management plan
* Creation and maintenance of project risk register
* Provision of monthly progress reports

RSSB’s facilities can be provided to the supplier for meetings and/or workshops without cost (subject to RSSB meeting room availability). Where appropriate, meetings can be held elsewhere if RSSB considers this beneficial.

1. Methodology

Tenderers are expected to propose a methodology suited to successfully meet the project’s objectives, scope, and deliverables.

Tenderers should factor the following within their proposals:

* Review of existing industry documentation
* Engagement with relevant operational practitioners to understand the effectiveness of current policies – Engagement should, for instance, include Operations Standards Specialists, Operations Safety Delivery Managers and Driver Team Managers for TOCs, FOCs and OTM operators, Trade Unions
* Engagement with a cross-sectional sample of train drivers and train driving instructors[[7]](#footnote-8) for TOCs, FOCs and OTM operators to understand what they need from a policy for it to be fair and practicable; and to understand organisational culture around driving behaviours
* Engagement with relevant rolling stock practitioners to understand the capabilities of on-train equipment – Engagement should, for instance, include Head of Fleet, Head of Engineering, Systems Engineers for TOCs, FOCs and OTM operators
1. Project structure

This project is structured in 2 work packages, **of which both Work Package (T1305-01 and T1305-02) are subject to this tender**.

|  |
| --- |
| **Work Package T1305-01** |
| **Title** | T1305-01 – Guidance on creating best practice driving policies and other instructions that influence driving practice |
| **Delivery**  | Supplier (competitive tender) |
| **Start** | June 2022 |
| **Completion** | December 2022 |

**Stage Gate**: ***During the delivery of work package T1305-01, a stage gate review meeting will be held with the project steering group to approve and reject progressing to work package T1305-02***

|  |
| --- |
| **Work Package T1305-02** |
| **Title** | T1305-02 – An approach to codifying driving policies that is useable by TSAR |
| **Delivery**  | Supplier (competitive tender) |
| **Start** | September 2022 |
| **Completion** | March 2023 |

1. Deliverables

**The supplier will produce the following deliverables for Work Package 1 (T1305-01):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Good practice driving policies for Train Operating Companies |
| **Deliverable Type** | Good practice guide |
| **Description** | The supplier shall produce a criterion-based good practice guide on driving policies for TOCs, based on traction and operator criteria; to enable a more effective and consistent approach, facilitating an improvement in safe performance. The document shall be targeted towards senior operational practitioners that are involved in the review and revision of Professional Driving Policies. The document should be short, accessible, and easy to use; and incorporate infographics where appropriate. The document shall incorporate the underlying evidence to inspire confidence in the recommendations. |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Worked example – Best practice driving policy for Train Operating Companies |
| **Deliverable Type** | Adoption support material  |
| **Description** | The supplier shall produce a worked example of a best practice Driving policy document for TOCs. This will be based on the best practice identified in this project. It should be short, accessible, and easy to use; and incorporate infographics where appropriate. The document shall be designed in a way that enables operators to adapt it based on their own best practice needs.  |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Good practice on driving policies for Freight Operating Companies |
| **Deliverable Type** | Good practice guide |
| **Description** | The supplier shall produce a criterion-based good practice guide on driving policies for FOCs, based on traction and operator criteria; to enable a more effective and consistent approach, facilitating an improvement in safe performance. The document shall be targeted towards senior operational practitioners that are involved in the review and revision of Professional Driving Policies.The document should be short, accessible, and easy to use; and incorporate infographics where appropriate. The document shall incorporate the underlying evidence to inspire confidence in the recommendations. |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Worked example – Best practice driving policy for Freight Operating Companies |
| **Deliverable Type** | Adoption support material  |
| **Description** | The supplier shall produce a worked example of a best practice Driving policy document for FOCs. This will be based on the best practice identified in this project. It should be short, accessible, and easy to use; and incorporate infographics where appropriate. The document shall be designed in a way that enables operators to adapt it based on their own best practice needs.  |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Good practice on driving policies for On-track machine operators |
| **Deliverable Type** | Good practice guide |
| **Description** | The supplier shall produce a criterion-based good practice guide on driving policies for OTM operators, based on traction and operator criteria; to enable a more effective and consistent approach, facilitating an improvement in safe performance. The document shall be targeted towards senior operational practitioners that are involved in the review and revision of Professional Driving Policies.The document should be short, accessible, and easy to use; and incorporate infographics where appropriate. The document shall incorporate the underlying evidence to inspire confidence in the recommendations. |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Worked example – Best practice driving policy for On-track machine operators |
| **Deliverable Type** | Adoption support material  |
| **Description** | The supplier shall produce a worked example of a best practice Driving policy document for OTM operators. This will be based on the best practice identified in this project. It should be short, accessible, and easy to use; and incorporate infographics where appropriate. The document shall be designed in a way that enables operators to adapt it based on their own best practice needs.  |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Evidence and analysis Report |
| **Deliverable Type** | Technical Report |
| **Description** | The supplier shall provide a technical report identifying core elements that should be included in the Professional Driving Policy and the evidence-based guidance on what those instructions should be. It should include key information that underpins the three good practice documentation, including:* Summary of key goals required from driving policies
* Assessment of how these goals relate to one another and the trade-off between them
* Categorisation of the goals relative to different types of train and operators that are different in nature
* Summary of the goals of current driving instructions
* Assessment of the extent and confidence to which operators believe those goals are achieved
* Assessment of the variability of driving instructions across comparable operators
* Comparison of driving instructions against wider driving policies

