

## RDG Good Practice Guide: Planning for and Responding to Passengers Stranded on Trains

RDG-OPS-GPG-049  
Issue 1 – August 2025



*Photo courtesy of Richard Davies*

## About this document

### Explanatory note

The Rail Delivery Group is not a regulatory body and compliance with Guidance Notes, Approved Codes of Practice and Good Practice Guides is not mandatory; they reflect good practice and are advisory only. Users are recommended to evaluate the guidance against their own arrangements in a structured and systematic way, noting that parts of the guidance may not be appropriate to their operations. Compliance with any or all of the contents herein, is entirely at an organisation's own discretion.

Other Guidance Notes and Approved Codes of Practice are available on the [Rail Delivery Group \(RDG\) website](#). Additional information relating to planning for and responding to passengers stranded on trains can also be found on the [Stranded Passengers on Trains SharePoint site](#).

### Executive summary

This Good Practice Guide is intended to assist transport undertakings and infrastructure managers both in delivering the recommendations contained in Network Rail and RDG Guidance Note RDG-OPS-GN-049: Meeting the Needs of Passengers Stranded on Trains and in responding to the results of associated Passengers Stranded on Trains Maturity Assessments.

### Issue record

Issue	Date	Comments
1	August 2025	New document

This document is not subject to a regular periodic review but will be updated as and when required.

#### Document owner:

**Peter Lovegrove**  
Operational Resilience Manager |  
Rail Delivery Group

#### Authorised by:

**Dean Johnson**  
Operational Resilience, Policing &  
Security Portfolio Manager, Rail  
Delivery Group  
Chair of Meeting the Needs of  
Passengers Stranded on Trains  
T&FG

#### Prepared by:

**Louise Elstow**  
Director and Principal Consultant |  
Fynbos Consulting Limited

# Contents

About this document .....	2
Explanatory note .....	2
Executive summary .....	2
Issue record .....	2
Contents .....	3
1 Introduction, purpose and scope .....	4
1.1 Introduction .....	4
1.2 Purpose .....	4
1.3 Scope .....	4
2 Other sources of information and advice .....	4
3 Definitions .....	5
4 Format .....	5
5 Good practice guidance .....	5
0. Documentation .....	5
1. Internal Collaboration .....	6
2. Industry Collaboration .....	6
3. External Collaboration .....	7
4. Embedded in response arrangements .....	7
5. Underpinning evidence and assessments .....	8
6. Generic information .....	8
7. Training .....	9
8. Competency Management .....	10
9. Validating the Protocol .....	10
10. Reviewing and Learning .....	11
11. The Initial Response .....	11
12. Roles and Responsibilities .....	12
13. Command and Control Structures .....	12
14. Activating and triggering appropriate arrangements .....	12
15. Priorities .....	13
16. Gathering information .....	13
17. Risk Assessment .....	13
18. Decision Making .....	14
19. Developing the tactical plan .....	14
20. Sharing the tactical plan with responders .....	14
21. Implementing the tactical plan .....	15
22. Engaging with Passengers .....	16
23. Providing immediate aftercare and compensation .....	17

# 1 Introduction, purpose and scope

## 1.1 Introduction

Incidents in which passengers become stranded on trains present risks to their health, safety, security and general welfare, and give rise to inconvenience, frustration and discomfort. The rail industry should take the initiative in managing such situations in such a way as to meet their reasonable needs but also demonstrate competence, care and control.

A major review of the existing guidance relating to passengers stranded on trains was undertaken in 2024, triggered in part by a number of high profile incidents and also the findings from independent research jointly commissioned by the ORR and Transport Focus and undertaken by Steer. The existing Guidance Note (Network Rail and RDG Guidance Note RDG-OPS-GN-049: Meeting the Needs of Passengers Stranded on Trains) was restructured and expanded and a new RM3 based Passengers Stranded on Trains Maturity Assessment Tool developed. It was also agreed that this document - a new Good Practice Guide – should be developed to complement the Guidance Note and Tool.

## 1.2 Purpose

This Good Practice Guide (GPG) is intended to be used in conjunction with the *Network Rail and RDG Guidance Note [RDG-OPS-GN-049: Meeting the Needs of Passengers Stranded on Trains](#)* and its associated *Passengers Stranded on Trains Maturity Assessment Tool*. Whilst GN-049 provides descriptions of what to aim for and factors to take into account when responding to an incident involving passengers being stranded on a train, this GPG provides succinct examples of good practice for HOW to reflect the principles set out in GN-049. This involves developing a capability to respond to such incidents and associated documents and arrangements that enable a consistent approach to be delivered in line with those principles.

