Recommendation Status Report

Report Title	Freight train derailment at Reading West Junction
Report Number	02/2013
Date of Incident	28/01/2012

Rec No.	Status	RAIB Concern	Recommendation	RAIB Summary of current status
02/2013/01	Implemented	None	The intention of this recommendation is to make shippers and freight forwarders aware of published guidelines for the safe packing of freight containers. Following these guidelines ensures that the cargo within a sealed container remains evenly loaded and secure. Recent research indicates that the UK freight industry is not fully aware of the guidelines. The Heath and Safety Executive should identify and use the most appropriate means to make shippers and freight forwarders aware of the need to pack freight containers in accordance with the 'Guidelines for packing of cargo transport units', published by the International Maritime Organization, or an equivalent document. By the same means, it should also remind organisations of the need to have operational procedures, resources, equipment and training in place to ensure that cargo is evenly loaded and secure. The Heath and Safety Executive should also make other national and international safety regulators aware of the findings of this investigation and highlight the need to follow the guidelines (paragraphs 108a and 108a.i).	HSE has reported to the RAIB that they have issued a safety advice note that has been placed on their website. Additionally, the note will be included in e-mail newsletters the HSE sends to over 65,000 plus interested parties who subscribe to the service covering the industrial sectors of transport, logistics and Ports. HSE proposes to take no further action unless they become aware that the information provided becomes inaccurate.
02/2013/02	Progressing	None	The intention of this recommendation is that rail freight and inter-modal freight terminal operators have arrangements in place to manage the risk associated with allowing poorly packed freight containers on the railway. Recognising that many of the indications of poor packing are hidden, operators should require that their customers give assurance that containers are packed in accordance with recognised good practice (eg the IMO/ILO/UNECE guidelines) and carry out appropriate audits to verify this. Where there is no assurance, operators should make physical checks to confirm the evenness of the load.	ORR reports that Freightliner has reviewed its procedures and concluded that it manages the risk of poorly loaded containers as far as is reasonably practicable. Freightliner considers it impracticable to require certification that a container has been packed in

Recommendation Status Report

			Freightliner should review its operating procedures and conditions of carriage for freight containers. It should then implement any changes necessary to require that (paragraphs 108a, 108a.ii and 108a.iii): l senders provide certification sourced from the relevant party, or have equivalent procedural arrangements in place, which confirm that freight containers offered for transit have been packed in accordance with the 'Guidelines for packing cargo transport units', published by the International Maritime Organization, or an equivalent document; l the effectiveness of such certification or procedural arrangements are periodically audited, with remedial action taken as needed; and that where such arrangements are not in place: l alternative action is taken to confirm that the cargo in a container is both evenly and securely stowed. This recommendation may also be applicable to other operators of rail freight services and inter-modal freight terminals.	accordance with current standards and that unilateral implementation of such a requirement would potentially disadvantage Freightliner by adding cost and additional bureaucracy and result in loss of business to other transport modes or competitors and therefore have no safety benefit. It also believes that it is impracticable to check that a cargo is evenly and securely stowed as this would require the container to be opened. ORR are seeking further information.
02/2013/03	Progressing	None	The intention of this recommendation is for inter-modal freight terminal operators to develop requirements and investigate introducing a suitable monitoring system, for use during routine container and train handling, to prevent freight container wagons entering traffic with a side-to-side wheel load imbalance. The system could be based on the measurement of individual or side-to-side wheel loads prior to the train entering traffic or the identification of freight container load offsets during lifting. Freightliner should develop requirements for a system to monitor and prevent load offsets from containers resulting in wagons with a side-to-side wheel load imbalance entering traffic from its terminals. The system should be considered when terminal equipment is planned to be installed or upgraded, and where practicable the system should be implemented (paragraphs 108a, 108a.ii and 108a.iii).	ORR has reported that the rail freight sector is currently examining the feasibility of using Network Rail's GOTCHA Wheel Load Detection Equipment to identify wagons with side to side wheel load imbalance. A two stage approach is proposed. The first stage, which has started, is to understand what GOTCHA does and how it works so that alarm limits can be determined. The second stage is to consider how this information can be used

Recommendation Status Report

			This recommendation may also be applicable to other operators of inter-modal freight terminals.	operationally to mitigate the risks. ORR is currently seeking to understand how rail freight operators intend to prevent load offsets from entering traffic. The RAIB agrees that it is important to understand how operators propose to detect offset load before departure or early in the journey. Update 30/6/14.
02/2013/04	Implemented	None	The intention of this recommendation is to prevent track geometry faults being undetected after mechanised track maintenance work is completed. The need for a TQS to inspect and measure the track during and after this work is an important opportunity to identify faults that have formed, or existed beforehand. Recognising that current inspection arrangements may not result in reliable detection, Network Rail should assess and implement practical improvements. These could include consideration of the continuous recording of track geometry using approved manual methods (with allowance made for track deflection due to vehicle loading) and taking full advantage of the track measurement capabilities of tamping machines and similar track maintenance plant. Network Rail should review and, where necessary, improve its processes for the detection of track geometry faults after mechanised track maintenance work to reduce the likelihood of such faults going undetected before the railway is handed back into service (paragraphs 108b.ii and 109).	IM review indicates some work done - probably enough. But NR has, so far, failed to make a decision re use of DRS for continuous monitoring during/following mechanised track work.ORR has reported that Network Rail has reported that it has completed actions taken in response to this recommendation. ORR proposes to take no further action unless they become aware that the information provided becomes inaccurate. ORR has reported that Network Rail has reported that it has completed actions taken in response to this recommendation.
02/2013/05	Implemented	None	The intention of this recommendation is for Network Rail to review its current processes for mechanised track maintenance, and develop and make available best practice guidelines that minimise the formation of geometry faults on crossovers and similar sections of track.	ORR has reported that Network Rail has reported that it has taken actions in response to this recommendation.

Recommendation Status Report

			Network Rail should establish best practice guidelines for mechanised track maintenance work in areas of switches and crossings that minimise the risk of track twist and other geometry faults forming, and remaining on, crossovers and similar sections of track. It should make its track maintenance teams aware of these and the importance of following them, wherever practicable (paragraph 110).	ORR proposes to take no further action unless they become aware that the information provided becomes inaccurate.