The above points shall cover TOCs, FOCs and OTM operators; and shall be anonymised. |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Executive Summary Presentation |
| **Deliverable Type** | Presentation |
| **Description** | The supplier shall prepare a summary presentation capturing the project methodology and key findings relating to TOCs, FOCs and OTM operators. The supplier shall deliver the presentation to the project steering group and up to four industry groups of RSSB choosing |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

**The supplier will produce the following deliverables for Work Package 2 (T1305-02):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Identifying critical elements of professional driving policies for railway performance and capacity modelling |
| **Deliverable Type** | Technical Report |
| **Description** | The supplier shall provide a technical report identifying elements of Professional Driving Policy that materially impact on service delivery and capacity. It will define all aspects that should be included to inform models and simulations allowing them to more accurately represent driving style. The report should include a template for how that information is presented & formatted to be read by a modelling/simulation tool. |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Case study demonstrating the benefit of codifying the tool in TSAR  |
| **Deliverable Type** | Case study (Technical Report) |
| **Description** | The supplier shall prepare a case study using the worked examples from work package one. It will demonstrate how codifying driving policies can provide a more granular model of how driving practices impacts system utilisation. The case study will also demonstrate the impacts of changing elements of driving policies on capacity and reliability of service delivery. |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB and the project steering group, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Business and safety case for implementing best practice guidance |
| **Deliverable Type** | Executive summary presentation |
| **Description** | This presentation will provide a clear and compelling overview of the business and safety case for implementing best practice guidance. This should be targeted towards senior operational practitioners that are involved in the review and revision of Professional Driving Policies, notably, Heads of Operations, Heads of Standards and Heads of Safety. It will demonstrate the benefits through the model and translate that into a case that operators can use to change their policies.All calculations and assumptions underpinning findings and recommendations made in this presentation should be documented in an additional appendix document  |
| **Publication** | The deliverable is to be produced in the standard RSSB format and is to incorporate appropriate infographics. The deliverable shall be reviewed by RSSB, to allow for comment. The deliverable is to be made widely available. |

Where a deliverable is submitted that closely meets the requirements, it is anticipated that RSSB shall provide single consolidated feedback on a complete deliverable from the project steering group, followed by a single consolidated review from an executive panel. Within the schedule the supplier should allow for two weeks for each review to return comments.

