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1 Introduction

On 10 March 2017, the Office of National Rail Safety Regulator (ONRSR) assumed responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the NSW Government’s response to the recommendations contained within the *Final Report of the Special Commission of Inquiry into the Waterfall Rail Accident (SCOI Final Report)* from the Independent Transport Safety Regulator of NSW (ITSR).

The SCOI Final Report was released on 17 January 2005 and made 177 recommendations (including 127 recommendations and 50 sub-elements). The recommendations proposed in the SCOI report indicated actions to be taken by a number of organisations including RailCorp (now Sydney Trains), emergency services agencies, ITSR, the Office of Transport Safety Investigations and other rail operators in NSW. ONRSR’s overseeing role includes verifying that the SCOI Final Report’s recommendations have been effectively implemented or that an approved plan is in place for implementation.

In 2013, the former Minister for Transport accepted ITSR’s recommendation to change the frequency of public reporting from quarterly to annually given that the majority of recommendations were either closed or subject to an implementation plan. This report covers the period from 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 and summarises the status of all recommendations.

ONRSR will continue to provide the Minister with annual reports for tabling in the NSW Parliament, in relation to the SCOI Final Report. ONRSR’s public reporting will continue until all the recommendations are implemented, with reports being published on ONRSR’s website.

This report is produced by ONRSR as part of its responsibility for monitoring implementation of the SCOI Final Report recommendations. It provides for each recommendation:

- the lead agency for delivering the recommendation
- current status
- Governments original response
- regulator’s expectation for implementation
- regulator’s assessment
- target date for completion (open recommendations)

ITSR developed a classification system to reflect the progress of recommendations through the various stages of implementation which is being maintained by ONRSR and is described in an appendix to this report.

For clarity, where actions are relevant to both ITSR and ONRSR, the generic term “regulator” has been used throughout this report, noting that the expectations of the regulator remain unchanged following the transition from ITSR to ONRSR.

Organisational changes: train operators

As of 1 July 2012, responsibility for the delivery of RailCorp’s automatic train protection project (recommendation 32) and the digital train radio system project (recommendation 38) were transferred to Transport for NSW (TfNSW).

On 1 July 2013, as part of the NSW Government’s major reform of rail services, RailCorp’s functions were divided between TfNSW and two new agencies: Sydney Trains and NSW Trains.
## 2 Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Automatic Train Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTRS</td>
<td>Digital Train Radio System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETCS</td>
<td>European Train Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Independent Transport Safety Regulator of NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONRSR</td>
<td>The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISSB</td>
<td>Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOI</td>
<td>Special Commission of Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfNSW</td>
<td>Transport for New South Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Recommendations

Recommendation 1
Staff at the Rail Management Centre (RMC) should receive training from RailCorp to enable them to quickly and accurately assess that an emergency has occurred and to provide precise and reliable information to emergency response personnel about the location of the emergency, the available access to the site and the resources necessary.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to provide:
> evidence of development of a training program that addresses issues identified in the SCOI (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
> evidence of a process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 2
A dedicated telephone line should be established by RailCorp between the RMC and any Emergency Services Control Centre for use during any emergency.

Government response
Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. The RMC has touch screen dial up capability to Police, Fire Brigade and Ambulance. In addition, a dedicated phone line is available for emergency services incoming calls.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to provide evidence of the connected services. Verification to be confirmed through:
> evidence by compliance review
> evidence of testing/exercise to ensure functionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 3

A designated staff member at the RMC should act as the rail emergency management co-ordinator. He or she should be the sole point of contact at the RMC with other rail personnel involved in the rail accident and emergency services personnel during the rescue phase of the emergency response.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation

The initial requirement is for a person to be readily identified. This person needs to have access to the appropriate hardware and procedures and be prepared to act as required in the SCOI report.

RailCorp to provide:

- evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
- evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
- evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
- review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes
- evidence of training of skills assessment
- evidence of responsibilities in position descriptions
- evidence of responsibilities reflected in plan (verification of above elements in relation to training will be covered in recommendation 20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 4

The RMC should be equipped by RailCorp with a transcriber system, or mimic board, or such other system as is necessary to enable identification of the precise location at any time of any train on the RailCorp network.

Government response

Supported in principle. The RMC is equipped with a network mimic panel that currently gives train visibility on approximately 65% of the RailCorp network. Visibility of approximately 90% is targeted for 2008. RailCorp will conduct a study of other options available, including GPS technology to provide a more precise location at any time of all operators’ trains on the RailCorp network.

Regulator’s expectation

RailCorp to provide a detailed program to explain how the trains will be located on a board, or similar, in the RMC. Recognising that this will require some capital expenditure, it is expected that the program will be a funded program with timelines.

Functionality is to include a requirement to enable trains to be readily identified, as a minimum. Conduct a compliance review (to determine if current coverage of the network is 65%). Review the
existence planning/funding (that will achieve 90% coverage by 2008). Check the existence of plans/project to review options available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Subject to implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td>See Waterfall SCOI Annual Status Report – Recommendations closed subject to implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 5**

All train guards should be trained by RailCorp in the use of the MetroNet radio and instructed to use it in any emergency.

**Government response**

The training of guards in the use of MetroNet radio is supported and being implemented. The use of MetroNet radio by guards in emergencies is supported in principle and RailCorp will review the operational and technical issues the recommendation raises.

**Regulator’s expectation**

> RailCorp to provide details of the training program that demonstrates that guards are trained in the use of MetroNet radio and know how to use the system in an emergency. The program is to include:

> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)

> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)

> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff

> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes

> ensure guard has access to communications

> assess project plan for implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 6**

Procedures should be put in place by RailCorp to ensure that electrical power supply to the area of an accident can be immediately isolated, if necessary, in the event of a rail injury or harm.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented.
Regulator’s expectation

> RailCorp to demonstrate that appropriate procedures have been established and that all appropriate staff have been trained in the procedures. The overall program is to demonstrate that procedures have been developed, with appropriate consultation. Project to include:

> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)

> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)

> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff

> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes

> ensure that the procedures are included in incident plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 7
Satellite telephones should be provided by RailCorp to all rail commanders at any emergency.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to provide a schedule for the purchase of satellite telephones. Procedure to deploy to RailCorp rail commander developed. Procedures to include process to ensure telephones are in working order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 8
All signal telephones must be maintained by RailCorp in proper working order.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to demonstrate that a suitable inspection, fault rectification and maintenance plan is in place. The maintenance plan is to include:

> process for reporting faults

> process for responding to faults

> preventative maintenance.
Recommendation 9

All emergency services stations should be provided with access keys to, and maps showing, all gates providing access to RailCorp tracks within their geographic area of responsibility.

Government response

Supported in principle subject to discussion between RailCorp and emergency services regarding operational and security issues.

Regulator’s expectation

Item requires an agreement between RailCorp and emergency services in place on most effective means of access to information to facilitate immediate access to emergency site agreement with emergency services. RailCorp to demonstrate that details are included in the incident management plans.

Recommendation 10

A railway disaster plan, or rail displan, should be developed by RailCorp and the emergency services to ensure co-ordinated inter-agency response to rail accidents and incidents on the RailCorp network.

Government response

Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. The State Emergency Management Committee advises a specific sub plan for rail would not provide additional response capability and it would not be consistent with the all hazards approach.

Instead the Commissioner's recommendations about a specific Railway Disaster Plan will be incorporated in the overall State Disaster Plan (Displan) and RailCorp's Incident Management Framework. This framework addresses all level of rail incidents including emergencies and will be implemented early 2005.

Regulator’s expectation

That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

> comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
> development of network incident management plan with ARTC and RailCorp (track manager)
> training issues to ensure that staff can implement.
Recommendation 11

The rail displan should include the use by all emergency response personnel of a uniform incident command system, involving procedures for such matters as the establishment of inner and outer perimeters, control of access to the site, orderly evacuation of injured passengers and the establishment of a staging area remote from the accident site, in a unified command structure with the site controller co-ordinating the various emergency services through representatives of each service.

Government response
Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.

Regulator’s expectation
That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

- comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
- development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
- training issues ensuring that staff can implement the procedures will be covered by Recommendation 20.

Recommendation 12

The rail displan should include provision for the appointment of a rail emergency management co-ordinator at the RMC, and an on-site rail commander with the sole function of assisting and supporting the emergency services during the rescue phase of the emergency response.

Government response
Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to provide:

- evidence of development of training program that addresses issues identified in the SCOI (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
- evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
- evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
- review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes
- that a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies.
The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

> comprehensive incident management plans/procedures.
> development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
> training issues to ensure that staff can implement will be covered in Recommendation 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 13**

The rail displan should provide for the site controller to have complete control of the site, with other agencies co-ordinating with and supporting him or her, until the rescue phase of the emergency response has been completed.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework. The RailCorp Incident Management Framework aligns with the State Displan, which requires the site controller to have control of the incident site.

**Regulator’s expectation**

That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

> comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
> development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
> training issues to ensure that staff can implement will be covered in Recommendation 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 14**

The incident command system should clearly identify the roles of the rail commander, site controller, police commander and commanders of the other emergency services, and the way in which each is to work together during the recovery phase of any rail accident.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.

**Regulator’s expectation**

That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

> comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
> development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
training issues to ensure that staff can implement will be covered in Recommendation 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 15
The location of the command post for site control at the scene of any rail accident should be identified by NSW Police by a distinctive flashing light.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:
> comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
> development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
> training issues to ensure that staff can implement.

Details also include:
> emergency service action
> implementation of distinctive identification of command post.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW emergency services</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 16
The role of the rail commander should be to provide support and assistance to the site controller and emergency services personnel until the rescue phase of the emergency response to any rail accident is completed.

Government response
Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.

Regulator’s expectation
That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:
> comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
> development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
> training issues to ensure that staff can implement will be covered in Recommendation 20.
Recommendation 17

The rail commander should have complete authority to direct and control any rail employees attending the site of a rail accident, in accordance with directions given or arrangements put in place by the site controller, until the rescue phase of the emergency response to the rail accident has been completed.

Government response

Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.

Regulator’s expectation

That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

- comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
- development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
- training issues to ensure that staff can implement will be covered in Recommendation 20.

Recommendation 18

RailCorp should develop and implement an emergency response plan for management of all rail accidents. Such a plan should be subsumed by the rail displan in the case of serious accidents or incidents.

Government response

Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework. The RailCorp Incident Management Framework was developed in consultation with emergency service agencies and it aligns with the State Disaster Plan.

Regulator’s expectation

That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

- comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
- development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
- training issues to ensure that staff can implement.
### Recommendation 19

The RailCorp emergency response plan should include action checklists of the steps that each employee is required to take, and the order for specific employees to follow in case of emergency.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented through the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.

**Regulator's expectation**

That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

- comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
- development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
- training issues to ensure that staff can implement will be covered in Recommendation 20.
- development/implementation of checklists
- distribution of the checklists and alignment with the staff training and emergency exercises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation 20

All operational rail staff should be trained by RailCorp in the action checklist relevant to each.

**Government response**

Supported.

**Regulator's expectation**

That a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies. The details of the plan are to include, amongst other things, immediate response, site management and recovery processes. Also requires the development of:

- comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
- development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
- training issues to ensure that staff can implement
- development/implementation of checklists
- distribution of the checklists and alignment with the staff training and emergency exercises.
To ensure that training requirements are met under Recommendation 3 namely, RailCorp to provide:

- evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
- evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
- evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
- review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes
- evidence of training of skills assessment
- evidence of responsibilities in position descriptions
- evidence of responsibilities reflected in plan.

To ensure that staff can implement emergency procedures in respect of:

- Use by all emergency response personnel of a uniform incident command system
- Appointment of a rail emergency management co-ordinator at the RMC and an on-site rail commander
- Site controller to have complete control of the site and the rail commander must report to this position
- Incident command system has clearly identified roles and that a joint or jointly developed plan is produced by the agencies
- Rail commander should provide support and assistance to the site controller and emergency services personnel
- The rail commander should have complete authority to direct and control all response personnel from rail organisations
- The RailCorp emergency response plan should include action checklists of the steps that each employee is required to take and the order for specific employees to follow in case of emergency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 21**

The RailCorp emergency response plan should be provided to all emergency response agencies. The officers of each emergency service should be trained in any rail specific features of the plan, so as to better ensure inter-agency co-ordination in the circumstances of an emergency.
Government response

Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. The RailCorp Incident Management Framework will be given to all emergency response agencies. In addition, RailCorp has provided access to emergency services to railway equipment for training purposes.

RailCorp has also produced a DVD covering rail specific emergency response matters for use by the emergency services for training their staff. 500 DVDs have been given to each of Fire Services, Ambulance and Police.

Emergency services personnel will be trained in rail hazard awareness using material provided by RailCorp. The very large number of emergency response personnel (including volunteer services) that may respond to a rail incident means training of all personnel in the RailCorp framework is unlikely to be achievable. Emergency services will investigate with RailCorp an extension of the DVD into a multimedia resource to improve the ability to educate wider numbers of emergency service workers.

Regulator’s expectation

The training program needs to be managed and implemented jointly by the emergency services and RailCorp. Details of the implementation program should include:

- existence of comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
- development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
- training issues
- liaison communication with emergency services
- the RailCorp incident report framework needs to be provided to emergency services.

Emergency services need to determine how best and who to train in the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp and NSW emergency services</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 22**

The RailCorp emergency response plan should include a requirement for the debriefing of all senior rail and emergency response personnel involved in any rail accident, so as to determine the way or ways in which emergency response arrangements for rail accidents can be continually improved, and thereafter implement such improvements.

Government response

Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation

The details of the debriefing sessions is to be included in RailCorp procedures and plans. The content of the debriefs should be reviewed to ensure that it addresses the effectiveness, on a case by case basis, of the incident management plans/procedures especially liaison issues with emergency services, network incident management plan with ARTC and RailCorp, if used, and training issues, if they are found to be a factor.
**Recommendation 23**

All emergency response personnel should be specifically trained in the features of railways which are relevant to their work, such as the location and means of operation of all emergency door releases on trains, the location and use of signal telephones, the methods by which electrical power can be isolated and the means by which they can readily identify and obtain information from the on-site rail commander.

**Government response**
Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. See Recommendation 21.

**Regulator’s expectation**

The training program needs to be managed and implemented jointly by the emergency services and RailCorp. Details of the implementation program should include:

- existence of comprehensive incident management plans/procedures
- development of network incident management plan with RailCorp (track manager)
- training issues
- liaison communication with emergency services
- the RailCorp incident report framework needs to be provided to emergency services. Emergency services to determine how best and who to train in the RailCorp Incident Management Framework.
- appropriate agreements/arrangements in place between rail operators and emergency services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp and NSW emergency services</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 24**

Regular field training exercises should be conducted by RailCorp with the emergency services to ensure that the incident command system and rail display are able to be fully implemented as quickly as possible and are reviewed and improved.

**Government response**
Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**
Program established for exercise in consultation with emergency services.
Recommendation 25

Uniform verbal descriptions identifying that power has been isolated should be developed by RailCorp and utilised by all railway personnel, electrical service providers and all emergency response personnel.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to provide:

> procedures developed (including appropriate consultation development)
> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes
> ensure included in incident management plans.

Recommendation 26

All rail employees should be trained by their employer to commence any emergency communication with the words 'emergency, emergency, emergency', thereafter to identify themselves, the train, its location, what has occurred, the approximate passenger load and whether death or injuries have occurred.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to provide:

> appropriate training for operational and non-operational staff in emergency communication procedures
> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 27**

A direct line of communication should be established between the RMC and Emergency Services Operations Control Centre by a ‘tie line’ or otherwise, so as to ensure that in the case of a serious rail accident there is an open line of communication between the officer in charge of the management of the incident at the RMC and the various emergency response services.

**Government response**

Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. See also Recommendation 2. The RMC has touch screen dial up capability to Police, Fire Brigade and Ambulance. In addition, a dedicated phone line is available for emergency services incoming calls.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to provide evidence of the connected services. Verification to be confirmed through:

> evidence by compliance review
> evidence of testing/exercise to ensure functionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 28**

A training centre for emergency services personnel should be established by RailCorp. The emergency services personnel should be required to undertake training at such a centre, which should be equipped with features replicating railway infrastructure and rolling stock.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented. An emergency services training facility is in place at Redfern with a platform, double decker carriage and blackout facilities. Petersham now nominated in place of Redfern.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp and emergency services agencies to review appropriateness and suitability of existing facilities. Determine and implement these arrangements.
Recommendation 29
All railway owners and operators should have a quality assurance program for the design and construction of rolling stock and regular review of construction to ensure that the rolling stock satisfies the original functional performance specifications.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR will ensure through its accreditation process that operators have detailed procedures for the design, construction and introduction of any new rolling stock.

Recommendation 30
The rail safety regulator should set standards for the design, manufacture, testing and commissioning of rolling stock to ensure that the rolling stock is fit for its purpose.

Government response
Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. ITSR will introduce regulations including for rolling stock that set out the expectations (or performance outcomes) required of industry. The regulations will be developed on a national basis, through the National Transport Commission (NTC) process, to ensure consistent application across the Australian rail industry. Notwithstanding the expectation that industry will develop and maintain appropriate safety standards, ITSR will retain the power to mandate such standards if the industry clearly fails to deliver satisfactory safety outcomes.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR will refer the matter to the NTC for development of national regulations. In the interim, ITSR will require operators, through the accreditation process to meet existing industry standards for rolling stock acquisition, including AS4292, rolling stock units, Train Operating Conditions and industry technical codes.
Recommendation 31

All trains must be fitted with a minimum of two independent engineering defences to minimise the risk of derailment or collision in the event of train driver incapacitation.

Government response

Supported in principle for further review. ITSR supports this for driver-only operations and will review its application on an industry-wide basis. It has been implemented on all RailCorp passenger trains. Driver safety systems and train protection systems are interrelated but may also be implemented independently. Recommendations 31-33 need to be reviewed in light of this relationship. All RailCorp passenger rolling stock have a minimum of two engineering defences (deadman, vigilance, trainstops) except 600 class (those operating in the Hunter Valley) which will be replaced from the end of 2005 with rolling stock that complies with this requirement. In the meantime on 600 class, the train guard travels with the driver as added protection for driver incapacitation.

Regulator’s expectation

ITSR currently requires through the existing accreditation process all driver-only trains (i.e. one person in the drivers cab) to be fitted with two independent engineering defences. ITSR to develop and lead a review of the need for a second engineering defence in other trains. ITSR to establish position following review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 32

RailCorp should progressively implement, within a reasonable time, level 2 automatic train protection (ATP).

Government response

Requires further detailed review. The government supports the implementation of additional train protection systems. Implementation of level 2 ATP as detailed in the recommendation would involve the replacement of all line-side signalling on the RailCorp network with on-train control systems. In addition every intra- and inter-state train accessing the network would also need to be equipped with level 2 ATP technology.

RailCorp has already retained consultants to undertake evaluation and risk assessment regarding implementation of additional automatic train protection systems on the RailCorp network. RailCorp will work with the Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) – which operates the interstate network – to develop, in conjunction with ITSR and interstate rail regulators, a national standard for an automatic train protection system.

RailCorp will also undertake a comprehensive review which will include a risk assessment, technical feasibility and cost benefit analysis of introducing level 1 ATP as well as level 2 ATP, as recommended by the Commission. Consistent with recommendation 34, any future options will need to be assessed by independent verification of acceptable risk.

Regulator’s expectation

A detailed technical review of available options.

This project was originally led by RailCorp until June 2012. On 1 July 2012, responsibility for the delivery of the ATP program was transferred to Transport for NSW (TfNSW).
The major outcome of the project is to be implementation of ATP including a trial of level 2 ETCS.

In March 2016, ITSR accepted TfNSW's proposal for the a limited supervision Level 1 ETCS to be considered as an “acceptable alternative response”. Accordingly, ITSR deemed that the status of recommendation 32 be classified as open – acceptable alternative response. ONRSR is maintaining this classification.

In March 2019, the first revenue passenger train movement with ATP was undertaken in the Cockle Creek area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Acceptable alternative response</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 33**

All new rolling stock should be designed to be compatible with at least level 2 automatic train protection discussed in chapter 7 of this report. Risk assessment and risk control procedures.

**Government response**

Requires further detailed review. See Recommendation 32.

**Regulator’s expectation**

Recommendation incorporated into review that will be undertaken in response to Recommendation 32. ITSR will refer the matter to NTC for the development of regulation/standards for rolling stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 34**

34 (a) Identify the features of the system, subsystem or activities that are to be risk assessed and managed, to determine what makes the system work in terms of equipment, infrastructure and human factors

34 (b) Identify all hazards that may exist within the particular system, subsystem or activity, whether it is a driver safety system, passenger safety system, engineering design system, train maintenance system or involves human factors or performance

34 (c) Identify what controls are in place to eliminate or minimise the risks associated with any identified hazard

34 (d) Test the validity of the controls to ensure that the risk is eliminated or reduced to an acceptable level and, if not, institute additional or further control measures

34 (e) Specify, in safety documentation, the level of any residual risk

34 (f) In the case of low probability, high consequence risks retain the services of an independent verifier of the risk assessments and controls to certify that all risks of such potentially catastrophic accidents have either been eliminated, or controlled to the extent identified by the independent expert

34 (g) The Board of RailCorp certify that it regards any residual risk of a high consequence, low probability accident as acceptable, notwithstanding the severity of the consequences, by reason of the cost of further measures to control the risk
34 (h) Provide to ITSR records of the processes of hazard identification, risk assessment, risk control, independent verification and certification, and any board certification relating to any high consequence, low probability accident

Government response
34 (a) Supported and being implemented. RailCorp has undertaken the development of a risk management framework, with the assistance of external safety experts. The draft risk management framework will be assessed against Recommendation 34 (a) to (h) to ensure the framework addresses them.
34 (b) Supported and being implemented.
34 (c) Supported and being implemented.
34 (d) Supported and being implemented.
34 (e) Supported and being implemented.
34 (f) Supported in principle for further review. RailCorp will investigate the availability of independent experts willing to undertake this certification role.
34 (g) The Board of RailCorp certify that it regards any residual risk of a high consequence, low probability accident as acceptable, notwithstanding the severity of the consequences, by reason of the cost of further measures to control the risk
34 (h) Supported.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp’s new risk management framework will incorporate requirements of Recommendations 34(a) to (h).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 35**
The ITSR should conduct its own risk assessment in relation to the risk of any such high consequence, low probability accident and, if necessary, direct RailCorp to conduct a further risk assessment to reduce the level of residual risk to a level ITSR regards as acceptable.

Government response
Not supported. ITSR is working with industry at the national level to identify appropriate risk assessment methods and consistent standards for regulators to accept risk assessments. This will provide rail operators with guidance on the level and depth of risk assessment required by them as part of accreditation. ITSR has undertaken a risk vulnerability study to identify the significant risks faced by rail operators and the corresponding risk control measures. The National Transport Commission is also developing a risk acceptance criteria project to provide further guidance to the rail industry on acceptable levels of risk. ITSR’s role in relation to operator risk assessment is to ensure that they have the competence and capacity to identify and control risks.

Regulator’s expectation
Rejected. Closed.
Recommendation 36
The ITSR should impose a standard in relation to the collection and use of data from data loggers.

Government response
Supported in principle for implementation through other means. ITSR will introduce regulations including for data loggers that set out the expectations (or performance outcomes) required of industry. The regulations will be developed on a national basis, through the National Transport Commission (NTC) process, to ensure consistent application across the Australian rail industry. Notwithstanding the expectation that industry will develop and maintain appropriate safety standards, ITSR will retain the power to mandate such standards if the industry clearly fails to deliver satisfactory safety outcomes.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR will refer matter to NTC for development of national regulations. In the interim, ITSR will review existing standards set in access agreements to ensure adequate standards for collection and use of data.

Recommendation 37
The standard in relation to the collection and use of data from data loggers should provide that such information must be accessed in the circumstances of any accident or incident and can be accessed to monitor driver performance generally.

