

Recommendation(s) Status: Dangerous occurrence at Lindridge Farm user worked crossing, near Bagworth, Leicestershire

This report is based on information provided to the RAIB by the relevant safety authority or public body.

The status of implementation of the recommendations, as reported to us, has been divided into eight categories:

Key to Recommendation Status

Implemented:	All actions to deliver the recommendation have been completed.
Implemented by alternative means:	The intent of the recommendation has been satisfied in a way that was not identified by the RAIB during the investigation.
Implementation ongoing:	Work to deliver the intent of the recommendation has been agreed and is in the process of being delivered.
Insufficient response:	The end implementer has failed to provide a response; or has provided a response that does not adequately satisfy ORR that sufficient action is being taken to properly consider and address a recommendation.
Progressing:	The relevant safety authority has yet to be satisfied that an appropriate plan, with timescales, is in place to implement the recommendation; and work is in progress to provide this.
Non-implementation:	Regulation 12(2)(b)(iii) = recommendation considered and no implementation action to be taken.
Closed - carry forward:	ORR intends to take no further action as it has been superseded by another recommendation.
Awaiting response:	Awaiting initial report from the relevant safety authority or public body on the status of the recommendation.

RAIB concerns on actions taken by organisations in response to recommendations are reflected in this report and are indicated by one of the following:

Red – RAIB has concerns that no actions have been taken in response to a recommendation.

Blue – The blue triangle shows recommendations where the RAIB has concerns that the actions taken, or proposed, are inappropriate or insufficient to address the risk identified during the investigation.

White – The white triangle shows recommendations where the RAIB notes substantive actions have been reported, but the RAIB still has concerns.

Recommendation Status Report



Report Title	Dangerous occurrence at Lindridge Farm user worked crossing, near Bagworth, Leicestershire
Report Number	11/2013
Date of Incident	22/03/2012

Rec No.	Status	RAIB Concern	Recommendation	RAIB Summary of current status
11/2013/04	Implemented	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to improve the controls for deferring test logs before a signalling system is commissioned. It calls for the risk to safety, design and functionality to be assessed when deferring an issue raised by a tester on the test log. That way all of the implications of not addressing the test log are considered.</p> <p>Network Rail should revise the controls for managing deferred test logs so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the person calling for the deferral of a test log is required to assess the risk to the safety, design and functionality of the signalling system by not closing the test log, record the outcome of their assessment and state any mitigation measures that need to be put in place before the signalling system can be commissioned; and the tester responsible for commissioning the signalling system is required to review the assessment, agree to the deferral of the test log and to check that the suggested mitigation measures are in place, before allowing the signalling system to be commissioned (paragraph 144i). 	<p>ORR reports that the testing handbook was amended and updated. The update requires a final review of all test logs by the tester-in-charge, which included considering the quantity and severity of the items raised on the test logs prior to entry into operational service.</p> <p>This final review is required to confirm that all Test Logs comply with one of the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Retested to the satisfaction of a suitably competent Tester and closed Endorsed and closed Deferred (providing the test log item is not unsafe or cannot be mitigated against) The Deferred Test Log Closure Plan has been signed. <p>Any deferred test logs require an agreed action plan (noted as 4 above). The action plan requires a</p>

Recommendation Status Report



				test log owner, the timescale for closure, the impact assessment and mitigation details, and the rectification action details, which shall include naming the rectification action owner.
11/2013/05	Implemented	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to show a level crossing in the correct place on the signaller's display when telephones are fitted to it. It calls for Network Rail's standards to define who can make the changes to the signaller's display, what information is needed to make the changes and how the changes will be checked afterwards. This recommendation also calls for the change to the level crossing to be recorded in the signalling records, either by updating records such as the signalling plan, or by entering the change in the deficiency register.</p> <p>Network Rail should have procedures in place that require the signaller's display to be updated in a controlled manner when telephones are being fitted at a level crossing for the first time. The requirements should also include what steps must be taken to record the change to the level crossing in the signalling source records (paragraph 146a).</p>	Network Rail believes the requirements for updating signaller displays are already documented within its standards and therefore it has focused on briefing its staff 'in recognition of the human errors observed in application of these procedures'. Briefings will make people aware in short term but effectiveness will fade over time. The intent of the recommendation was to make it clear who can make changes to signaller display, what information is needed and how the changes will be checked, plus to mandate how the changes will be captured within the signalling records. Network Rail believes all of this is already documented within its standard, albeit it is spread across a number of documents.
11/2013/01	Implemented	White	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to require signalling re-control projects to establish what signalling source records exist for the area being</p>	The recommendation intent was to specifically document requirements for source records for signalling re-control work so