1. Stakeholder roles and responsibilities

The key stakeholders and their responsibilities are detailed in the table below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role**  | **High level description**  | **Specific responsibilities are to:** |
| RSSB Project Manager | The RSSB Project Manager is the first point of contact for the suppliers once the contract has been put into place.The RSSB Project Manager is responsible for ensuring that the supplier delivers the project as agreed in their proposal. | * Organisation, co-ordination, and chair of project meetings.
* Monitoring and tracking of project progress and spend
* Point of contact for escalation for enquiries from supplier, steering group, or project sponsor.
* Dissemination of deliverables to project steering group and governance group.
* Authorisation of payment within agreed project spend.
 |
| RSSB Technical Lead | Throughout the project, the RSSB Technical Lead, generally a RSSB employee, ensures that technical aspects are considered and reflected accurately.  | * Provide input to the specification, either by writing it or reviewing its content, and assure it is technically sound and appropriately scoped
* Assess tenders
* Review and provide input to draft deliverables
* Review final deliverables to ensure that they are technically sound and the conclusions defensible
 |
| RSSB Sponsor  | The RSSB Sponsor is a senior RSSB employee that is best placed to actively monitor the project through development and delivery, keeping the project aligned with and informed by industry's expectations and initiatives; and steers implementation facilitation activities. | * Sponsors the RSSB business case and implementation plan, focusing on how RSSB can support industry benefiting from the findings
* Advises the Project Steering Group on shaping the project and its deliverables to most effectively support industry take up and to get most value out of it
* Actively monitor the project through delivery working with the Industry Sponsor to successfully navigate the project through any points of conflict between stakeholders, and decision points relating to emerging findings
* Keep active awareness of the emerging findings and, as appropriate, bring them (and any related decision points) to the attention of the Industry Sponsor to jointly provide advice to the steering group
* Provide advice and steer on activities required to facilitate implementation
 |
| Industry Sponsor | The Industry Sponsor acts as figurehead for the research, championing its importance and its outputs. The Industry Sponsor forms part of the Project Steering Group, however, their key role as Industry Sponsor is to provide steer to the research as it progresses and to influence industry to make use of its findings. | * Advises the Project Steering Group on shaping the project and its deliverables to most effectively support industry take up
* If required, facilitate access to industry data, people and equipment needed to deliver the project
* Oversees the project through delivery working with the RSSB sponsor to successfully navigate the project through any points of conflict between stakeholders, and decision points relating to emerging findings
* Promote industry take up and implementation of the research beyond completion of the R&D project
* Provide feedback to RSSB during project delivery and after completion
 |
| Industry Project Supporters | The two Industry Project Supporters represent parts of industry complementary to the Industry Sponsor’s organisation. | * Offer expertise during project development and delivery
* If required, facilitate access to industry data, people and equipment needed to deliver the project
* Support the implementation of findings
 |
| Project Steering Group | The Project Steering Group ensures the project is specified and delivered to take into account different stakeholders’ needs. The group is made up of representatives from within the rail industry and other industries where appropriate.  | * Provides input to and reviews the ‘case for research’ (i.e., the business case, specification, and implementation plan)
* Monitors and steers the project through delivery
* If required, facilitates access to industry data, people and equipment needed to deliver the project
* Attends meetings with Project Team and suppliers
* Reviews draft and final output(s)
 |
| Primary Governance Group | The Primary Governance Group is an established industry group that has responsibility to steer and oversee activities in a specific topic area. | * Comment on research ideas and consider outcomes from idea review activities that RSSB undertakes
* Review and endorses the ‘case for research’ before it goes for budget authority
* Endorse the findings and support their implementation
 |

1. Budget, timescales, and responsibilities

The budget for this work is up to £75,000 for T1305-01 and £75,000 for T1305-02. The supplier should provide separate costings for work packages 1 and 2. If, whilst compiling a response, tenderers determine that it is not feasible to submit a quote to this budget but still wish to provide a response, they shall:

* Provide a quote for all work as requested, even if this exceeds the budget. This allows RSSB to conduct a like-for-like comparison as required by the evaluation criteria. Those who price within RSSB’s budget will score more highly in line with the pricing calculation, however, higher bids will not be automatically disqualified.
* Provide a supporting explanation as to why an increase in budget is required to deliver the work to a good standard.

RSSB expects the work to start in [Month] [20##], we envisage this research to take less than 11 months to complete. However, these are indicative dates and RSSB will consider bids that cannot meet these expectations if the supplier includes a robust project plan and an explanation as to why they cannot meet the preferred start and end dates, while still meeting the project objectives.

