

Recommendation(s) Status: Derailment of a freight train at Barrow-upon-Soar, 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 six 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. |
| In-progress: | 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. |
| 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 latest report from the relevant safety authority or public body) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1 27/12/2012 22/2013</p> <p>Derailment of a freight train at Barrow-upon-Soar, Leicestershire</p> <p>Status: Implemented by alternative means </p> | <p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the risk of an embankment failure due to flooding by providing the Route geotechnical team with information that will trigger an earthwork evaluation.</p> <p>Network Rail should amend its company standards so that track maintenance staff are required to notify the Route geotechnical team if the foot of an embankment is saturated, flooded or has recently been flooded, and a track geometry defect or loss of ballast is found on top of the embankment (paragraphs 114b, 114c, 114d.i, 114d.ii, 114d.iii and 115b).</p> | <p>ORR has reported that Network Rail has reported that it has taken actions (by alternative means) in response to this recommendation. ORR proposes to take no further action unless they become aware that the information provided becomes inaccurate.</p> <p>It is not clear to RAIB how existing processes and proposed changes will address the intent of the recommendation. \$b</p> |
| <p>2 27/12/2012 22/2013</p> <p>Derailment of a freight train at Barrow-upon-Soar, Leicestershire</p> <p>Status: Implemented</p> | <p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the risk of an embankment failure by improving the process used by the Route geotechnical team to determine if an earthwork should be included in the flood warning database.</p> <p>Network Rail should amend its processes so that when assessing whether an embankment should be included in the flood warning database, the assessment should include additional factors which are relevant to its stability such as how the embankment was constructed (as far as can reasonably be determined) to understand the effect of water on any planes between different types of materials, and the history of flooding or ponding at the foot of the embankment (paragraph 115a).</p> | <p>ORR reports that Network Rail will address this recommendation with the following action plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Undertake risk assessments and identify earthworks subject to special risk of flood action. 2) Develop and implement process for managing risk of flooding and to build this into a database or other appropriate tool. <p>ORR proposes to take no further action unless they become aware that the information provided becomes innaccurate. An update is planned for July 2015.</p> |
| <p>3 27/12/2012 22/2013</p> <p>Derailment of a freight train at Barrow-upon-Soar, Leicestershire</p> <p>Status: Implemented</p> | <p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the risk of an embankment failure by improving the quality of the earthwork evaluation process used by the Route geotechnical team.</p> <p>Network Rail should amend its company standards so that when an earthwork evaluation is carried out on an embankment, the evaluation should consider how the geometry of the track on top of an embankment has changed over time, using data recorded by Network Rail's track geometry recording trains. If the evaluation has been triggered by a change in track quality, flooding or the ponding of water, and includes an assessment of the embankment's susceptibility to flooding or water action, the levels of recent rainfall onto the top of the embankment should be considered as part of the assessment (paragraphs 116a and 116b).</p> | <p>ORR has reported that Network Rail has taken actions in response to this recommendation. ORR proposes to take no further action unless they become aware that the information provided becomes inaccurate.</p> |