The *Maturity Assessment Tool* is set out in roughly chronological order, i.e. planning for incidents involving passengers becoming stranded on trains and developing an appropriate capability, comes before the overview of the intended response. The Tool has 24 sections, each of which assesses a specific element of planning, preparation and response, and this GPG follows the same format. This means that organisations which have identified areas of weakness in their response to incidents involving stranded passengers either during an incident or through completion of a Maturity Assessment, can easily use this GPG to determine how to improve against specific criteria.

## 1.3 Scope

This GPG has been prepared for both passenger transport undertaking members of RDG and Network Rail. However, its content may also be of use or interest to others.

# 2 Other sources of information and advice

The following documents include content that is relevant to the management of stranded trains and the passengers on them. Where appropriate, specific cross-references are provided within the text of this Good Practice Guide.

- **RDG and Network Rail Guidance Note RDG-OPS-GN-049: Meeting the Needs of Passengers Stranded on Trains.** Referred to henceforth in this document as GN-049, this guide provides a description of what is expected when responding to an incident involving actual or the potential for stranded passengers.
- **Passengers Stranded on Trains: Maturity Assessment Tool.** Referred to henceforth in this document as Maturity Assessment Tool, this is a spreadsheet-based tool. It enables organisations (either internally or by a third party) to assess their arrangements for responding to incidents involving actual or the potential for stranded passengers, against the principles set out in GN-049.

- **Network Rail's National Operating Procedures (NOP): Procedure 4.15. Managing Stranded Passengers and Train Evacuation.**

## 3 Definitions

A full list of relevant definitions can be found in Section 4 of GN-049.

## 4 Format

The structure of this GPG aligns with that of the assessment criteria provided in the Maturity Assessment Tool. For each assessment criteria area, a description of what is expected is provided, along with examples of good practice (and in some cases, practice to avoid), identified during an initial round of maturity assessments undertaken in 2024 and 2025 with operators and infrastructure managers. There are 24 sections (0-23).

## 5 Good practice guidance

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>0. Documentation</b>	<p>The organisation has arrangements and processes in place for managing incidents involving passengers stranded on trains (PSOT),</p> <p>These processes are documented in the organisation's Passengers Stranded On Trains Protocol (or similarly named document) – hereafter 'the Protocol'<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>The Protocol has a clear owner (or owners if across more than one organisation). The owner may delegate responsibility for development and maintenance of the Protocol to other members of staff, but is responsible for assurance that it is fit for purpose and could be enacted in practice.</p> <p>The Protocol has version control and has been updated within a reasonable period of time.</p> <p>It is clear which parts of which organisations the Protocol applies to.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> ensure that there is a specific PSOT Protocol in place, ideally jointly developed between operators and infrastructure managers, and that the Protocol forms a coherent and recognised part of the organisation's wider incident response arrangements, given that many different kinds of incidents on the rail network have the potential to involve passengers stranded on trains.</p> <p>In order to have a coherent set of arrangements for responding to PSOT incidents, it is good practice to document the approach in a single document, rather than distribute these arrangements across multiple documents – doing so risks producing a siloed approach.</p> <p>Recently undertaken maturity assessments suggest that significant effort has been made in updating PSOT response arrangements in recent months. Organisations which had joint plans agreed between one or more operator(s) and the infrastructure manager(s) presented a coherent and consistently joined up approach to PSOT incidents. This is more easily achieved if the organisations' Controls are co-located.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The GPG recognises that any organisation may have more than one document to support their PSOT incident response, but for ease, this GPG uses the term 'Protocol' in the singular to refer to any documents specifically in place to support the response to PSOT.