1. Critical success criteria and risk management

The following critical success criteria have been identified to help ensure successful delivery and to increase likelihood of industry acceptance/implementation:

* Assessment of a wide range of data sources
* Significant engagement with industry
* Well targeted outputs, suitable for implementation by relevant senior operational practitioners

To deliver outputs that are implementable, it is critical that named individuals in the supplier project team have the following demonstrable skills and knowledge:

* Understanding of how to enable cultural change in GB rail
* Good understanding of train driving requirements including train driving polices
* Good understanding of railway operations with front-line experience
* Has experience with a Railway Undertaking (i.e., a TOC, FOC or OTM)
* Good understanding of train service performance management and systems
* Good understanding of safety management and systems
* Has a high enough standing within the industry to work with range of experienced staff
* Understanding of project management processes
* Ability to communicate well verbally and in writing

The following initial risks have been identified to highlight where the project may encounter issues during delivery, the supplier will be expected to propose approaches to mitigate these risks and any others they perceive:

* Access to key stakeholders may be additionally challenging due to post-COVID-19 resource constraints
* Lack of buy in among senior rail leadership
* Lack of buy in from Trade Unions
1. Selection and award criteria

**Tenderer refers to the organisation, or organisations that are part of this tender, and experience can be drawn from across any involved party. Tenderers must carefully read the selection criteria in order to address EACH requirement. Tenderers shall fail the selection criteria unless they address EACH requirement, tenderers that fail the selection criteria will not have their award criteria evaluated. The stated limit on the length of each response must be adhered to. Responses will only be evaluated within the stated length limit, any response exceeding the stated limit will be disregarded beyond that limit.**

Selection criteria

| **Selection criteria** | **Detail and Evaluation Criteria** |
| --- | --- |
| **S1** Tenderer’s organisational expertise in train driving activities[Total 1 page for all examples] | The tenderer shall provide a short description of at least two completed examples within the past five years that focused on train driving activities (for instance, policies, training, investigations, etc) For clarification, a ‘completed example’ refers to work specifically completed by the tenderer. If the completed work forms part of a larger activity (involving other organisations), the overall activity does not need to have been completed.In order to pass the selection criteria, the tenderer’s response must address the above and:* Demonstrate a track record of successfully delivering work focused on train driving activities
* Give RSSB full confidence in the tenderer’s expertise on train driving activities

The tenderer shall fail the selection criteria if it either fails to provide a short description of at least two completed examples within the past five years that focused on train driving activities; or the provided example fails to achieve ANY of the following:* Demonstrate a track record of successfully delivering work focused on train driving activities
* Give RSSB full confidence in the tenderer’s expertise on train driving activities
 |
| **S2** Tenderer’s organisational expertise in rolling stock[Total 1 page for all examples] | The tenderer shall provide a short description of at least one completed example within the past five years that focused on rolling stock (for instance, braking, WSP, sanding systems, etc) For clarification, a ‘completed example’ refers to work specifically completed by the tenderer. If the completed work forms part of a larger activity (involving other organisations), the overall activity does not need to have been completed.In order to pass the selection criteria, the tenderer’s response must address the above and:* Demonstrate a track record of successfully delivering work focused on rolling stock
* Give RSSB full confidence in the tenderer’s expertise on rolling stock

The tenderer shall fail the selection criteria if it either fails to provide a short description of at least one completed example within the past five years that focused on rolling stock; or the provided example fails to achieve ANY of the following:* Demonstrate a track record of successfully delivering work focused on rolling stock
* Give RSSB full confidence in the tenderer’s expertise on rolling stock
 |