Recommendation Status Report



			<p>re-controlled, how up-to-date they are and whether they are correlated. If signalling source records are not available, the project's scope should explicitly include activities at its start to produce them so they are available to designers and checkers for their design work, testers for testing the design prior to it being commissioned, and to the maintainers afterwards.</p> <p>Network Rail should revise its project management processes and company standards to require that signalling re-control projects (ie projects transferring the control of signalling from one location to another when the interlocking, trackside signalling equipment and infrastructure are unchanged) identify the signalling source records that are needed for the design, checking and testing of these works. These projects should then be required to include activities within their scope of work to obtain these signalling source records, including correlating, updating or producing records as necessary (paragraphs 144a, 144c and 145).</p>	<p>projects were mandated to establish what source records were needed for such a project. Network Rail is relying on adherence to existing standards, which this investigation found were not followed by East Midlands signalling re-control project.</p> <p>No substantive change has been made as Network Rail believes its standards already cover this. RAIB has notified ORR that it disagrees. ORR has sought further clarification from the end implementer. \$w</p>
11/2013/02	Implemented	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to provide Network Rail SDG designers and checkers with a way of working which will remove the possibility of incorrect track circuit names being drawn on a signalling or scheme plan during its production, and then missed during the checking process. This way of working could be implemented in the software used by designers or by procedure. It is equally applicable to conceptual work (such as new designs) and non-conceptual work (such as the redrawing of an existing design).</p> <p>Network Rail should, in consultation with its principal signalling contractors, review the ways of detecting and addressing incorrect track circuit names for all types of signalling or scheme plan production. The review should consider what manual or automatic methods can be used by designers and checkers. The findings of the review should then be implemented by means of a time bound programme for changes to the</p>	<p>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.</p>

Recommendation Status Report



			tools and mandated design processes that cover this activity (paragraphs 144b, 144b.i, 144b.ii, 144d, 144e and 144f).	
11/2013/03	Progressing		<p>The intent of this recommendation is to mandate that the position of fixed infrastructure on any new signaller display is correlated to its position on the existing signaller display. By doing this any discrepancies can be identified and the reasons for them understood.</p> <p>Network Rail should revise its design processes so as to specifically require that the position of fixed infrastructure, shown on any new signaller's display being installed by a project, is correlated to its position as shown on the existing signaller's display that is being replaced. This work should be carried out by staff who are qualified as competent to do correlation, and when a discrepancy is found between the new and existing signaller displays, they should record it and investigate the reason for it. Such an investigation should include a check of the accuracy of associated records, such as signalling or scheme plans, and result in the necessary corrections being made to the design or to the records to resolve the discrepancy (paragraphs 144g, 144h and 146b).</p>	<p>This rec called for a check between the newly proposed signaller display and the existing display. The ORR response indicates that this would be a final check that would happen at the end of the design and testing process. That was not the intention. This type of check should be carried out at a much earlier stage. Normally, the new signalling workstation displays are one of the very first things to be produced on a re signalling project and they agreed at a very early stage in the design process. This then gives the operators a chance to comment on the new displays so everyone is then happy with what they look like, such as happened at the design check meetings held for the Leicester workstation displays. Only once you have agreed displays do you then start the data preparation activities. Doing the check at an earlier stage saves pushing further checks into the testing stages and also helps to save a lot of redesign and data changes later on in the process.</p>

Recommendation Status Report



				<p>Therefore this check should be done sooner than indicated in the ORR response and if the agreed new design varies from the existing signaller display then the project has the opportunity to find out why.</p> <p>The other part of the argument in ORR's response is incorrect. When the design check meetings were held for the Leicester workstation displays, and Lindridge Farm UWC was moved to the wrong track circuit, the panel at Leicester did not have Lindridge Farm UWC shown on it. The design meeting that moved Lindridge Farm UWC took place in March 2011 whereas the panel did not get marked up incorrectly until April 2011. Therefore, in March 2011 there would have been a variance between the old and new displays. Had the check as described in Rec 3 taken place then, the difference could have been investigated, understood and checked. That would have increased the likelihood of the error being spotted and corrected at a very early stage, rather than it being found in the test stages at a much later date. \$b</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Recommendation Status Report