		Assessed organisations cited a range of adjacent documents, plans and policies that support the implementation of the PSOT Protocol – this included not just the standard items specifically noted in the assessment tool, but also standards for Crisis Management, Incident Learning and Review Procedures.
--	--	---

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>1. Internal Collaboration</b>	The Protocol has been developed and reviewed with direct input from the organisation's (or organisations', in the event that the plan is joint) functions and teams who would be directly involved in its implementation of a response to a PSOT incident.	<p><b>It is good practice for</b> organisations to involve internal partners in the construction of any new PSOT Protocol – rather than just asking for feedback on an existing draft document.</p> <p>Not all parts of the organisation will need to input equally into the Protocol, and so the approach may flex depending on the level of input required. The level of input required into informing the Protocol should reflect the team's level of input into the response to a PSOT incident.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>2. Industry Collaboration</b>	<p>The Protocol has been developed and reviewed in consultation with rail industry partners who are likely to be involved as additional external partners in a PSOT incident, and any feedback incorporated. This includes TOCs, infrastructure managers, FOCs.</p> <p>BTP is normally included as a rail industry partner, but would otherwise also be picked up in 'external collaboration' below. The key point is that they should be involved!</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> involve rail industry partners in the development of the PSOT Protocol, so plans covering different geographic areas / organisations become aligned.</p> <p>GN-049 and Network Rail's NOP 4.15 encourage this alignment at a national level, but there will always be a challenge for operators who work across multiple routes and regions, as they may need multiple PSOT Protocols to be in place to cover different sections.</p> <p>The initial assessments highlighted that organisations do not tend to engage with FOCs on PSOT arrangements. However, FOCs may need to be aware of arrangements in order to avoid becoming stranded themselves. They may be part of the plan to help recover stranded trains (as is the case with GTS, formerly MTREL).</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>3. External Collaboration</b>	<p>The Protocol has been shared with external agencies and organisations who are likely to be involved as external partners in a PSOT incident, and any feedback incorporated.</p> <p>BTP is normally included as a rail industry partner above, but would otherwise also be picked up in here. The key point is that they should be involved in developing and agreeing an appropriate protocol!</p> <p>There is an existing arrangement for collaborating and sharing information before, during and after incidents, with the emergency services.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to consider the appropriate level of involvement with external partners in drafting the Protocol – for some organisations this may just be sharing the document with them for feedback, for others, it may be prudent to take a more active engagement with them.</p> <p>Engaging with BTP is the most likely external collaboration needed, but fire service colleagues are critical to any rescue operation, medical colleagues from the ambulance service would be involved in any medical emergency, and local authorities may be involved in supporting an evacuation or shelter (depending on the location and scale of the incident). Other response agencies may be required and so if the Protocol involves expectations of action by other organisations – it is good practice to check with them that your expectations align with theirs.</p> <p>This also links directly to involving external partners in training and exercising opportunities and post incident reviews.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>4. Embedded in response arrangements</b>	<p>The Protocol is not a standalone document, but links into and is cross-referenced between key documents and arrangements which provide the basic response to incidents in general. This includes arrangements for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine incident management (e.g. articulated in Control Manual),</li> <li>• Major incident management (e.g. articulated in Major Incident Plan)</li> <li>• Ad hoc special events management (e.g. arrangements for providing additional services for sports, music or other leisure events).</li> </ul>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to ensure that there are clear links and signposting between the PSOT Protocol and other key documents, and to ensure that these linked documents had also recently been reviewed to ensure that they align to the updated principles from GN-049 and the organisation's updated Protocol. These reviews should be ongoing and periodic to ensure that the Protocol continues to evolve alongside changes to GN-049 and wider learning.</p> <p>SouthEastern has incorporated PSOT thinking into event planning and prep for events such as those taking place at Dreamland in Margate, for the London Marathon and for match days at West Ham in Stratford - high profile music and sporting events. This includes key considerations for crowd management at stations, keeping people moving (avoiding stranded passengers) and whole journey experiences. They also have weekly Monday morning meetings to discuss seasonal arrangements in their '<b>Summer Plan</b>' - forward looking temp, key events, a review of recent events, staffing levels etc.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>5. Underpinning evidence and assessments</b>	<p>Before developing their Protocol the organisation has gained an understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A risk-based needs for emergency equipment to support a PSOT response,</li> <li>• The rolling stock in use by the organisation and how its configuration and functionality will impact how any PSOT incident response is managed (e.g. to provide heating, cooling, ventilation, lighting, toilets, refreshments, etc.)</li> <li>• The key roles for PSOT incident response outlined in GN-049 and how these could be fulfilled by the organisation.</li> <li>• An understanding of stations (and their functionality and staffing), access points and diversionary routes that could support a PSOT incident response.</li> </ul>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to begin by reviewing the resources and challenges that your organisation faces in relation to PSOT incidents before constructing the plan and processes outlined in the Protocol.</p> <p>Having an understanding of this baseline information helps ensure that equipment needed to support a PSOT response is appropriate and located in the right place(s), that PSOT roles are allocated to the right members of staff, that the right processes are developed to get people and equipment to the right place and that there is a baseline of information about the risks and opportunities each type of fleet can pose to a PSOT response. Risks need to be considered together.</p> <p><i>As an example:</i> Trains operating in metropolitan areas may not have any toilets. The higher risk to passenger welfare that this poses is offset to some degree by the increased likelihood of being able to detrain at a station and for alternative onward travel to be provided. Unfortunately, this is also coupled with a higher uncontrolled evacuation risk (as people are more likely to be able to see a station that they might try to reach by their own means) and low staffing levels mean that there are fewer staff members onboard to assist the response.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>6. Generic information</b>	<p>The Protocol includes basic information about general resources that could be used to support a PSOT incident response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fleet specifications and how to best to manage a PSOT incident to best effect given the specifications involved.