

Recommendation(s) Status: Overspeed at Queens's Park, London




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 05/01/2016 19/2016</p> <p>Overspeed at Queen's Park, London</p> <p>Status: Awaiting response</p>	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to provide an effective competency regime for London Midland managers who drive trains and assess the train driving skills of others.</p> <p>London Midland should review and improve the process for routine competence management and assessment of driver managers and other managers with train driving competencies. The review should include consideration of:</p> <p>the extent to which people of the same grade and/or from the same location should undertake assessments;</p> <p>the minimum amount of driving which driver managers should undertake, and the processes required to record and audit this activity;</p> <p>the content and frequency of the refresher training needed for maintaining the skills needed to assess train driving;</p> <p>monitoring and, where necessary, improving the conduct of assessments; and</p> <p>including an explicit statement about how responsibility for safety of the train is allocated to a driver and an assessor during an assessment.</p>	
<p>2 05/01/2016 19/2016</p> <p>Overspeed at Queen's Park, London</p> <p>Status: Awaiting response</p>	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to ensure that safety critical information is easily and unambiguously seen in late notices and other communications.</p> <p>London Midland should review and improve the communication of safety critical information transmitted to its drivers using traditional methods (eg late notice cases) and any transmitted electronically. The review should include:</p> <p>ensuring essential safety information is prominently displayed;</p> <p>ensuring subsidiary information is differentiated from safety critical content;</p> <p>ensuring non-essential information is omitted;</p> <p>considering the use of differing fonts, differing font sizes and colours;</p> <p>considering use of maps or plans; and</p>	

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

Safety Recommendation

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

considering the introduction of a requirement for staff to acknowledge the receipt and understanding of such communications.

This recommendation may also apply to other train operators.

3 05/01/2016 19/2016

Overspeed at Queen's Park, London

Status: Awaiting response

The intent of this recommendation is to assist prompt action in response to safety related issues which require identification of the person driving a train.

London Midland should introduce an effective means of ensuring that relevant staff (for example control room operators) can rapidly establish who is driving a train (for example when driver managers replace booked drivers).

This recommendation may also apply to other train operators