

**NOTES / ACTIONS from 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2016 NTF meeting**

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>CB opening remarks</b></p> <p>CB welcomed Richard Schofield (Anglia) as the NR RMD rep, John Halsall (South East) for the TSR item and Andy Jones (technical lead for TSRs) and Hannah Raven (project manager for TSRs) who accompanied John.</p> <p>Oliver Bratton deputising for Jeremy Long (MTR), Richard Dean for Dyan Crowther (GTR) and Alan Pilbeam for Tom Norris (Abellio).</p> <p>John Thompson (NR) supporting Phil Hufton on Item 2.</p> <p>Peter Wilkinson (DfT) sent apologies. *post meeting note – PW attended from Item 10.</p> <p>RDG – the August meeting was cancelled.</p> <p>Action tracking – DB said there were no concerns around outstanding actions.</p>		
	<p><b>Verbal Updates</b></p> <p><b>Vegetation Management</b></p> <p>PH stated that approach was for Routes and TOCs to prioritise sites for clearance and make a business case, noting that funds were finite. RS noted that Anglia Route had learned lessons from previous ‘awful autumn’ and the Curley 2015 Anglia review, and had agreed the list of super sites with AGA to be managed on a sustainable basis.</p> <p>MH said that vegetation management tended to be managed inconsistently from one year to the next, depending partly on the people involved. It should be managed in the same way as infrastructure assets, like track, where these variances in activity would not be tolerated. JH noted that there was a standard</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1608_01	<p>for vegetation management but that NR was not funded to deliver it in full. It was important both to ensure that the standard was revised appropriately, and that the CP6 business plan funded its delivery. GR noted that NR was funded to deliver asset policies in CP5, but agreed the importance of ensuring the alignment of standard and business plan for CP6.</p> <p>CB noted that it was important that the AWG review of autumn preparedness reported on the progress of both identifying and treating super sites in each Route in its August and September reports to NTF.</p>	MH/BH	31 August and 28 September
1608_02	<p>CB said it was also important to make the case for CP6 and that the business case work reported by AWG could be useful. While it was not clear what approach new Ministers would take, the response to the challenge from Claire Perry on the business case for spending more to improve autumn performance should be taken to PDG in October.</p>	GC	10 October PDG
1608_03	<p>CB also asked that PH bring a note to NTF on NR's proposed approach to vegetation management for CP6 and the PR18 process / Initial Industry Advice.</p>	PH	28 September NTF
	<p><b>Service resilience</b></p> <p>GC stated that he and PW were meeting to discuss the issue of tackling service resilience through the franchising process in week commencing 8 August. <i>Post meeting note</i> – meeting has happened and NTF will get a briefing from PW at next meeting.</p>		
1608_04	<p><b>Paper A – Performance Report</b></p> <p>JT noted that performance in period 4 had been the worst period 4 for 10 years. Key causes of this were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asset reliability on the very hot days 18-20 July</li> <li>• GTR train crew issues (accounting for 5% PPM shortfall)</li> </ul> <p>CB stressed the need for deeper analysis of the root causes of asset failures in the heat and to learn lessons from this, and reiterated the need for the analysis to draw out underlying performance and event driven performance.</p>	JT	From P5 reporting if possible - if not then P6

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>Paper B – TSR Reduction plan</b></p> <p>JH presented an overview of the TSR reduction plan. Slides available <a href="#">here</a>. He acknowledged that NR had not demonstrated a coordinated approach previously and understood why operators might feel that the issue was not being taken seriously. He reiterated that the main reason for the recent significant rise was the number of unplanned TSRs due to cyclic top, with increases following 2 letters of instruction – issued following derailments – that mandated immediate speeds until the problem was addressed. Increased frequency of measurement was also finding more problem sites more quickly.</p> <p>The priority is therefore to improve the ability to <i>predict and prevent</i> the need for TSRs. A series of actions were being taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• roll out of an ORBIS tool that combined existing data sets to predict risk sites – this had been tested on historic south east data and found to have predicted 60% of the TSRs that were applied;</li> <li>• refinement of the measuring train algorithms to show emerging dips before they reached the exceedance thresholds – rather than just showing the sites that already exceeded thresholds.</li> </ul> <p>Better prediction tools would be in place across the network in a few months, although it would be longer before the reduction in numbers would be observed.</p> <p>In parallel, Methods of Control guidance was being produced that would specify actions to address symptoms that could lead to TSRs being required, enabling action to be taken – in a planned way – to avoid the need for a TSR.</p> <p>The plan was being governed through periodic conference calls with all Route DRAMs, using a dashboard of outputs and precursors.</p> <p>PH underlined the importance of getting measurement trains to tell us how good the track is, not how bad it is.</p> <p>MH noted that if cyclic top speeds applied to freight only, was the cyclic top problem the right focus to improve passenger performance? JH replied that he believed tackling the cyclic top issue was the key issue, and that this would address a lot of sub-threshold delay and clear the ‘noise’ around the impact of the remaining TSRs. CB reiterated the importance of the local prioritisation to focus on clearing the</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1608_05	<p>TSRs with the biggest performance impact, in tandem with the focus on reducing the main volume driver of TSRs</p> <p>OB said that the performance impact of the standards change should have been predicted. AJ acknowledged that, with hindsight, the consultation with operators should have been better, but explained that NR had been under pressure from ORR to demonstrate that the derailment risk was being tackled. HR confirmed that the standard for standard changes was being changed to incorporate assessment of performance impacts and that this would go live in December.</p> <p>JH undertook to report back on progress in three months – noting that members could expect this to show progress in the elements of the recovery plan but would not be expected to show a reduction in TSRs.</p>	JH	26 October NTF
1608_06	<p>CB noted the variation on Route performance against the forecasts in the report and questioned whether the plan would reduce the number of TSRs to an acceptable level when considering the capacity and performance demands being made on the network and the rise in subthreshold delay. Were TSRs taking up too much of the engineering allowances in the timetable and are the engineering allowances still valid for today's railway? JH said he would look at what reductions in the South East were possible, whether this was acceptable for performance, and whether anything else could be done.</p>	JH	26 October NTF
1608_07	<p>MH noted that there was plenty of evidence that tackling TSR issues in the past had resulted in significant performance improvements.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note:</b> GC drew to the attention of JH, HR and AJ the significant work NR had done to better measure the performance impact of TSRs, and asked that DJ / DB share this work with them. DB to liaise with JH, JT to ensure that October TSR paper joins up the issues raised in previous NTF meetings about engineering allowances and the measurement of the impact of TSRs on West Coast.</p>	DJ DB	5 August 26 August
	<p>In relation to the Level Crossing Night Time Quiet Period proposals, GC explained that TOCs did not support a blanket change to the NTQP and favoured specific risk mitigation for individual crossings. Allan Spence had written to ORR about this and the debate would be taken forward with ORR and RSSB as it is not a relevant matter for NTF.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>Paper C – TSR system risk</b></p> <p>GC summarised the previous research work noted in the paper. Members endorsed the recommendation that they should revisit these papers to ensure they are applying the learning and that if anyone wanted to pursue further research this should be go through the Train Operations Risk Group (TORG).</p>		
	<p><b>Paper D – Non-track asset reliability</b></p> <p>RS summarised the key messages, noting that the trend in asset reliability remained positive, but at a slower rate with the very hot days in period 4 having an adverse impact – rail expansion impacting on IBJs and points. Asset reliability dipped significantly when temperatures exceeded 30C.</p> <p>Remote condition monitoring equipment was starting to deliver real benefits in predicting and preventing failures. GC and other members observed that NT has been promising this since CP3.</p> <p>Axle counter reliability was declining (after allowing for the rising population) and is not good enough although they remain more reliable than track circuits. Some specific failure modes had been eliminated but new ones had emerged.</p>		