</li> <li>• Equipment available to support PSOT incident response and its location</li> <li>• Key roles activated in a PSOT incident (in conjunction with generic incident management roles)</li> <li>• Key infrastructure and access points to support a PSOT incident.</li> </ul>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to ensure that key background information about fleet, staff, equipment and infrastructure - identified during the initial assessments (see above) - is readily available to those who need it. This could be provided in a simple table in the Protocol or an organisation might link from the Protocol to digital information sources which link to live information.</p> <p><i>GTS (formerly MTREL) includes some of this information within a live platform as part of their <b>Crew Displacement Management Tool</b>, and generic arrangements for providing emergency accommodation are covered under existing major incident response arrangements.</i></p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<p><b>7. Training</b></p>	<p>The organisation identifies and provides appropriate levels of training for all staff who are responsible for implementing the arrangements documented in the Protocol.</p> <p>These staff are aware of and able to undertake their roles and responsibilities, understand the roles of others that they would interface with, are able to locate and use any resources to allow them to fulfil their role (e.g. equipment or supplies).</p> <p>Staff with a role in PSOT incidents know how to identify key risk factors that might lead to additional stranded trains or uncontrolled evacuations.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to develop a programme which delivers an appropriate level of initial and ongoing training to all staff likely to be involved PSOT incident response.</p> <p>Transport for Wales recently did 9 days of training on stranded passenger arrangements, delivered to 380 staff, the majority of them Network Rail and TfW Control room staff. The mornings of those sessions were taken up with <b>briefings on the new guidance notes on stranded trains and the various options outlined in those arrangements</b>. In the afternoon they worked through different scenarios alongside partner agencies.</p> <p>Training could be standalone or in some cases, it might be necessary to incorporate PSOT response training into other existing training courses/programmes, such as Crisis Management, Leadership, RIO, TOLO or MOM training.</p> <p>Recent maturity assessments highlighted that in many organisations, those in safety critical roles were provided with more rigorous PSOT training than on-call staff or station staff, whose training was based on a mentoring or less rigorously confirmed approach. It is good practice to ensure a robust level of training is provided to all involved in a PSOT response.</p> <p>If organisations developed training packages and processes which were consistently applied either regionally or nationally, this could combat the employee ‘churn’ which contributes to a loss of organisational knowledge and experience for the organisation they are leaving, and a new expense for the recruiting organisation which then has to retrain them – having industry approaches to PSOT should reduce the need to retrain people every time they move organisations, as people will need less ‘new PSOT training’ (as it has done with other areas of incident response, e.g. <b>Incident Care Team training</b>)</p> <p><b>It is good practice</b> to incorporate PSOT into regular exercising programmes and to include different stranded train/passenger scenarios.</p> <p>In order to ensure that practicing opportunities are made available to the greatest number of people, it can be useful to provide a mixture of live exercises, table top exercises and shorter evacuation drills, as this will help ensure that all different PSOT Protocol roles are exercised. Live exercises can be expensive to run and can be resource intensive to organise, so it can be tricky to provide meaningful exercising opportunities for a large cohort. Consider working with other rail partners to put on joint exercises.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>8. Competency Management</b>	<p>The organisation has systems in place to ensure that staff PSOT training is relevant, appropriate and delivered and assessed by appropriately trained trainers/assessors.</p> <p>Staff receive initial and refresher training appropriate to their role and within a reasonable timeframe (e.g. annually), and their skills and competencies are validated through practical opportunities (e.g. exercises and practice drills).</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to incorporate PSOT into the organisation's competency management system (CMS), so that the organisation has a record of what training people have received and to gain assurance that this is being maintained over time.</p> <p>Staff with key safety critical roles (e.g. Control Room Staff, Drivers etc) competencies in relation to PSOT responses are routinely maintained and monitored through the CMS. Nearly all organisations noted that training and assessments identified that staff working in on-call incident response roles or staff in stations may not have had such a rigorous initial training process or ongoing review process. It is good practice to ensure a robust review of competency is maintained in relation to <u>all</u> involved in a PSOT response.</p> <p>Greater Anglia use a <b>learning management system</b>, with online videos and e-learning elements and which includes content on equality and managing vulnerabilities. The exercises also involve multiple functions in the organisation and external agencies – so that the exercise reflects the reality of responding alongside other agencies.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>9. Validating the Protocol</b>	<p>The Protocol has been validated to ensure that it is fit for purpose and that the organisation has the resources and competencies in place to deliver it in practice. Validation activity involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation and reviews following incidents and exercises.</li> <li>• Inviting internal partners, rail industry partners and non-rail industry external partners to review it.</li> <li>• Using a range of scenarios with different features, passengers, times of day/year and trains involved as the basis for exercises. These range from a simple single train incident to a complex multi-train incident.</li> <li>• Opportunities to participate in exercises are distributed equitably across staff.</li> </ul>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to validate the Protocol in advance of it being implemented and used, although this may not be possible in the same way for minor amendments to the Protocol that are identified during reviews.</p> <p>It appears that many organisations are validating their plans only after their publication.</p> <p>Greater Anglia have <b>designed a set of 4 scenarios</b> that they are using in a programme of exercises this year. Each will cover a different kind of PSOT incident to ensure validation of their plans and arrangements in different kinds of incidents.</p> <p>Transport for Wales incorporated validation and exercising with multi-agency partners into their training and briefing for stranded passenger incidents. Following on from training in the morning they invited more people to <b>afternoon exercises covering various scenarios</b>. Participation included on call elements, BTP Home Office police, the Welsh Ambulance Service Trust and South Wales Fire and Rescue. They reported that it was a really useful way to see incidents from the time of reporting from train crews through to through to the signaller and control rooms, to see the whole process unfold for everybody.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>10. Reviewing and Learning</b>	<p>The Protocol, and the arrangements it describes, are reviewed and updated on a regular basis to ensure that they remain fit for purpose and that practice aligns with the Protocol. Such reviews are informed by regulatory changes and learning from incidents and exercises (including those experienced by other organisations),</p> <p>Reviews occur within pre-defined reasonable timeframes and on an ad hoc basis where necessary.