Award criteria scoring

Each of the criteria set out in the weighted award criteria are scored 0-5. The below explains the scoring system used:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Definition of grade** |
| 5 | An Excellent Tender Response that (where applicable):* Addresses all aspects of the question in an informed and comprehensive manner;
* Demonstrates a thorough understanding of what is being asked for;
* Provides evidence of how that understanding can be applied in practice;
* Offers full confidence that the Tenderer will deliver the service in full;
* Addresses the majority of areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Provides certain, unambiguous commitments or statements of intent that permit reliance through translation into contractual terms
 |
| 4 | A Good Tender Response that (where applicable):* Addresses all aspects of the question and is generally of a good standard;
* Demonstrates a good understanding of what is being asked for;
* Provides a worked-up methodical approach;
* Offers confidence that the Tenderer will deliver the service in full, with limited areas of doubt or uncertainty;
* Addresses key areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Provides commitments that can be translated well into contractual terms
 |
| 3 | A Satisfactory Tender Response that (where applicable):* Addresses the majority of the question and is generally of a good standard but lacks substance or detail in some areas;
* Demonstrates an understanding of what is being asked for;
* Provides a satisfactory approach;
* Offers a general level of confidence that the Tenderer will deliver the service (but with room for doubt in some areas);
* Address some areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Provides some commitments that can be translated well into contractual terms.
 |
| 2 | A Poor Tender Response that (where applicable):* Addresses some of the question but either lacks relevant information and detail or lacks substance in a manner that would suggest the response is a “model answer”;
* Demonstrates some understanding but with a lack of clarity in key areas;
* Provides an approach which is not wholly appropriate or viable or lacks evidence;
* Shows that the level of confidence that the supplier can deliver does not outweigh the doubt;
* Does not address many areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Does not offer sufficient commitment (with doubt as to the extent to which would translate into contractual terms).
 |
| 1 | An Unsatisfactory Tenderer response that (where applicable):* Does not address the question or has omissions;
* Lacks understanding in significant areas:
* Provides an approach which has gaps or creates concerns;
* Shows that the level of confidence that the supplier can deliver is low;
* Creates uncertainty; and
* Displays significant lack of commitment (with doubt as to the extent to which would translate into contractual terms)
 |
| 0 | An Unacceptable Tenderer response that (where applicable):* Provides no response or omissions/oversights that prevent scoring;
* Refuses to deliver the requirement; and
* Creates concerns so significant that the response would be detrimental to the interests of RSSB
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Award criteria** | **Detail and Evaluation Criteria** | **Weighting**  |
| **W1** Summary of proposal[Max 1 page] | Tenderers should outline their ability to concisely summarise key aspects of their proposal. The information will be used by RSSB to contextualise the tenderer’s response. The tenderer’s response shall be evaluated on the following criteria within the maximum stated page limit:* The tenderer has clearly outlined their understanding of the project’s objectives and outputs;
* The tenderer has summarised their proposal (excluding any pricing information), outlining how it shall clearly address the project’s objectives and outputs.
 | N/A(For information only) |
| **W2** Supplier’s understanding and methodology[Max 4 pages] | Tenderers should clearly outline their understanding and methodology to carry out the required works defined in the project specification.The tenderer’s response shall be evaluated on the following criteria within the maximum stated page limit:* The tenderer clearly demonstrates their understanding of each of the project objectives and outputs;
* The tenderer establishes and presents a clear and appropriate methodology to address each of the project objectives and to deliver each of the project outputs, detailing how it shall commit to ensuring the project and outputs are delivered to a sufficient quality;
* The tenderer presents a viable and practical approach to:
	+ Identify a list of goals required from a low adhesion driving policies
	+ Assess how these goals relate to one another and the trade-off between them
	+ Group the goals relative to different types of train and operators that are different in nature
	+ Identify the goals of current driving instructions
	+ Assess the extent and confidence to which operators believe those goals are achieved
	+ Assess the variability of driving instructions across comparable operators
	+ Compare driving instructions against wider driving policies
	+ Assess how organisational culture is embedded in organisational policies related to safety events (e.g., SPADs and station overruns) and close calls
* The tenderer addresses the success criteria in order to ensure successful project delivery and increased likelihood of industry implementation
 | 30% |
| **W3** Individual expertise[Max 4 pages] | Tenderers should clearly outline how their individual expertise can directly address the required works defined in the project specification.The tenderer’s response shall be evaluated on the following criteria within the maximum stated page limit:* The tenderer outlines relevant activities undertaken by named individuals within their organisation, that demonstrates suitable experience to meet the project requirements, notably individuals will need to demonstrate they have the following expertise and experience:
	+ Understanding of how to enable cultural change in GB rail
	+ Good understanding of train driving requirements including train driving polices. Experience in train driving is desirable but not essential
	+ Good understanding of railway operations with front-line experience
	+ Has experience with a Railway Undertaking (i.e., a TOC, FOC or OTM)
	+ Good understanding of train service performance management and systems
	+ Good understanding of safety management and systems
	+ Has a high enough standing within the industry to work with range of experienced staff
	+ Understanding of project management processes
	+ Ability to communicate well verbally and in writing
* The tenderer demonstrates what capabilities individual project team members will bring and how this shall contribute to successfully meeting the project’s objectives and outputs. To support RSSB’s evaluation, the tenderer shall provide a one-page CV for each key project member within an appendix.
	+ **The tenderer must not provide any team members or CVs unless that person is expected to have a role in the project**
 | 30% |
| **W4** Project management: Planning and engagement[Max 4 pages] | Tenderers should outline the processes and resources it proposes to use in order to fulfil RSSB’s requirements.The tender’s response shall be evaluated on the following criteria within the maximum stated page limit:* The tenderer provides adequate allocation of resource to successfully deliver outcomes to time, cost, and quality[[8]](#footnote-9). To support RSSB’s evaluation, the tenderer shall provide:
	+ A Gantt chart detailing key tasks and timeframes
	+ A resource table that details task, role, name, and effort (in days). The table should include total effort (in days).
* The tenderer provides a clear engagement plan detailing:
	+ Which stakeholders it intends to engage with
	+ When (and how) it intends to engage with stakeholders
	+ What input it shall seek from stakeholders
		- A ranking of stakeholders by order of priority, outlining how the stakeholders will have impact on successful delivery of the project.
 | 20% |
| **W5** Risks and opportunities[Max 2 pages] | Using the RSSB supplied ‘Risk and Opportunity register templates and guidance’, tenderers should detail what risks and opportunities[[9]](#footnote-10) are foreseen in the delivery of the project.The tenderer’s response shall be evaluated on the following criteria within the maximum stated page limit:* For each risk, the tenderer shall detail:
	+ Description of the impact and probability of the risk if unmitigated
	+ Impact of the risk on Time, Quality and Cost (scored out of 5)
	+ Likelihood of the risk occurring (scored out of 5)
	+ Provide a risk rating (impact \* likelihood)
	+ Actions to address probability and impact of the risk; and revised risk rating with mitigation in place
	+ Actions to be taken should the risk be realised
	+ Specific individual ultimately responsible for the risk control
* For each opportunity, the tenderer shall detail:
	+ Description of the opportunity
	+ The benefits of realising the opportunity on project Time, Quality and Cost
	+ Actions to be taken to support the opportunity being realised
	+ Specific individual ultimately responsible for the opportunity

