Review of Options to Improve Visual Amenity of Electrification in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Phase 1 Assessment Template

Idea description, name or number:

	Stage 1 Result: Pass or Reject	
		100
Impact	Selection	Notes on basis/reason for
Greater impact/lower visual amenity	Reject	rejection
Significant/long term negative impact to the local area which cannot be reasonably mitigated	Reject	
Any obvious non-compliance that is unlikely to find reasonable mitigation = reject Any obvious non-compliance i.e. cannot run IEP & EMU trains = reject Must be capable of delivering line speed Any obvious adverse impact (Increase) = reject. No negative impact on current guaging/route clearances Any obvious adverse impact (reduction) = reject.	Reject Reject Reject Reject Reject	
VERY Significant delay to introduction of new service OR VERY significant duration with no improvement to visual impact of current electrification infrastructure = reject	Reject	
Significant adverse impact on safety (construction or operational)	Reject	
	Impact Greater impact/lower visual amenity Significant/long term negative impact to the local area which cannot be reasonably mitigated Any obvious non-compliance that is unlikely to find reasonable mitigation = reject Any obvious non-compliance that is unlikely to find reasonable mitigation = reject Must be capable of delivering line speed Any obvious adverse impact (increase) = reject. No negative impact on current guaging/route clearances Any obvious adverse impact (reduction) = reject. VERY Significant delay to introduction of new service OR VERY significant duration with no improvement to visual impact of current electrification infrastructure = reject	Stage 2 - Visual improvement factor x Impact factor: Note max score = 100 Impact Selection Greater impact/lower visual amenity Reject Significant/long term negative impact to the local area which cannot be reasonably mitigated Reject Any obvious non-compliance that is unlikely to find reasonable mitigation = reject Reject Any obvious non-compliance i.e. cannot run IEP & EMU trains = reject Reject Any obvious adverse impact (increase) = reject. Reject No negative impact on current guaging/route clearances Reject No obvious adverse impact (increase) = reject. Reject No negative impact on current guaging/route clearances Reject VERY Significant delay to introduction of new service OR VERY significant duration with no improvement to visual impact of current electrification infrastructure = reject Reject

2nd stage assessment (if none of the above are assessed as Reject and more than 10 options passing filtering)

			Criteria		
Factors	Range	Selection	Scoring	weighting	Overall Score
Visual Improvement factor	Significant improvement/virtually unnoticeable	1	100) 100
	Large improvement		70		0
	Minor improvement		30)	0
	No discernible difference		()	0 100
Impact Factors:					100
Long term Reliability	Better than Series 1 anticipated	1	100) 40	0 40
(i.e. anticplated failure compared with Series 1)	No difference to Series 1		70)	0
	Slightly lower than Series 1		30)	0
	Anticipated to be higher failure compared to Series 1		()	0
Engineering Access/impact on current rail service	ROR or adjacent land (no impact on operational railway)	1	100) 1() 10
(for construction and maintenance)	Likely to require series of small disruptive possessions for installation		70)	0
	Likely to require small disruptive possessions every 5/10 years for maintenance		30)	0
	Likely to require blockade of 2 weeks or longer to install or risk to timetable during construction		()	0
	Significant long term disruptive possessions for installation and/or maintenance				
Timescale - design, development & installation	Can be installed in parallel with current electrification works	1	100) 1() 10
(product approvals, planning, network change etc.)	0-1 years prior to improved visual amenity		70)	0
	1-5 years prior to improved visual amenity		30)	0
	5+ years prior to improved visual amenity or causing delay of over 1 year to electrification timescale	s	()	0
Other environmental impact	Environmental Benefits locally or offsetting	1	100) 20) 20
	No impact		70)	0
	Some disruption to local area - construction traffic etc.		30)	0
	Major disruption - short term		()	0
Safety factors	Improved i.e. less maintenance, greater electrical clearances etc	1	100) 20	0 20
(to workforce and public)	No impact		70)	0
	limited additional risk (small amount exposure to install or maintain)		30)	0
	High risk (to workforce due to extensive exposure for install/maintain or risk to public in event of failure)		()	0
				100)
			Total we	ighted score	e 100

Notes: 1. All criteria are judged in comparison to Series 1 and on the basis that the equipment has already been installed on the sections of line under review. 2. Environmental impact is not part of the remitted assessment criteria, however it is proposed that this should be included. 3. A first phase filtering of the options generated will be undertaken to remove any ideas with rejection criteria. 2nd stage assessment will take place if more than ten options pass through the first filter. 4. It has been agreed in discussion with Network Rail that cost (capital or operating cost) is not to form part of the assessment at this phase.

Free text to record notes/discussions on option under review: