

Recommendation(s) Status: Collision between a train and a collapsed signal post at Newbury

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

Open (replaces Progressing and Implementation On-going)	Actions to address the recommendation are ongoing.
Closed (replaces Implemented, Implemented by alternative means, and Non-implementation)	ORR consider the recommendation to have been taken into consideration by an end implementer and evidence provided to show action taken or justification for no action taken.
Insufficient response:	The end implementer has not provided sufficient evidence that the recommendation has been taken into consideration, or if it has, the action proposed does not address the recommendation, or there is insufficient evidence to support no action being taken.
Superseded:	The recommendation has been superseded either by a newer recommendation or actions have subsequently been taken by the end implementer that have superseded the recommendation.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	Collision between a train and a collapsed signal post at Newbury
Report Number	15/2015
Date of Incident	17/11/2014

Rec No.	Status	RAIB Concern	Recommendation	RAIB Summary of current status
15/2015/01	Insufficient Response	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the risk of failure of ancillary structures across the national rail network.</p> <p>Network Rail should review its asset management strategy with the objective of improving the examination and maintenance of its ancillary structures (paragraphs 96a and 98). The review should consider:</p> <p>identification of structures at greatest risk of failure (eg by age of the structure, those of hollow section, those without galvanised or otherwise treated surfaces, those in hostile environments) and the possible consequences of failure in the context of wider safety risks to the railway;</p> <p>steps to mitigate the risk (such as periodic replacement); and</p> <p>specific measures to deal with planted posts as well as those structures fixed to foundations.</p>	<p>ORR has reported that the Network Rail has not provided a response, or the response does not adequately satisfy the ORR that sufficient action is being taken to address the recommendation.</p> <p>ORR is not content with duty-holder response, further engagement ongoing / proposed.</p>
15/2015/02	Closed - I	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the risk of corrosion at the base of ancillary structures and to allow examination of baseplates fixed to foundations.</p> <p>Network Rail should develop and implement a risk assessment process to</p>	<p>ORR has reported that NR 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</p>

Recommendation Status Report



			determine when it is necessary for the critical elements of ancillary structures to be exposed for the purposes of examination and/or to mitigate the risk of corrosion. The process should take into account the specific risk of corrosion of buried metalwork on hollow section ancillary structures that are fixed to foundations (paragraphs 96a and 97a).	information provided becomes inaccurate.
15/2015/03	Open	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the vulnerability of the routine examination and maintenance regimes to missing failures of ancillary structures that are currently subject to visual examinations only.</p> <p>Taking account of the emerging findings from the implementation of Recommendation 1, Network Rail should review its examination and maintenance regimes for ancillary structures and make any necessary improvements to ensure that its processes are commensurate with the risk arising from the failure of those structures (paragraphs 96b, 96d and 99). The review should include, but not be limited to, consideration of the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a regime of periodic enhanced examinations for ancillary structures (such as the Detailed Examination regime applied to bridges and other complex structures); consideration of the special requirements for examination of the buried elements of planted posts; a means for assessing the internal condition of hollow section structures as well as their external condition; re-designing the examination forms (whether electronic or paper versions) to improve usability for the examiners, to clarify the need to report hidden critical elements that were not examined and to improve reporting lines between Network Rail and its examinations contractors; 	<p>ORR has reported that Network Rail has a proposed action plan and timescale for delivery to be taken in response to the recommendation. ORR will advise RAIB when actions to address this recommendation have been completed.</p>

Recommendation Status Report



			<p>revising the competence standards for staff involved in the examination of structures to ensure consistency in the level of training received both by those who are new to the industry as well as experienced examiners; and</p> <p>cyclical maintenance of any surface treatments on ancillary structures.</p> <p>Changes made as a result of the review should be re-briefed to all those involved in structures examinations and relevant company standards and other documents should be updated as appropriate.</p>	
15/2015/04	Closed - I	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to reduce the risk of structure defects being missed on examinations due to the variability in standards being applied by different examiners.</p> <p>Without waiting for Network Rail's actions in response to Recommendation 3 above, Amey should immediately review and revise its competence management processes for its staff involved in structures examinations in accordance with the findings from this investigation (paragraph 97b). The revised processes should allow for further adjustments to be made as necessary once Network Rail has completed its response to recommendation 3.</p>	<p>ORR has reported that Amey has reported that it has completed actions taken in response to this recommendation.</p> <p>ORR proposes to take no further action unless they become aware that the information provided becomes inaccurate.</p>
15/2015/05	Insufficient Response	None	<p>The intent of this recommendation is to prevent the risk of internal corrosion to hollow signal posts in future.</p> <p>Network Rail should develop a specification for a new signal post, or a modification to existing posts, that eliminates or mitigates the risk of internal corrosion (eg, preventing water ingress, improving drainage, internal surface treatments), taking account of whether the galvanisation specified since 1993 (paragraph 17) is adequate and applicable to other</p>	<p>ORR has reported that the Network Rail has not provided a response, or the response does not adequately satisfy the ORR that sufficient action is being taken to address the recommendation.</p> <p>ORR is not content with duty-holder response, further engagement ongoing / proposed.</p>

Recommendation Status Report



			<p>designs of post (paragraph 96a). The specification should be implemented on new installations or to replace existing structures where opportunities arise to do so and where risk assessments indicate that it is necessary and appropriate.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--