Government response
Supported in principle for implementation through other means. See Recommendation 36. Information from data loggers can be accessed to monitor for any incident or accident and can be accessed to monitor a driver’s performance generally.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR will refer matter to NTC for development of national regulations. ITSR will adopt national regulations. In the interim, ITSR will seek from RailCorp proposals to improve the monitoring of driver performance (especially for training purposes).
**Recommendation 38**

There must be compatibility of communications systems throughout the rail network. It is essential that all train drivers, train controllers, signallers, train guards and supervisors of trackside work gangs in New South Wales be able to communicate using the same technology.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented. The National Standing Committee on Transport endorsed the Australasian Railway Association (ARA) working with operators and regulators, including RailCorp and ITSR, to develop a national approach on communications systems, which has agreed minimum functionality requirements for train radio systems.

RailCorp plans to implement a digital train radio system. An objective of this system is for it to be interoperable with existing analogue radio systems. Because of the technical complexities associated with achieving inter-operability, this has been a longer-term initiative and the first stage of its implementation will commence in 2005.

**Regulator’s expectation**

Regulator to ensure functionality and compatibility requirements are included in the national standard developed by the ARA.

This project was originally led by RailCorp until June 2012. On 1 July 2012, responsibility for the delivery of the DTRS project was transferred to Transport for NSW (TfNSW).

Regulator to ensure TfNSW/ARTC radio functionality for next generation technology meets compatibility requirements. All rail safety workers are currently able to communicate with each other but not using the same technology. Accordingly, ONRSR has deemed that the status of recommendation 38 continue to be classified as open – acceptable response.

It is anticipated that this recommendation will now be closed during the 2019/20 reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Acceptable response</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 39**

Communications procedures must be standardised throughout the rail network, so that all railway employees describe the same subject matter in an identical way.

**Government response**

Supported. RailCorp Network Procedures contain standardised communications procedures, which are in place across the NSW network. ITSR will introduce regulations including for communications that set out the expectations (or performance outcomes) required of industry. The regulations will be developed on a national basis, through the National Transport Commission process, to ensure consistent application across the Australian rail industry.

**Regulator’s expectation**

ITSR to ensure that standard communications procedures are included in Network Rules. ITSR to ensure that appropriate training is provided by operator including:

> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes. ITSR will refer matter to the NTC for development of national regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 40**
All RMC communications related staff should be selected upon the basis of the ability to convey information clearly, accurately and concisely and to follow strict communications protocols.

**Government response**
Supported.

**Regulator's expectation**
Appropriate selection criteria developed. Appropriate weighting given to developed selection criteria when selecting staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 41**
All communications protocols must be strictly enforced by all accredited rail organisations.

**Government response**
Supported.

**Regulator's expectation**
ITSR to ensure that rail operators have internal processes in place to audit and monitor compliance with protocols. ITSR will enforce these systems through its compliance & inspection program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 42**
The ITSR should audit the RMC to ensure communications protocols are being followed. The sanction for non-compliance with communications protocols should be identical to that in the aviation industry and involve immediate removal from duty. Any RailCorp employee not following communications protocols should be required to undertake further training. If, following return to
duties after such training, the officer continues to fail to comply with communications protocols, that officer is not to be employed in communications related work.

Government response
Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. ITSR will take action against operators who fail to manage non-compliance with these protocols.

Regulator's expectation
ITSR to ensure that communications protocols are included as a specific compliance/audit criteria in ITSR's compliance and audit program. ITSR will also review operators' processes to ensure they have systems in place to effectively deal with non-compliant staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 43
Communications protocols and procedures should be standardised and mandated by regulations making them a condition of accreditation.

Government response
Supported. As for Recommendation 39.

Regulator's expectation
ITSR will refer matter to NTC for development of national regulations ITSR will adopt national regulations. In the interim, ITSR will enforce compliance with the current protocols through its accreditation, audit and compliance activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 44
ITSR should ensure, as a condition of accreditation, each of these recommendations is carried into effect and should audit against them to enforce compliance.

Government response
Supported. As for Recommendation 39.

Regulator's expectation
ITSR will include these requirements as specific criteria in ITSR's compliance inspection and audit program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 45
The ITSR should conduct random audits of accredited rail organisations for compliance with communications protocols.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR will specifically audit train recordings to determine actual compliance in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 46
There should be interoperability of communications equipment between all trains operating on the New South Wales rail network.

Government response
Supported and being implemented. Interoperability is defined in terms of the driver having one hand-set with interfaces to allow communications with the appropriate operating personnel. It does not imply a single all-users radio system.

The National Standing Committee on Transport endorsed the Australasian Railway Association (ARA) working with operators and regulators, including RailCorp and ITSR, to develop a national approach on communications systems, which has agreed minimum functionality requirements for train radio systems. RailCorp plans to implement a digital train radio system. An objective of this system is for it to be interoperable with existing analogue radio systems. Because of the technical complexities associated with achieving inter-operability, this has been a longer-term initiative and the first stage of its implementation will commence in 2005.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR to ensure compatibility requirements included in national standard currently being developed by the ARA. ITSR to ensure RailCorp/ARTC radio functionality for next generation technology addresses compatibility requirements. In the interim ITSR will mandate through regulation the requirement for train radio communications equipment that allows communication between all trains operating on the NSW network in an emergency situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 47
Defects reporting, recording and rectification should be integrated with the RailCorp regimes for train maintenance.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.
Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to have effective maintenance regime in place that ensures integration of defects reporting, recording and recertification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 48**

All train drivers' defects reports should be entered by RailCorp into a computerised record and tracked to finalisation.

**Government response**
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to have effective procedures and database to ensure all defects reports are endorsed and tracked to finalisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 49**

No RailCorp train should enter into revenue service or remain in service if, in the opinion of the driver in charge of that train, any defect in it creates a risk of injury.

**Government response**
Supported.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to have instructions in place clearly identifying issues when a train is not to enter or remain in service. RailCorp to have a process to ensure all relevant staff are aware of requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 50**

All reported train defects should be certified by a person in a supervisory position in RailCorp as having been rectified.

**Government response**
Supported and being implemented. A supervisory position in RailCorp as having been rectified.
Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to have identified an appropriate position to sign off train defects that have been rectified. RailCorp to have implemented procedures to support and implement process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 51
The RailCorp defects unit should be combined with the passenger fleet maintenance division of RailCorp.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp defects unit combined with the passenger fleet maintenance division. Appropriate processes and procedures in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 52
Maintenance plans on all trains should be revised annually.

Government response
Supported in principle for further review. All maintenance plans are being reviewed. RailCorp will incorporate this recommendation in that review.

Regulator’s expectation
All plans reviewed. Process to ensure regular/appropriate reviews take place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 53
Train inspections should be carried out at the time of stabling RailCorp trains, as well as a part of train preparation prior to entering service.

Government response
Supported in principle for further review. RailCorp is reviewing procedures and resources to rectify defects. RailCorp provides time for drivers of stabling trains to report any noted defect.
Regulator’s expectation
A documented risk assessment and/or business case by RailCorp, detailing how train integrity on entering into service is to be managed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 54**
Random alcohol testing should be continued.

**Government response**
Supported.

**Regulator’s expectation**
ITSR to ensure current programs continue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 55**
Alcohol and drug testing should be mandatory for any train driver or guard involved in any accident or incident.

**Government response**
Supported. ITSR will review this recommendation as part of its ongoing involvement in checking drug and alcohol programs of rail operators. RailCorp currently tests randomly for drugs and alcohol and allows for drug and alcohol testing to be undertaken for safety-related accidents and incidents.

**Regulator’s expectation**
ITSR to develop guideline on when/which accidents/incidents require mandatory testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 56**
RailCorp should continue its system of voluntary self-identification and rehabilitation of employees with alcohol or related problems.

**Government response**
Supported.
Regulator’s expectation

RailCorp has voluntary self-identification system and rehabilitation of employees with alcohol and drug related problems. Current program continues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 57**

57 (a) The ITSR should develop standards for periodic medical examinations which include the following: all medical examinations of safety critical employees must contain a predictive element, including use of a cardiac risk factor predictions chart to assess risk of sudden incapacitation, and follow-up procedures, where indicated

57 (b) Medical examinations must be conducted by medical practitioners with an understanding of the duties and responsibilities of the safety critical employees being examined

57 (c) A medical practitioner conducting such a medical examination should, with the employee’s consent, have access to his or her medical history. If such consent is not given, the employee must be required to undertake a more exhaustive medical examination with specialist diagnostic procedures

57 (d) All such medical examinations must be reviewed on behalf of the employer by an occupational physician.

57 (e) Appropriate follow up examinations, such as a stress ECG or examination by a cardiologist, must be arranged for any safety critical employee whom the occupational physician believes may be at risk of sudden incapacitation.

57 (f) Medical histories of employees should be monitored by an occupational physician to enable identification of any trends that may indicate a deteriorating state of health

57 (g) routine basic psychological screening, by means of a questionnaire such as the KLO questionnaire, should form part of periodical medical examinations

57 (h) medical standards should be reviewed at least every five years to ensure that recent advances in medical knowledge and technology are utilised

**Government response**

57 (a) Supported and being implemented. A national standard for Medical Health Assessments for the rail industry is in place.

57 (b) Implemented.

57 (c) Implemented.

57 (d) Supported. ITSR will submit this recommendation to the National Transport Commission (NTC) for consideration as part of the national standard.

57 (e) Supported. ITSR will submit this recommendation to the National Transport Commission (NTC) for consideration as part of the national standard.

57 (f) Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. The standard requires follow-up examinations to be arranged for safety critical workers whom the examining doctor (AHP) believes may be at risk of sudden incapacitation. Note, the Health Assessment Standards refer to an Authorised Health Professional, who is not necessarily an occupational physician but is a doctor who has received the appropriate training.

57 (g) Supported and implemented.
57 (h) Supported and implemented.
57 (i) Implemented. The national standard is to be reviewed every five years.

Regulator’s expectation
57 (a) Implemented in current standard.
57 (b) Implemented in current standard.
57 (c) Implemented in current standard.
57 (d) ITSR will submit recommendation to NTC for consideration in context of current standard.
57 (e) ITSR will submit recommendation to NTC for consideration in context of current standard.
57 (f) ITSR will submit recommendation to NTC for consideration in context of current standard.
57 (g) Implemented in current standard.
57 (h) Implemented in current standard.
57 (i) Periodic examination standards prescribed by ITSR should take into consideration medical standards for safety critical rail staff prescribed elsewhere in Australia to ensure, so far as possible, uniformity of such standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 58
RailCorp should establish a comprehensive safety document management system

Government response
Supported.

Regulator’s expectation
The RailCorp safety document management system to be implemented which incorporates Recommendations 59-62.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 59
The safety document management system should provide for the distribution of electronic versions of safety documentation to relevant staff.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
The RailCorp safety document management system provides for the distribution of electronic versions of safety documentation to relevant staff.
**Recommendation 60**

RailCorp should employ a Chief Safety Information Officer to manage the collection, collation information within RailCorp.

**Government response**

Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. RailCorp has employed a Manager Information Systems within the Corporate Safety Group whose role and accountabilities include these requirements.

**Regulator’s expectation**

Position established. Position description reflects appropriate responsibilities and accountabilities.

**Recommendation 61**

RailCorp should provide access to electronic versions of safety documentation for all operational staff at their workplace.

**Government response**

Supported in principle for further review. RailCorp is reviewing options for providing all staff with the best and appropriate means of accessing safety documentation, including by electronic means.

**Regulator’s expectation**

The RailCorp safety document management system ensures the distribution of electronic versions of safety documentation to relevant staff. Procedures in place so that all operational staff can access safety documentation at appropriate times.

**Recommendation 62**

ITSR should have permanent access to the RailCorp intranet.

**Government response**

Supported in principle for implementation through other means. ITSR has a number of means available to it to obtain information from RailCorp and other rail operators when required, including access to an operator's intranet where electronic safety information is maintained. This occurs for example during an audit of an operator.
Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp and ITSR to reach agreement on the access requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 63
ITSR should establish an electronic document control system to enable effective and reliable information to be gathered for monitoring the safety of the New South Wales rail system.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR should establish and implement an electronic document control system. Appropriate policy, procedures and training developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 64
RailCorp and ITSR should co-operate with national programs for the collection, collation, trend analysis and dissemination of safety critical information.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR should continue its active participation in the National Rail Occurrence Database (NROD) and provides guidelines to Industry on reporting requirements consistent with NROD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 65
Recommendations one to seven of the final report of the Special Commission of Inquiry into the Glenbrook rail accident should be fully implemented, save that the random auditing referred to in recommendations five and seven should be carried out by ITSR

Government response
Supported and being implemented. ITSR and RailCorp will review the implementation of all the seven recommendations in light of the Waterfall inquiry.
Regulator’s expectation

RailCorp to conduct an audit review of Recommendations 1-7 of the Glenbrook report.

RailCorp to develop an overall training development program based on competences identified in Glenbrook Recommendations 1-7. This is expected to deal with training related issues identified in recommendations from SCOI Glenbrook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 66**

RailCorp should use its simulators in an interactive manner.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to provide:

> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)

> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)

> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff

> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 67**

RailCorp should use its simulators to train drivers and guards in methods of dealing with degraded operations on the rail network.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to provide:

> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues in recommendations 66-70 (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)

> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)

> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 68**

Train driver and guard training should encourage teamwork and discourage authority gradients.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to provide:

> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues in recommendations 66-70 (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)

> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)

> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff

> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 69**

RailCorp must establish a task analysis for particular categories of employees, to identify the specific skills and responsibility of those employees or groups of employees, and thereafter undertake a training needs analysis, to develop the skills required in particular areas.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to provide:

> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues in recommendations 66-70 (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)

> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)

> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff

> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 70**

Training should be based upon a needs analysis, to determine what skills a particular person will require to carry out the tasks of any position safely and efficiently, and instruction and practice, to acquire and demonstrate those skills.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to provide evidence of a corporate system to identify skills development requirements based on a needs analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 71**

The position of team leader should be created by RailCorp to be responsible for a group of approximately 30 train drivers, with responsibility to ensure that each train driver's training needs are being met and that any safety concerns of train drivers are being properly addressed. The team leaders are to have direct access to the Chief Executive of RailCorp if any safety concerns they have are not addressed.

**Government response**

Supported in principle for further review. RailCorp is reviewing the current supervisory structure of train crewing in light of this recommendation.

**Regulator’s expectation**

Creation of appropriate position to carry out functions outlined in Recommendation 71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 72**

The New South Wales Government should make the necessary arrangements with the Australian Government, including any necessary legislation, for the Australian Transport Safety Bureau (ATSB) to have the power to investigate all rail accidents occurring on the New South Wales rail network the investigation of which may advance the knowledge of the causes of rail accidents in Australia.

**Government response**

Supported in principle. The Minister for Transport has written to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport to initiate negotiations on the appropriate mechanisms to enable the ATSB to undertake
investigations referred to it by the NSW Government. This may require legislation in NSW via state referral of power to the Commonwealth.

Regulator's expectation
Review and develop appropriate MOU. Mechanisms in place to provide for ATSB to undertake investigations referred to it by the NSW Government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Transport Safety Investigations</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 73**
ITSR should ensure that OTSI, as a division of ITSR, co-operates and assists the ATSB in the conduct of any independent investigation by the ATSB of any rail accident or incident in New South Wales.

Government response
Supported in principle. See Recommendation 72

Regulator's expectation
Review and develop appropriate MOU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Transport Safety Investigations</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 74**
The ATSB should deliver any report of any such rail accident which it investigates to the board of any rail organisation involved in the accident, ITSR and the Minister for Transport Services.

Government response
Supported in principle. See Recommendation 72

Regulator's expectation
Review and develop appropriate MOU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Transport Safety Investigations</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 75**
All ATSB accident investigation reports should be made public.
Government response
Supported. The NSW Government is advised the accident investigation reports are already published by this Commonwealth agency.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR to confirm with ATSB that its investigation reports are made public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 76
The ITSR should establish a data and information management system, containing all data and information that it requires, to continually monitor the safety of the New South Wales rail system.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR will amend its data and information management system to incorporate requirements of Recommendations 76-77.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 77
The data and information management system should be compatible with any data and information management system established by the ATSB for the designated interstate rail network, provided that the establishment of a compatible system does not reduce the amount or quality of the information obtained by ITSR below the optimum levels which it needs to conduct trend analysis, and otherwise properly manage the safety of rail operations in New South Wales.

Government response
Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. See also Recommendation 64. NSW already shares data with the ATSB and is working with other agencies in a project being managed by ATSB to expand the range of information which can be shared between all relevant agencies.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR will amend its data and information management system to incorporate requirements of Recommendations 76-77.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 78
The OTSI should continue to conduct rail accident investigations on behalf of ITSR and report directly to the Chief Executive of ITSR.

Government response
Supported in principle and being implemented other means. OTSI will be established as a separate agency independent of ITSR, reporting directly to the Minister for Transport. OTSI will continue to conduct 'just culture' investigations in NSW.

Regulator's expectation
OTSI established as a separate agency to ITSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 79
The relevant legislation should be amended to provide expressly that OTSI and the Chief Investigator have the power to initiate a rail accident or incident investigation

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Legislation amended to provide for OTSI Chief Investigator to initiate a rail accident/incident investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 80
Any barriers to communication between OTSI and ITSR should be removed, so as to ensure that any findings made by OTSI in relation to any investigation it conducts are reported immediately to ITSR.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Develop MOU between OTSI and ITSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 81**

All reports of the Chief Investigator of OTSI should be delivered, upon completion and without being reviewed, to ITSR and the Minister for Transport Services.

**Government response**

Supported.

**Regulator's expectation**

Legislation already provides for OTSI reports to go to the Minister for tabling in parliament. ITSR receives OTSI investigation reports as an interested party. This process will be incorporated into the MOU between OTSI and ITSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Transport Safety Investigations</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 82**

Legislation should be enacted and any necessary arrangements made, to enable the ATSB to review any reports of any investigation by a rail organisation or the OTSI into any serious incident or accident in New South Wales.

**Government response**

Supported in principle for further review. See Recommendation 72.

**Regulator's expectation**

Review and develop appropriate MOU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 83(a)**

83 (a) RailCorp should develop a plan to be submitted to ITSR to address the deficiencies in the safety culture of RailCorp, including: the means whereby RailCorp proposes to ensure that all its operational, administrative and managerial staff consider the safety implications of any decision or action undertaken by them.

**Government response**

Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator's expectation**

RailCorp to develop safety culture program which incorporates Recommendation 83 (a) - (n).
**Agency** | **Status** | **Regulator assessment** | **Target date**
--- | --- | --- | ---
Not assigned | Closed | No further action | Verified

**Recommendation 83(b) to (n)**

83 (b) the means whereby any distrust between management and operational staff is removed and replaced by a culture in which the whole organisation is motivated towards the safe conduct of its transportation activities

83 (c) the means whereby RailCorp proposes to implement a just culture instead of a blame culture

83 (d) the means whereby RailCorp proposes to establish and implement accountability and responsibility of individuals for the safety of the activities that they undertake

83 (e) the means whereby RailCorp proposes to measure the safety performance of all individuals with accountabilities and responsibilities for safety, for the purpose of determining whether their level of safety performance is satisfactory

83 (f) the means whereby the Board of Directors, the Chief Executive and the Group General Managers intend, by their actions and behaviour, to foster the development of a safety culture in the organisation

83 (g) the means whereby RailCorp proposes to reward employees for bringing safety issues to the attention of management, and the means whereby the management of the organisation proposes to track the safety issues raised, to ensure continual safety improvement

83 (h) the means, generally, whereby RailCorp intends to replace the present culture of on-time running with a culture encouraging safe, efficient and reliable provision of rail services

83 (i) the means whereby RailCorp proposes to ensure that communications protocols are followed by the employees of the RMC and all other employees engaged in safety critical work

83 (j) the means whereby RailCorp proposes to set safety targets for the reduction of incidents overall, and incidents in particular classes, and the means whereby the relevant information is to be kept and collated for the purpose of measuring safety performance in those areas

83 (k) the means whereby employees responsible for particular areas are rewarded for safety improvements in their areas of activity

83 (l) the means whereby RailCorp intends to integrate safety in all aspects and at all levels of the transportation activities which it undertakes

83 (m) the means whereby RailCorp proposes to train staff in processes of hazard analysis and risk management relevant to the particular activities that they conduct

83 (n) the means whereby RailCorp is to integrate the management of safety in all aspects into the general management of its business undertaking

**Government response**

The RailCorp safety culture program will be reviewed to ensure compliance with this recommendation.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to develop safety culture program which incorporates Recommendation 83 (a) - (n).
Recommendation 84
If ITSR accepts such a plan as an appropriate response to the existing weak safety culture, ITSR should approve it and monitor the effectiveness of the plan.

Government response
Supported in principle. ITSR is reviewing the process used to develop the plan. ITSR will also review the plan as submitted and monitor its effectiveness.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR reviews RailCorp’s plan and assess whether it incorporates Recommendation 83 (a) - (n). ITSR monitors implementation of plan.

Recommendation 85
RailCorp’s approach to occupational health and safety should be proactive and involve the systematic analysis of all current hazards, risks and controls and an assessment of their adequacy to reduce the risk of injury to, or death of, employees to an acceptable level overall safety management.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
RailCorp to demonstrate the implementation of an integrated SMS as detailed in their accreditation application.

Recommendation 86
RailCorp should integrate its management of OHS into its overall safety management.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
Requirements to be part of SMS.
### Recommendation 87
Risk assessments of occupational health and safety issues by RailCorp should include an analysis of broader public safety risks and not be confined to narrow occupational health and safety issues.

**Government response**
Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**
Requirements to be part of SMS. Appropriate RailCorp Risk Management Framework in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation 88
The RailCorp passenger containment policy must be abandoned

**Government response**
Supported. RailCorp will review and replace the current containment policy, in consultation with ITSR. The Commission recognised the complexity of determining appropriate policy and operational/technical arrangements for emergency egress from trains. Evidence to the Commission was that on some occasions passengers are best kept inside a train; in others they need to be able to escape. An independent risk assessment of the alternatives to the current policy will be undertaken. This risk assessment will be consistent with Recommendation 34, and the replacement passenger containment policy will be based on its results.

**Regulator’s expectation**
Risk assessment conducted. Containment policy reviewed. New policy developed and implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Subject</td>
<td>See Waterfall SCOI Annual Status Report – Recommendations closed subject to</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td>implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation 89
There must be a minimum of two independent methods of self-initiated emergency escape for passengers from all trains at all times.
Government response
Requires further detailed review, subject to the risk assessment referred to in Recommendation 88.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Subject to implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td>See Waterfall SCOI Annual Status Report – Recommendations closed subject to implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 90
All passenger trains must be fitted with an internal passenger emergency door release.

Government response
Requires further detailed review. See Recommendation 89.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Subject to implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td>See Waterfall SCOI Annual Status Report – Recommendations closed subject to implementation of an approved program or plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 91
All passenger trains operating in New South Wales must be fitted with external emergency door releases which do not require any special key or other equipment to operate.

Government response
Supported and being implemented. RailCorp has commenced a modification program to ensure all external emergency door releases do not require special keys or other equipment to operate.

Regulator’s expectation
ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.
### Recommendation 92

The internal passenger emergency door release should be fitted with a facility which prevents it from operating unless the train is stationary.

**Government response**

Requires further detailed review. See Recommendation 89.

**Regulator’s expectation**

ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.

### Recommendation 93

The operation of the train doors should have an override facility whereby the train driver or the guard can override an internal passenger emergency door release system if the door release is interfered with when there is no emergency. There should be an alarm, together with an intercom, in the train guard's compartment so that, if a passenger attempts to initiate an emergency door release, there is an appropriate delay during which time an alarm sounds in the train guard's compartment and the guard can then, after first attempting to speak via the intercom to the person concerned, if necessary, override the door release, and make an appropriate announcement over the intercom system in the train.

**Government response**

Requires further detailed review. See Recommendation 89.

**Regulator’s expectation**

ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.
**Recommendation 94**
The risk of abuse of internal passenger emergency door releases should be further reduced by introducing significant penalties for any improper use of such an emergency facility. It should be a criminal offence for anyone to use or tamper improperly with an emergency escape facility in a train.

**Government response**
Supported.

**Regulator’s expectation**
Appropriate legislation introduced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 95**
All passenger trains operating in New South Wales must have the external emergency door release clearly marked with the words ‘Emergency Door Release’.

**Government response**
Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**
ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 96**
All RailCorp operational personnel should be trained in the location and operation of external emergency door release mechanisms.

**Government response**
Supported and being implemented.

**Regulator’s expectation**
RailCorp to provide:
> evidence of development of training program that addresses issues (includes development process, training aids/curriculum)
> evidence of appropriate assessment competency (delivery of course by appropriately qualified trainers)
> evidence of process to ensure the training of new staff and the refresher training of existing staff
> review process built-in, to take into account relevance and changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 97**

All emergency services personnel should be trained in the location and operation of emergency door release mechanisms on all rail cars.

**Government response**

Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. RailCorp has produced a training DVD showing the location and operation of external emergency door release mechanisms. 500 copies have been provided to each of Fire Services, Police and Ambulance.

The very large number of emergency response personnel (including volunteer services) that may respond to a rail incident, means training of all personnel in the RailCorp framework is unlikely to be achievable. Emergency services will investigate with RailCorp extension of the DVD into a multimedia resource to improve the ability to educate wider numbers of emergency service workers.

**Regulator’s expectation**

Agreement between RailCorp and emergency services in place on most effective means of communication/training for location and operation of emergency door release mechanisms on all passenger cars. Training aids developed/distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW emergency services</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 98**

All trains should have windows available through which passengers can escape.

**Government response**

Requires further detailed review. See Recommendation 89.

**Regulator’s expectation**

ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 99

All new rail cars must have appropriate signage and lighting identifying escape routes in the case of emergency.

Government response

Supported.

Regulator's expectation

ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 100

All new rolling stock must be designed with an area of the roof through which emergency services personnel can access a rail car without encountering wiring or other equipment. That access point must be clearly marked with words such as "emergency services cut here".

Government response

Requires further detailed review. See Recommendation 89.

Regulator's expectation

ITSR has undertaken an initial review and recommended options for a standard. ITSR to develop principles for an appropriate standard incorporating review findings and refer matter to NTC for development of a national standard. ITSR to ensure operators comply with standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 101

ITSR should initiate and/or participate in the development of a national standard for crashworthiness of all passenger trains.

Government response

Supported.

Regulator's expectation

ITSR will refer matter to NTC for development of national regulations. ITSR will adopt national regulations. In the interim ITSR will ensure compliance with existing industry standards through its accreditation process.
**Recommendation 102**

RailCorp should make it a condition of employment that all level 2 managers have or obtain a formal qualification in system safety management.

**Government response**

Supported in principle for further review. RailCorp has developed and implemented a program of safety science training for senior managers (levels 2, 3 and 4). A comprehensive review of available formal qualifications in system safety management, including international practice, with an option of having RailCorp’s training formally recognised.

**Regulator’s expectation**

Program implemented to ensure all level 2 managers obtain formal qualifications in system safety management. Position description to reflect criteria.

**Recommendation 103**

RailCorp should establish clear safety accountability statements and reporting lines for all management positions.

**Government response**

Supported.

**Regulator’s expectation**

Accountability statements implemented for all management positions.

**Recommendation 104**

The RailCorp Board should establish independent external safety auditing processes to regularly audit and report to the Board on the implementation of an integrated safety management system by RailCorp and on safety performance generally. The RailCorp Board should establish independent external safety auditing processes to regularly audit and report to the Board on the implementation of an integrated safety management system by RailCorp and on safety performance generally.
Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
Program established that provides for independent external safety audit. Independent external safety audits conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 105**

The RailCorp Board should ensure that RailCorp has an adequate and integrated safety management system, including adequate systems for risk assessment, clearly defined safety responsibilities and accountabilities for persons holding management positions, and specific performance criteria against which evaluations can be made of safety performance and accountability for safety performance of all managers.

Government response
Supported and being implemented.

Regulator’s expectation
Implementation of RailCorp safety management system. Clearly defined accountabilities to be in the SMS documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 106**

The RailCorp Board should require a full review of the safety competence of RailCorp managers to ensure that each has the ability to bring about those safety reforms recommended in this report which are applicable to his or her position. The RailCorp Board should require a full review of the safety competence of RailCorp managers to ensure that each has the ability to bring about those safety reforms recommended in this report which are applicable to his or her position.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator’s expectation
Review undertaken by RailCorp. Recertification plans developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 107
RailCorp should ensure that where the safety competency of any manager is deficient such manager is required to undertake professional development courses to raise his or her safety competency level to an adequate standard.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Review undertaken by RailCorp. Recertification plans developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 108
RailCorp should conduct internal and external safety audits to evaluate the adequacy of its safety management system and to ensure that any risk control measures are effective.

Government response
Supported and being implemented. RailCorp's annual safety audit plan includes audits to evaluate the adequacy of its safety management system and risk control measures. The 2005 audit plan includes four external audits.

Regulator's expectation
Internal/external audit plan developed. Evidence of audits conducted/audit reports. Develop rectification plans (link to Recommendation 104).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 109
Following completion of any external audit, a corrective action plan to remedy any identified safety deficiencies should be developed by RailCorp, implemented and followed up within the business groups affected, to ensure appropriate and timely completion of the action plan, by a formal examination of the effectiveness of the controls put in place. Senior management personnel should certify that the corrective action plan has been implemented and is effective. Senior management personnel should be accountable for any such certification.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Develop rectification plans. Formal closeout procedures/processes in place and monitoring program in place.
Recommendation 110

A Safety Reform Program Director (SRPD), reporting directly to the Chief Executive of RailCorp, should be retained to manage, as head of a Safety Reform Program Office, any safety reform program being undertaken by RailCorp. The SRPD should work with the Chief Executive and senior management to ensure the implementation of an integrated safety management system and the cultural change required. The SRPD must have qualifications suitable for recognition by the Australian Institute of Project Management as a master program director. He or she should report to and be under the control of the Chief Executive, to ensure that the accountability of the Chief Executive is not reduced. The SRPD should co-ordinate and integrate any existing rail safety reform programs and, in consultation with and with the authority of the Chief Executive he or she should:

110 (a) assign responsibility for particular aspects of the project to identifiable employees
110 (b) ensure that each person to whom such an aspect of the program has been assigned has the time and resources to undertake the tasks each is required to perform
110 (c) identify the period of time during which such persons are required to achieve the desired safety outcome for the particular aspect of the program
110 (d) specify a clearly defined scope of work to be undertaken, a schedule setting out when such work is to be completed, and institute a system of measuring whether or not the objectives have been achieved in the time specified
110 (e) report to the Chief Executive of RailCorp on a monthly basis on each aspect of the program, and the Chief Executive is to report on a monthly basis to the RailCorp Board and to ITSR, on the progress of each program

Government response
Supported.

Regulator’s expectation
Position established/filled. Position description reflects responsibilities in Recommendation 110 (a) to (e).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 111

The Advisory Board established under the Transport Legislation Amendment (Safety and Reliability) Act 2003 must be abolished.

Government response
Not supported. The statutory obligation of the ITSR Advisory Board to review and provide advice to OTSI in regard to accident investigations and any functions of the Chairman in respect of accident investigation will be removed but the ITSR Advisory Board will be retained as a source of expert advice to ITSR.
Regulator's expectation
Rejected. Closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not assigned</td>
<td>Closed - Recommendation rejected</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 112

Legislative changes should be enacted to ensure the complete independence of ITSR from the Minister for Transport Services.

Government response

Not supported. The principal objective of ITSR is to facilitate the safe operation of transport services in the state and to promote safety and reliability as fundamental objectives in the delivery of transport services. As such it makes a critical contribution to the transport portfolio. ITSR will be retained as an agency within the Transport portfolio, but its accountability and the responsibility of the CEO, and ITSR's independence will be enhanced by providing explicit reporting requirements of ITSR in the legislation and removing from legislation the requirement for the Advisory Board to review ITSR reports.

Regulator's expectation
Rejected. Closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not assigned</td>
<td>Closed - Recommendation rejected</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 113

The Chief Executive of ITSR should have accountability and responsibility for the regulation of rail safety in New South Wales.

Government response

Supported in principle. The Chief Executive of ITSR administers the government's rail safety legislation and provides advice on rail safety to the government.

