

Recommendation(s) Status: Two signal passed at danger incidents, at Reading Westbury Line Junction, 28 March 2015, and Ruscombe Junction, 3 November 2015

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.
Other Public Body or Authority	The recommendation is also addressed to another public body or authority.
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:

-  The red triangle shows recommendations where the RAIB has concerns that no actions have been taken in response to a recommendation.
-  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.
-  The white triangle shows recommendations where the RAIB notes substantive actions have been reported, but the RAIB still has concerns.

Note: The tables which follow, report the status of recommendations on 31 December 2015. In some other cases the end implementer has already sent information to the relevant safety authority about the actions it has taken, or proposes to take and the safety authority is considering whether it is satisfied that those actions and the associated timescales are accepted.

Number/ Date/ Report No/ Inv Title / Current Status	Safety Recommendation	Summary of current status (based on ORR's report to RAIB)
<p>1 03/11/2015 18/2016</p> <p>SPADs at Reading Westbury Line Junction & Ruscombe Junction</p> <p>Status: Awaiting response</p>	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the risk of fatigue arising from the rosters and diagrams worked at Westbury depot.</p> <p>DB Cargo (UK) Ltd should review the driver diagrams and rosters at Westbury depot to identify those at highest risk of fatigue and amend the timing, duration and/or operation of these trains in order to reduce the fatigue risk. The review should consider the findings from this investigation, industry good practice, staffing levels and feedback from the company's drivers (paragraph 102b).</p>	
<p>2 03/11/2015 18/2016</p> <p>SPADs at Reading Westbury Line Junction & Ruscombe Junction</p> <p>Status: Awaiting response</p>	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to improve the management of fatigue amongst freight operating companies, in accordance with contemporary research and good practice.</p> <p>Freight operating companies should expedite a review of their fatigue risk management systems to ensure that they have sufficient controls (eg policies, company standards) in place which are consistent with published good practice (such as that from ORR and RSSB), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I rostering rules and associated staffing levels (such as limits on working hours, overtime and consecutive shifts), especially for night shifts; I appropriate use of biomathematical fatigue models (such as the FRI); I training and education on fatigue for safety-critical workers and controllers of safety-critical work; I fitness for duty checks when booking-on for duty; I processes for gathering and using feedback, in an open and timely manner, from safety-critical workers on fatigue-inducing shift patterns; I in consultation with their occupational health advisers, screening and treatment for sleep disorders as part of medical assessments, both routinely and particularly where a worker has been involved in a suspected fatigue-related incident, and requirements on individuals to declare any known sleep disorders to their employer. <p>(paragraph 103b)</p>	

**Number/ Date/ Report No/
Inv Title / Current Status**

3 03/11/2015 18/2016

SPADs at Reading Westbury Line Junction &
Ruscombe Junction

Status: Awaiting response

Safety Recommendation

The intent of this recommendation is to improve the industry's understanding of fatigue risk through deeper analysis of available data sources, providing more intelligence on fatigue risk precursors which could feed into fatigue risk management systems (although this should not be a reason to delay the implementation of recommendation 3) and be of benefit to the wider industry.

DB Cargo (UK) Ltd, in cooperation with other freight operating companies, should submit a research proposal to RSSB with the aim of conducting more detailed analysis on incident patterns using normalised data (eg long shifts, consecutive shifts), revisiting previous research in this area and building on recent advances in SPAD data analysis (paragraph 134).

**Summary of current status (based on ORR's report to
RAIB)**