1608_08	<p>While asset reliability continues to improve, the rising DPI continues to offset the impact of this improvement on train performance. NR were focused on improving response and fix times to reduce this. CB said there was a need for better visibility of actions being taken to reduce DPI for both fleet and infrastructure assets. Routes and TOCs need to review Performance Strategies to ensure that they contain sufficient targeted actions to address DPI and to comment on this in Y3Q2 reviews.</p>	All Routes and operators	Q2 reviews
	<p>OB said that industry is too optimistic about reliability of new assets and needed to be more realistic. AP noted the importance of product acceptance processes to ensure that new assets and components were reliable from the start – citing the airline comparison - PH agreed that this was critical.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p><b>1608_09</b></p> <p><b>1608_10</b></p> <p><b>1608_11</b></p>	<p><b>Paper E– Train Location Services</b></p> <p>RL explained that the ITED project had carried out a detailed review of scope against the available funding and proposed a slightly reduced scope that would continue to draw PPM and delay minute data from PSS rather than create a new source. The revised scope was believed to deliver 80% of the original benefit assessment. RL showed the high-level delivery plan and said it was hoped to contract for the work at the beginning of Sept. Slides available <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>RL confirmed to GC that the system would provide the ability to see the difference between planned and actual train location.</p> <p>The importance of involving the right range of people from the industry in the development was noted. RL to provide ‘person specs’ to GC as soon as practicable for sharing in the TOC / FOC community.</p> <p>CB questioned how the project would deal with the new performance metrics for CP6. RL to share a plan for addressing this when it is available before December.</p> <p>CB said that it would be useful to see reporting of what proportion of the train fleet was able to feed in GPS information, and the plan to deliver 100%</p> <p>OB highlighted that many TOCs were developing their own analytical capability, drawing in other data sources, and that there was a risk of NR getting left behind.</p>	<p><b>RL</b></p> <p><b>RL</b></p> <p><b>RL</b></p>	<p><b>12 August</b></p> <p><b>TBC</b></p> <p><b>28 September NTF</b></p>
	<p><b>Paper F – PR18 consultation response on outputs</b></p> <p>DJ introduced the paper – seeking comments on the proposed text. NJ asked that the text acknowledge that the outputs would be set for the System Operator as well. DJ noted that the text was one section of an overall RDG response to ORR’s consultation and that this would cover the System Operator issues. After asking members, CB confirmed to DJ to NTF endorsed the NTF response to Periodic Review 2018 (PR18) initial consultation.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1608_12	<p><b>Route scorecards</b> – GC summarised earlier conversation with PH and CB on the future direction of Route scorecards. These would cover customer and regulatory requirements and might comprise 80% core measures common to all Routes and 20% more local requirements. A specific proposition of what they would look like and the governance process will be developed for debate at NTF. GR noted he need to consider (a) how they would be used in last two years of CP5 and (b) how they would evolve in CP6.</p>	GC/PH/ CB	28 September NTF
1608_13	<p><b>Papers for Noting</b></p> <p><b>Performance messaging</b> - PW noted the latest narrative and asked how it was being used. CB stated that the purpose was to have common lines to take in response to questions. Noting that PW had raised concerns for several meetings, GC agreed to pick up in an existing meeting with PW on 8 August</p> <p><i>Post meeting note:</i> GC / PW meeting was much wider than NTF messaging. GC has set up meetings with RDG comms and briefed Paul Plummer</p>	GC	8 August
	<p>DJ reminded members that there was no meeting at the end of August – but that a number of papers would be circulated for review by correspondence. The next NTF meeting would take place on 28 September.</p> <p>*Post meeting note – 31<sup>st</sup> August correspondence meeting items likely to consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autumn - AWG task force report</li> <li>• Performance reporting - separating non-routine events from underlying trends</li> <li>• NTF Biennial review - draft report</li> <li>• Performance challenge - one key theme</li> </ul>		

Other attendees: John Thompson (JT), Andy Jones (AJ), Hannah Raven (HR), Roberta Lowes (RL).