Please note: Tenderers must not use their own template for this section. | 10% |
| **W6** Cost of project | Tenderers should provide a fixed cost for the project and the associated cost break down.The tender with the lowest total cost will receive 100% of the available weighted score ([#%]). Other tenderers will receive a pro-rated score relative to the lowest cost according to the following formula:* Score of other tender = lowest tender total cost / other tender total cost x [%].
 | [10]% |

1. Procurement timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Start Date** |
| Supplier engagement meeting (if applicable) | 03/05/22 10:30-12:00 |
| Request for proposal issued on Delta eSourcing | 13/05/2022 |
| Supplier clarification questions deadline  | 03/06/2022; 14:00 hours |
| **Deadline for Submitting tenders** | **10/06/2022; 14:00 hours** |
| Evaluation and moderation | w/c 13/06/2022 |
| Estimated notification of award decision | w/e 24/06/2022 |
| Target contract commencement date | w/c 04/07/2022 |

Note: RSSB reserves the right to amend these dates as business requirements demand and will communicate any changes to tenderers.

1. https://www.rssb.co.uk/en/research-catalogue/CatalogueItem/T1181 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [ADHERE: Low adhesion driving policies (T1221) (rssb.co.uk)](https://www.rssb.co.uk/research-catalogue/CatalogueItem/T1221) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Ahead of the project commencing work, RSSB will acquire as many Professional Driving Policies and supporting documentation as it can from TOCs, FOCs and OTM operators. RSSB has to date acquired documentation from 14 TOCs (34 documents and 1 video); 3 FOCs (6 documents); and 4 OTM operators (5 documents). The documentation shall be shared with the awarded supplier ahead of the project commencing work (for clarification, the documentation shall not be shared with tenderers during the tendering stage). The supplier shall be responsible for acquiring any additional documentation and for arranging discussions with operators. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Fair culture [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. At RSSB’s discretion [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. To be decided by RSSB [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. A maximum of 10 individuals in total [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. For clarity, ‘quality’ is defined as the delivery of robust outputs that successfully meet the project’s objectives [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. For clarity, ‘opportunities’ is defined as an upside, beneficial source of risk [↑](#footnote-ref-10)