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> set a regular review date for the Protocol and for this to be written in Version Control in the document (or included in the organisation's policy management system).</p> <p>Within those organisations who were assessed, all had updated their PSOT Protocols and arrangements within the previous 6 months. There were multiple reasons for this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Regulator (Office for Rail and Road) wrote out to all TOC and NR MDs on the matter</li> <li>• RDG has been driving a cross-industry group looking at PSOT since mid 2024</li> <li>• Industry research (conducted by ORR and Transport Focus) has suggested the response must improve</li> <li>• One organisation had already begun to update their arrangements after a serious stranding event in late 2023.</li> </ul> <p><b>It is good practice to</b> learn from recent incident responses and keep documents and practices updated accordingly. <i>GTS (formerly MTREL) have a daily conference at 1430 - all operational directorates are involved. In this they look at any declared stranded trains – their approach is to declare early and stand down, so they are often stood down within 10 mins. They will cover in more derail anything that took over 30 mins to resolve in the call and anything that is clearly not managed well or is a multiple train event – is subject to a formal review within 7 days.</i></p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>11. The Initial Response</b>	<p>The organisation uses GN-049 definitions of Stranded Train and Passengers Stranded on Trains, is able to identify potentially stranded trains and take steps to avoid this from taking place. It also differentiates between 'rescued' and 'evacuated' passengers using GN-049 definitions.</p> <p>Once a PSOT incident is identified, the Protocol is triggered and a record of the start time of the PSOT incident is made in order to monitor achievement of the 15-30-60-90 timeline targets set out in GN-049.</p>	<p>It is good practice to align with the expectations set out in GN-049, in particular the key terms, key roles and key timings. In consistent application of terms, roles and timings has the potential for confusion with other partners who may interface with multiple rail industry organisations and may struggle to decipher different approaches which deviate from those in GN-049. However, GN-049 is a guidance note and not a standard.</p> <p>The recent assessments highlighted that most, but not all organisations used these terms in ways consistent with the descriptions in GN-049.</p> <p><i>GTS's (formerly MTREL) CMDT system has an automatic countdown system in it to aid in time keeping.</i></p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>12. Roles and Responsibilities</b>	<p>The Protocol includes the roles and responsibilities necessary to enact a PSOT response and these are aligned to those in GN-049, including key leadership and decision-making roles such as the Stranded Passengers Champion (TOC role) and Stranded Trains Champion (infrastructure manager role).</p> <p>The Stranded Passengers Champion(s) and the Stranded Trains Champion work together during the incident to gather information, assess risks, agree priorities and make key decisions.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> for organisations who adopt the two distinct ‘Champion’ roles, to use ‘Stranded Trains Champion’ (for infrastructure managers) or ‘Stranded Passengers Champion’ (for passenger operators) titles where possible. Doing this will mean that they are consistent with a national approach. It avoids confusion about the focus of the infrastructure manager vs the passenger train operator.</p> <p>The role Stranded Passenger Champion existed previously, but the most recent version of GN-049, added a distinction between a champion for passengers and a champion for trains.</p> <p>The ‘Champion’ roles have been widely adopted within the rail industry. It is recognised that changing existing role names can be challenging when these are woven through company training and documentation.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>13. Command and Control Structures</b>	<p>The Protocol outlines a clear organisational structure for responding to PSOT incidents. This incident response structure is scalable to be able to respond to incidents of different scales and types.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to ensure that PSOT command and control structures build off routine incident management structures and roles, so that the PSOT response can work alongside and within, rather than sit separate from normal incident response structures.</p> <p>Transport undertaking and infrastructure manager organisations who are co-located and who have co-created joint plans are likely to find a coherent and collaborative response to a PSOT incident management easier to achieve.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>14. Activating and triggering appropriate arrangements</b>	<p>The Protocol is activated as soon as the potential for a PSOT incident is identified and guides the intended response (in conjunction with basic incident response arrangements described elsewhere), and includes appropriate triggers for activating a Major Incident response.</p> <p>The Protocol describes an outline process to follow, and details about how and when to activate partners (from elsewhere within the rail industry and external emergency responders) and the kinds of assistance they could provide in a PSOT.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> to develop positive working relationships and exercise together with emergency services and other external responders as part of their Major Incident and routine incident management plans.</p> <p>Organisations can benefit from the increased positive working relationships with those partners during PSOT incidents because clear lines of communication are open and each organisation develops trust in and an understanding of other response organisations’ priorities, concerns and likely actions, before a PSOT incident.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>15. Priorities</b>	The Protocol describes a set of PSOT priorities which align to those listed in GN-049, section 5.2, and it is clear which priority takes precedence in the event they are in conflict with one another.	<p><b>It is good practice</b> for PSOT principles to be clearly and concisely worded, rather than just implied, within the Protocol.</p> <p>The priorities in GN-049 have been consistently adopted, which has caused a shift in the mindset in both passenger operators and also infrastructure managers, so that ‘think passenger’ has become key to both. Some organisations noted that there is sometimes a lag in the adoption of this mindset in Control and fleet staff, who have historically been ‘think train’ focused.</p> <p>The Assessments highlighted that the Emergency Services will often ask for an electrical isolation in order to comply with their own risk assessments before attending a trackside scene, but this can have significant impacts on service delivery.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>16. Gathering information</b>	The Protocol describes a range of factors about the incident which will be important to understand (e.g. train characteristics, external environmental factors, internal environmental factors, uncontrolled evacuation factors, passenger demographics and vulnerability factors, staffing, specialist resources and equipment availability). The Protocol is clear what relevance these factors have to a PSOT and why it is important that they be considered.	<b>It is good practice</b> for organisations to have tables of this information to refer to as a checklist of considerations during their risk assessment process – so that it is clear what relevance it has to a PSOT incident and how this factor could be assessed.

