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Study design: the what, why and how

Three key research questions:
- How are other organizations conducting RCA?
  - How do they decide when to conduct a RCA?
  - How do they perform the RCA?
- How are the key findings disseminated and used?
- What is working & what is not?

Study approach:
- Review of public documents about the organization
  - Mandate, history, organizational structure, operations, budget, etc.
- Review of investigations by the organization
  - Investigation reports, congressional testimony, etc.
- Interviews with former members of the organizations
Case study selection: the who

Case studies were selected to cover various:

- Industries
- Organizational structures
- Mandates (regulatory, non-regulatory, non-governmental)

Organizations included in case study:

- National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB)
- Chemical Safety Board (CSB)
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
- Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)
- Divers Alert Network (DAN)*

* DAN is a non-profit organization dedicated to the safety of recreational diving
Finding I: not every investigation is a RCA

Three distinct but related types of investigations:

- **Predictive (before operations)**
  - What can go wrong & how to prevent it?
  - Based on risk assessment, fault tree analysis, etc.
  - Site licensing, standard setting, regulations, etc.

- **Operational (during operations)**
  - Are safety measures implemented & adhered to?
  - Based on inspection, surveys, etc.

- **Investigational (after accident)**
  - What went wrong & why? What actually worked?
  - Based on root cause analysis
Finding II: responsibilities differ

Organizations with regulatory oversight function:
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
- Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)
- Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA)

Organizations without regulatory oversight function:
- National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB)
- Chemical Safety Board (CSB)
- Divers Alert Network (DAN)*

* DAN is a non-profit organization dedicated to the safety of recreational diving
Finding III: not every accident requires RCA

- Accident or incident
  - New & catastrophic
  - Known factor
    - Minimize occurrence
      - RCA
        - Monitor
          - Recommend changes
            - Trend analysis
            - Training & outreach
            - Rules & regulation
            - Recommend changes
Finding IV: different definitions of root cause

**NTSB:**
- “probable cause” = explanation of event supported by facts & evidence
- recommendations not restricted to probable causes

**Chemical Safety Board:**
- Any factor that would have prevented the accident if the factor had not occurred

**Nuclear Regulatory Commission:**
- “direct cause” = the action or condition immediately preceding the event
- “probable cause” = preponderance of evidence for presence during event
- “possible cause” = may have been present, but insufficient evidence
Finding V: types of evidence are universal

- Eye witnesses
- Other parties

- Site visits
- Lab samples
- Wreckages
- Other

- Inspections
- Company files
- Others

- Compliance
- Sufficiency

- Interviews
- Physical evidence
- Records & documents
- Laws & regulations
Finding VI: Effective RCAs reconstruct event

Before the accident

| What was the general situation before the event? | What specific events led up to the event? |

During the accident

| What went wrong and why? | What went right? |

After the accident

| How well did the post-event response work? | What has been learned and what changes have been made? |
Finding VII: Effective RCAs consider 4 factors

- Physical factors, including:
  - Structures & systems (e.g., buildings, automatic monitoring systems, etc.)
  - Impacts (e.g., survivability, injuries etc.)

- Operational or ‘human factors’, including:
  - Operator performance
  - Decision-marking (before, during and after the accident)
  - Communications

- Organizational factors, including:
  - Structures, policies, organizational culture, SOPs, etc.

- External factors, including:
  - Weather & external conditions during the event
  - Post-emergency response (e.g., first responders, regulators etc.)
  - Applicable rules & regulations
Finding VIII: Keys to an effective RCA

- **Timely investigations and frequent reporting**
  - Evidence can be secured, no ‘information void’, no misinformed public

- **Appropriate technical expertise**
  - E.g., through NTSB’s ‘party system’

- **Comprehensive & systematic investigation**
  - From before the event to after the post-event response, all relevant factors

- **Conclusions based on & driven by evidence**
  - Conclusions clearly follow from the facts; hypotheses portrayed as such
  - Potentially based on commissioned research or ruling out of other causes

- **Unbiased & transparent**
  - Sunshine provisions, party systems, etc.

- **Clearly & concisely reported**
Finding IX: Common challenges to RCA

- **Access**
  - To facilities, records, accident sites, interviewees etc.

- **Resource availability**
  - Specialized expertise, staffing issues, triaging of accidents, etc.

- **Privacy concerns**
  - Confidential or private data

- **Potential legal actions**
  - Liability in civil and/or criminal lawsuits
  - Sealing of records following litigation

- **Ability to translate findings & recommendations into practice**
  - Regulatory challenges (e.g., standard-setting process)
  - Other challenges (e.g., economics)
Interviewees identified the following additional factors as central to success:

- The ability to issue recommendations at any point in the investigation
  - Recommendations do not have to relate to probable or root cause
    - Ability to learn from observations before they cause catastrophic event

- The ability to review all aspects of the accident without real/perceived COI
  - Failure to regulate (e.g., set or enforce regulations) common contributor
  - Access to specialized technical expertise, research etc. when needed

- A collaborative working relationship among all stakeholders
  - Access: to evidence, expertise, information etc.
  - Resources: utilize existing structures and systems where possible
  - Impact: ability to implement changes based on lessons learned
Conclusions: some common themes

- Vast differences across ‘case studies’
- Some ‘models’ work better than others
- Not everything is directly transferrable across industries
  - CSB modeled after NTSB, considerable differences in operations
- Yet, common challenges and approaches
- Some promising solutions
  - Transferrable to other sectors?
- Many aspects are scalable
  - Many industries grapple with scalability, some interesting approaches
- Translating findings into changes is perhaps the greatest challenge
  - It really does take a village……