Regulator's expectation
Implemented. Chief Executive has sole accountability for administering the Rail Safety Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 114
The ITSR should publish guidelines to be followed by accredited organisations.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Have guidelines in place, ITSR has a process to identify, develop and issue guidelines as required from time to time under the Rail Safety Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 115
The ITSR should not grant accreditation to any rail organisation unless it has an integrated safety management system in accordance with any safety management system regulation and the guidelines published from time to time by ITSR.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
The National Accreditation Package is the new standard for accreditation which includes requirement for an integrated SMS. The National Accreditation Package will be supported by a regulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 116
The ITSR should conduct field audits to satisfy itself that all accredited rail organisations conduct their activities in accordance with the safety management system on the basis of which each was accredited.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Implemented. Audit program in place, compliance program in place, ITSR audit and compliance programs are developed around and focused on the safety management systems as submitted by accredited organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 117**
Staffing arrangements for ITSR should be reviewed by it to ensure that adequate staff are employed in field positions, actively monitoring the safety of rail operations and compliance with conditions of accreditation.

**Government response**
Supported.

**Regulator’s expectation**
Implemented. ITSR reviews its field resources and staff allocation on a regular basis to ensure adequate staff are employed in field positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 118**
All accredited rail organisations should be required to re-apply every three years to ITSR for accreditation.

**Government response**
Not supported. Under the Rail Safety Act 2002, ITSR has the right to require an operator to re-submit its safety management system (SMS), the central requirement of operator accreditation, at any time. This provides ongoing opportunity to review and check an operator's SMS as required rather than at a pre-determined frequency.

Additionally, the National Rail Safety Accreditation Package (NRSAP) requires frequent audits of rail operators and evidence of continuous improvement in the operator’s SMS.

**Regulator’s expectation**
Rejected. Closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not assigned</td>
<td>Closed Recommendation rejected</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 119**
The ITSR, when considering a re-application for accreditation, should conduct a field audit of the organisation to ensure that it is carrying on its activities in accordance with the basis upon which it seeks accreditation.

**Government response**
Supported
Regulator’s expectation

Implemented. ITSR conducts regular field audits as part of its accreditation application process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 120**

The ITSR should continue to participate in the development of a national system for rail safety regulation, provided that any ultimate agreement between the States and Territories and the Australian Government does not produce a safety outcome for New South Wales that is less than would be achieved by the implementation of all the recommendations contained in this report.

**Government response**

Supported in principle for further review. ITSR will continue to participate in the development of a national system for rail safety regulation.

**Regulator’s expectation**

ITSR actively participates in national reform/NTC processes. ITSR has as a principle, that NSW will not accept national reform proposals which produce less safe outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 121**

A safety management system regulation should be promulgated, specifying the requirements of safety management systems in all accredited organisations, using Annexure I to this report as a guide.

**Government response**

Supported in principle for implementation through other means. ITSR will introduce regulations that set out the expectations (or performance outcomes) required of industry. The regulations will be developed on a national basis, through the National Transport Commission process, to ensure consistent application across the Australian rail industry.

**Regulator’s expectation**

ITSR will refer the matter to the National Transport Commission for development of national regulations. ITSR will adopt the national regulations. In the interim, ITSR has developed NAP which sets out requirements and has made NAP a condition of accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 122**

RailCorp should establish an integrated safety management system which includes the following:

122 (a) a formal performance management system, incorporating measurable safety accountabilities and responsibilities for each managerial position

122 (b) defined safety accountability and responsibility statements for senior management

122 (c) an effective means of reviewing and acting upon audit investigation and review findings

122 (d) an effective system for managing audit and investigation findings, to ensure that any identified deficiencies have been rectified

122 (e) criteria for recruitment and promotion of management staff, including safety management qualifications, experience and expertise

122 (f) development of risk management procedures, including:

- analysis of the nature of the activities being undertaken
- identification of all potential hazards within those activities
- analysis of the nature of the hazard
- analysis of the risks of the hazard materialising
- development of controls to mitigate the risk
- development of systems for monitoring the effectiveness of the controls to ensure that they are working
- development of a continuing program to enhance the development of safe practices at all levels of the organisation
- development of key performance indicators for safety performance by all persons in management positions
- development of a safety information data collection system which captures all hazards, occupational health and safety incidents, audit results, non-compliance findings and near miss reports
- development of a system to arrange in priority order, on the basis of data and trend analysis, those safety deficiencies which require the most urgent attention
- design and implementation of communications protocols, including standard phraseology, with particular standard phraseology for emergency situations
- development of training systems, based upon training needs analysis.

**Government response 122 (a)**

Supported. The RailCorp Board has approved the safety strategic plan and the engagement of external experts to assist in the development of an integrated safety management system for RailCorp. The safety management system has been developed and will be implemented in 2005, consistent with the requirements of RailCorp's provisional accreditation.

RailCorp will review its integrated safety management system against this recommendation to ensure consistency.

**Government response 122(b) to (f)**

RailCorp will review its integrated safety management system against this recommendation to ensure consistency.
Regulator’s expectation

RailCorp to review its SMS to ensure that it incorporates requirements from Recommendation 122 (a) - (f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 123**

RailCorp should establish a safety management system containing the 29 elements identified in the SMSEP report which is in volume 2 of this report.

**Government response**

Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. RailCorp's draft integrated safety management system incorporates the substance of all 29 elements identified in the SMSEP.

**Regulator’s expectation**

RailCorp to review its SMS to ensure that it incorporates 29 elements identified in SMSEP report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RailCorp</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 124**

The ITSR should ensure that RailCorp establishes a safety management system containing the 29 elements identified in the SMSEP report, and ensure the ongoing monitoring and improvement of the safety management system established.

**Government response**

Supported in principle and being implemented through other means. See Recommendation 123.

**Regulator’s expectation**

ITSR to review RailCorp’s SMS in line with the accreditation requirements outlined in Recommendation 123.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 125**

125 (a) The ITSR must provide a quarterly report to the Minister for Transport Services on the progress made by RailCorp in implementing these recommendations, including a statement as to whether or not the recommendation has been implemented and, if so, is working effectively.
125 (b) if the recommendation has not been implemented, the means by which the safety objective of the recommendation is otherwise to be achieved

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Quarterly reports provided outlining issues raised in the recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 126**

The Minister for Transport Services must table in Parliament, each such quarterly report by ITSR.

Government response
Supported.

Regulator's expectation
Reports tabled in Parliament.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITSR</td>
<td>Closed - Verified</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 127**

The Minister for Transport Services should retain, independently of ITSR, safety auditors to provide a report to the Minister confirming or qualifying the contents of each such ITSR quarterly report.

Government response
Not Supported. The government is confident that ITSR has the capacity and competence to effectively monitor and review implementation of the recommendations arising from the Commission's final report. An additional independent auditor would duplicate the work of ITSR and may cause confusion about which agency is the primary regulatory authority.

Regulator's expectation
Rejected. Closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Regulator assessment</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not assigned</td>
<td>Closed - Recommendation rejected</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix A: Classification system taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Await response</td>
<td>This status is automatically assigned to an accepted recommendation. Affected parties will be asked to submit their response for implementing the recommendation to the regulator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Response received</td>
<td>The regulator has received a response from an affected party and this response is under review by it. It has not yet been accepted by the regulator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Acceptable response</td>
<td>The regulator agrees that the planned action, when completed, meets the recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Acceptable alternative response</td>
<td>The regulator agrees that alternative action, when completed, satisfies the objective of the recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Response rejected by Regulator</td>
<td>The regulator does not agree that the planned or alternate action meets the recommendation. The company or agency is advised of the rejection and requested to provide a revised response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Company claims closure</td>
<td>The entity claims that the planned or alternate action has been completed. The action has not yet been verified by the regulator, who has not yet agreed that the item is closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Recommendation rejected</td>
<td>The regulator has determined through further analysis and review that the recommendation is not appropriate (i.e. will not achieve the desired safety outcomes) and has rejected the recommendation. It is therefore closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed No longer applicable</td>
<td>The recommendation has been overtaken by events and action is no longer required. For example, a new technology has eliminated the reason for the recommendation, it has been superseded by other recommendations issued, or the operator affected has gone out of business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Action verified</td>
<td>Completion of the planned or alternate action has been verified by the regulator through a compliance inspection or audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Action not verified</td>
<td>The regulator accepts that the planned or alternate action has been completed following a review of documentation submitted. Field verification is not necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Subject to the implementation of the approved program or plan</td>
<td>A long term implementation plan has been approved. The regulator will monitor reported progress against the plan to ensure compliance with delivery schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>