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>17. Risk Assessment</b>	<p>The organisation has in place a PSOT Risk Assessment process/tool, which incorporates consideration of all the factors (listed above) and this is used by the Stranded Passengers and Stranded Trains Champions in their decision-making process and in determining the most appropriate tactical plan to resolve the incident.</p> <p>Risk assessments are undertaken as soon as possible and updated as the situation evolves. Records of the risk assessments are kept.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> for organisation to use some kind of data gathering tool to assist in the risk assessment process and its recording.</p> <p>Network Rail’s Kent Route is developing a partially automated <b>PSOT Risk Assessment Tool</b>, for use by their Control room managers and which is pre-populated with risk scores for different factors. The tool accounts for multiple trains being involved and is based on an Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>GTS (formerly MTREL) has a ‘stranded trains’ element within its web-based <b>Crew Displacement Management Tool</b>. It pre-populates a stranded trains risk assessment - loading data, W3W locations, status of train equipment and functioning (heating, lighting etc), driver name and status (how long have been on shift).</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>18. Decision Making</b>	<p>The Protocol outlines the key decisions that will need to be made in a PSOT incident, aligned to section 10.3 of GN-049, and describes who is responsible for making these decisions.</p> <p>As with risk assessments, records of any key decisions made are kept, with sufficient detail about the options considered and the reason for choosing the option selected.</p> <p>The Protocol describes how to resolve a situation where there are conflicting views about how to proceed between the Stranded Passengers and Train Champions and other organisations (e.g. BTP).</p>	<p><b>It is good practice</b> for organisations to have a decision-making record template available, which prompts the person recording the decision to note the relevant details.</p> <p>It is likely that this kind of record keeping tool may be linked to existing logging systems (e.g. CCIL), and may also be used to record the details of decisions made which are not specifically related to PSOT incidents (e.g. are in place for all major incident decision making).</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>19. Developing the tactical plan</b>	<p>The Protocol outlines the need to make any tactical plan to respond to a PSOT (hereafter the Tactical Plan) in conjunction with other relevant responders (from the rail industry, emergency services and other external responders) whose advice should be incorporated into the agreed response.</p> <p>The Protocol includes a hierarchy of options for resolving a PSOT incident, aligned to section 10.2 of GN-049, and confirms that unless there is a high level of confidence that evacuation is not going to be needed, evacuation should always be considered as a potential option and planned for accordingly, and that at least one back up plan should be developed, in case the preferred option cannot be enacted.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> ensure that the Tactical Plan is developed collaboratively, that it incorporates all relevant current understandings about the incident and current risk profile, that it is communicated effectively and that it is updated as needed in the event that the situation changes.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>20. Sharing the tactical plan with responders</b>	<p>The Protocol (or aligned documents describing information sharing during incidents) describes needing to share the Tactical Plan with those who will need to enact it. These include rail partners, emergency services and other responding agencies.</p> <p>METHANE messages should be used to form part of the initial information passed on.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> ensure that generic arrangements for sharing information about any tactical incident response plan on the day are robust and that there are open routes to communicate with staff and other agencies (both inside the rail industry and external response agencies). These lines of communication are best forged before a PSOT incident as part of general stakeholder engagement activity so that trust and knowledge of each other's general approaches are already well established.</p>

