

Cross Audit improvement plan

| Ref | Issue raised | Proposed action | Action owner | Deadline/ progress |
|-----------|--|---|--|--------------------|
| 2.2.1.(1) | ORR has developed a CMS that partially covers ORR staff undertaking SCA/SP. ORR could consider developing specific competency requirements for the different roles within the SCA/ SP/APS processes. This should include engineers involved in these processes. | A comprehensive training course is in place for all staff carrying out SCA/SP and is available to engineers, although its use is not mandatory. This covers the roles and requirements for each role. As part of the next review of this training programme we will consider if there is a need to develop this area further. | TBC – RPP Deputy Director (Asset M’ment) | April 2013 |
| 2.2.1.(2) | ORR should consider having a consistent method of hand over when the account holder changes. The audit team said that there were 2 different cases of hand over: in one case there is overlapping of 4 months, whereas in another case there was no overlapping at all. The new account holder who assessed the application for the safety certificate renewal was not informed about the remedial actions the RU has done after an accident which took place some months before the application of the certificate renewal. | Revision of the inspection manual will address this area. | MF | April 2013 |
| 2.2.2 (1) | The use of the “ROGS assessment check list” & “the assessment plan calculator” help the Assessment Managers to easy monitor deadlines and take immediate action when required and ORR should consider making these forms mandatory | Revision of the inspection manual will address these areas. | MF | April 2013 |
| 2.2.2 (2) | Procedures are not up to date after the restructuring of ORR & change of IT systems, although there is a project running at the moment to review procedures | Revision of the inspection manual will address these areas. | MF | April 2013 |

| | | | | |
|------------|--|---|----|------------|
| 2.2.3 (1) | ORR should consider clarifying and explaining in their manual how the results from the supervision activity are taken into account during the reassessment of a safety certificate/ safety authorisation | Revision of the inspection manual will address these areas. | MF | April 2013 |
| 2.2.3 (2) | ORR has a system interface risk team as part of its planning team to ensure the interface risks are covered across the Network Rail and Transport Undertaking teams. ORR should review this process to see if it is adequately dealing with system safety issues. ORR has a System Interface risk team. That team's role is to look at risk at all interfaces, a key priority is looking at Level Crossing risk, but it does cover other interface risk areas. However ORR should consider evaluating whether, separating Network Rail and Transport undertakings work into discrete units, poses risks to supervising system safety issues and consider improving working arrangements on system safety issues between the different units in a systematic way. | ORR did assess the risks when carrying out the reorganisation in 2009. Our planning process has been improved to provide better integration between IM and TU units. | SJ | Completed |
| 2.2.4. (1) | ORR should consider introducing procedures and decision making criteria for identifying a substantial risk in case of APIS for a non TSI conforming vehicle. | This will be included in the guidance to the RIR2011. As previously stated at the close-out meeting these are particular set of circumstances linked to cross acceptance which will occur rarely in the UK. | PH | April 2013 |
| 2.2.4. (2) | ORR should consider having a documented process to ensure continuous improvement of the APIS activities. | We have been audited twice in this area in the last two years and found to be performing best practice. We have asked for the RSD competence management system to be extended to RPP. | PH | April 2013 |
| 2.2.4.(3) | There is no process securing a link between post APS and Supervision activities, e.g. how | This will be covered in the revised paper being taken to the European Program Board | PH | April 2013 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | to incorporate supervision of projects that have been awarded an authorization for placing in service. ORR commented here that the CSM SP is a key issue. Audits from engineering point of view and from SMS point of view should be part of their strategy | paper on interoperability on 4 February 2013 and a view sought how best to link this to Supervision activities and future business planning work. | | |
| | | | | |