	<p>The Protocol describes an expectation that the Tactical Plan includes information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How and when it will be enacted (and if involving multiple trains, in what order)</li> <li>• Which resources (staff and equipment) are deployed to which train, and to which version of the plan (Plan A or contingency Plan B)</li> <li>• How the basic needs of all passengers stranded on trains will be met, and on each train involved – this includes meeting the needs of those with additional support needs – until they cease to be classed as stranded (including but not limited to access to functioning toilets, refreshments, communication, onward travel, accommodation etc).</li> <li>• Any additional support the emergency services need for to be able to enact their part of the response.</li> <li>• What is happening with passenger luggage.</li> <li>• What to do in the event of an uncontrolled evacuation.</li> </ul>	<p>This is exemplified by using terminology that other agencies are familiar with, avoiding the use of jargon and incorporating common interoperability tools (such as METHANE and JESIP).</p> <p>Good practice would be for an agreed template tactical plan to be developed by and used by the industry. This is not yet available – however this is something that could be developed by collective effort within the industry.</p>
--	---	--

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>21. Implementing the tactical plan</b>	<p>The 15-30-60-90 principle for evacuation set out in GN-049 informs the implementation of the Tactical Plan, and the Protocol takes the approach that it is better to stand down a response if not needed, than to stand up a PSOT approach too late.</p> <p>The Tactical Plan will only be implemented once pre-conditions (section 12.3 of GN-049) have been met.</p> <p>The Tactical Plan is expected to be reviewed on a regular basis to monitor its implementation against anticipated timescales and progress, and the Duty of Care for passengers continues until they cease to be Stranded (as defined in GN-049).</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> go early in activating the PSOT Protocol and stand it down soon. Although this will obviously result in more incidents being recorded, it should mean that those which cannot be resolved within a short period of time (e.g. 5-10 mins) are resolved more effectively and efficiently and with the least impact on passengers overall.</p> <p>The template tactical PSOT response plan could include the list of preconditions and spaces to record reviews of progress during the implementation and a record of the incident response being determined as complete. This kind of data could contribute to improvements in data collection in the long run and could therefore result in targeted interventions that address specific challenges that occur frequently in reported cases.</p>

Section	What does good look like?	Additional comments or examples of GP
<b>22. Engaging with Passengers</b>	<p>Information will be shared with Passengers about the PSOT incident using an appropriate communications method and will sufficient detail about the reason for the PSOT incident and the current plan for resolving it.</p> <p>Passengers with additional support needs are identified by trained staff, and the means by which these needs will be met are shared with those passengers.</p> <p>Once a Tactical Plan has been developed, appropriate detail to meet passenger needs will be shared with them in an open and proactive manner. Instructions on what to do with luggage and about accommodation will be provided, if necessary and to those affected.</p> <p>The Protocol describes when it will be necessary to collate passenger details, and how this will be done.</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> consider the different options that an organisation has to support communication to and support for passengers – this will differ depending on how compact an organisation’s geographic coverage is, support staff available and where they are located, and also fleet configuration and staffing levels.</p> <p>This is an area of development in the industry and continues to evolve.</p> <p>Whilst industry guidance suggests that Incident Care Team deployment <u>may not be appropriate for smaller and more routine incidents involving stranded passenger</u> (which are likely to require a more customer service focused response), organisations may wish to include or consider using ICTs for more complex stranded passenger responses where there are concerns about passenger welfare and where the passenger needs are aligned with the humanitarian response ICTs are trained and equipped to provide.</p> <p><b>SouthEastern uses their Incident Care Team to support the response to some PSOT incidents, in particular in passenger care and welfare provision after evacuation has taken place.</b></p> <p><b>GST (formerly MTREL) have an onboard volunteer leaflet</b> that provides supporting guidance on how to help during an incident. The leaflet is aimed at off duty railway employees or emergency services who could support those with additional needs in particular. This is more of an issue for their services as they are all Driver-Only Operation, and therefore there are no mobile onboard staff to support the driver.</p> <p>It is worth noting that there is no single one-size-fits-all solution to providing sufficient staff for passenger engagement. The specific requirements will be defined at the time of an incident and will differ depending on passenger needs and vulnerabilities, as well as the location and time of the incident, and the nature of the trains involved. There may be legal aspects to using non-standard staffing arrangements in terms of competence, liabilities etc. which an organisation will need to address if using a non-standard approach.</p>

<i>Section</i>	<i>What does good look like?</i>	<i>Additional comments or examples of GP</i>
<b>23. Providing immediate aftercare and compensation</b>	<p>Stranded Passengers continue to receive support even after they have been detrained, until they cease to qualify as Stranded.</p> <p>Support includes access to toilets, shelter, food and refreshments, medical assistance, support to contact friends and relatives and support for onward travel (or accommodation, if not possible on the same day).</p>	<p><b>It is good practice to</b> consider what options for providing assistance exist once passenger have been detrained and before they have been able to continue on their journey. Support could come from on train staff, station staff, response staff or additional incident response volunteers, or support from other organisations such as the local authority or British Red Cross.</p> <p>See above regarding alternative staff.</p>

# ***Rail Delivery Group***

---



Rail Delivery Group Limited Registered Office, First Floor North, 1 Puddle Dock, London, EC4V 3DS  
[www.raildeliverygroup.com](http://www.raildeliverygroup.com) 020 7841 8000 Registered in England and Wales No. 08176197