

NOTES / ACTIONS from 7 June 2017 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Chair - opening remarks</p> <p>GC welcomed Martin Frobisher (LNW) as the NR RMD rep, Ben Rule (Arriva – for Rob Warnes) and David Hewer (DfT for Pete Wilkinson).</p> <p>Apologies received from Mike Gurtenne and Rick Davey.</p>		
	<p>Verbal Updates</p> <p>RDG Feedback – GC reported that the RDG Board had been very supportive of the content and timing of the Industry Performance Plan. The Board had asked what was different about the plan. GC had responded that improving punctuality was now recognised by all industry players as a top priority, as reflected in the IIA for CP6 and stronger commitment from NTF members than he had seen for several years. The Board noted the need to develop the next Better Timetables activities, sharing NTF’s view on the need for this to balance punctuality, capacity, journey times, passenger income etc. A quarterly report on the IPP would go to Planning and Production Board, while RDG Board would receive a brief on punctuality against plan each period and receive wider NTF updates as part of the PPB briefings to the Board quarterly.</p> <p>ORR Review of South East – GR noted that Reporters had completed fieldwork and were now moving into analysis. GR emphasised that it remained ORR’s role to hold NR to account for the delivery of CP5 outputs. The next Monitor, setting out ORR’s latest assessment, would include findings from the South East ‘deep dive’. This is due to be published on 11 July, which will enable GR to brief NTF before publication at the 5 July meeting.</p>		
	<p>Paper A – Period 2 report</p> <p>DM noted that period 2 had been one of two halves – ahead of plan over the first fortnight before being affected by the Manchester attack and high temperatures affecting fleet and infrastructure assets, with</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1706_01	<p>PPM finishing just behind plan at 91.2%. While this was a substantial improvement over P2 last year, it is still the second worst P2 performance in the last nine years.</p> <p>MH questioned whether temperatures had been high enough to have had a significant impact. JS responded that the diurnal temperature variation was the key factor, not the maximum, and that this had been very large. Track circuits and points had been most affected, but overall the assets had performed better than in similar conditions last year. PH noted that the capability to manage critical rail temperature had improved. <i>Post meeting note:</i> 26th May was an ‘adverse’ weather day for all TOCs, but not ‘extreme’. 25th May was adverse for 13 TOCs.</p> <p>DM presented some figures on the PPM failures directly attributable to the Manchester incident. He was asked to develop analyses of Manchester and London Bridge so that there is common view of the overall impact on PPM for affected TOCs that can be taken onto account when assessing performance against plan. It was agreed that it was appropriate for TOCs/Routes to agree revised local performance forecasts.</p> <p>DM presented a slide on the extent of sub-threshold delay at sector level, showing it to be broadly stable on Long Distance and Regional, but rising on LSE. NB noted the work being done on sub-threshold analysis and action planning with NR South East route which would be shared with NTF when there was sufficient insight. OB noted that the use of the ‘on time at all station stops’ measure would sharpen the focus on identifying and managing sub-threshold delay.</p> <p>TS pointed out that passenger volumes had reduced in some areas in the last year. If rising passenger volumes had been a key factor in the increase in sub-threshold delay in previous years, then a drop would be expected and this might be worth investigation.</p> <p>MH noted that Arriva Trains London could be asked for a ‘3 Greens’ presentation. DB added that Southeastern had seen several periods of substantially better performance and that they and NR South East were very keen to share learning with NTF. It was agreed that, following recent periods of improvement, that GTR would no longer be required to provide performance improvement updates every quarter.</p>	DM	5 July NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1706_02</p> <p>1706_03</p> <p>1706_04</p>	<p>Paper B – Industry Performance Plan</p> <p>DB introduced the Industry Performance Plan, noting the emphasis on the local planning processes, the need to develop the next steps in the Better Timetables theme, and that gaps in the workstream definitions would be filled by the August meeting. The NTF Charter was signed by members.</p> <p>MA commented that the plan did not show how the initiatives would deliver the required improvement in performance and asked whether a table could be added showing the expected performance benefits from each part of the plan. GR supported this, adding that a new Minister would find it difficult to understand where the improvements come from. It was noted that there are many actions contributing small benefits, but agreed that this should be reviewed – each workstream is required to be quantified.</p> <p>DB / DM to review how best to demonstrate how the component parts of the plan will deliver the performance improvement planned in 2017/18.</p> <p>MH queried the industry’s readiness for the next timetable change and whether the Code of Practice was fully understood. FD suggested that the effectiveness of the Code of Practice should be reviewed after the implementation of the December 2017 timetable.</p> <p>FD said that the OPSG was having a workshop on 9th June to develop the next iteration of Better Timetables, identifying key priorities and workstreams. She would report back to the 5 July NTF meeting on the outcomes of the workshop and the next steps.</p>	<p>DB/DM</p> <p>FD/DJ</p> <p>FD</p>	<p>5 July NTF</p> <p>February 2018 NTF</p> <p>5 July NTF</p>
	<p>Paper C – Q4 Performance Reviews</p> <p>DB introduced the paper, noting the joint purpose of covering the Q4 Performance Strategy reviews and recommending changes to the process for Q1. The way in which Q4 reviews were conducted had varied considerably between operators, with some holding specific review meetings and others covering the ground within other meetings. The key recommendation was that, from Q1, each</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1706_05</p> <p>1706_06</p>	<p>TOC/Route should be required to submit a concise templated report to NTF, to enable members to decide whether the process and plans were sufficiently robust.</p> <p>MH felt the paper was too polite, and that a more intrusive, independent process was appropriate where planned performance was not delivered. MF suggested that a risk-based approach to review / audit of plans could be taken.</p> <p>The proposed handling of future reviews was endorsed – at least until an alternative model is put forward and agreed. DB/DM put this in place for the Q1 reviews.</p> <p>GC to develop a proposal for more intrusive independent review process, considering what the triggers would be and who could conduct it.</p>	<p>DB/DM</p> <p>GC</p>	<p>2 August NTF</p> <p>2 August NTF</p>
	<p>Paper D – Better Operations</p> <p>TS picked out two key areas of work from the Better Operations Plan.</p> <p>On Managing Disruption, the intent was to look at the emergency services approach to incident management to see how it could be applied in rail, with clarity on decision-making processes at every level. OB expressed strong support for this work, aimed at empowering front-line staff to make decisions (rather than delegate upwards) knowing that they would be backed-up.</p> <p>The work on mitigating Level Crossing sighting TSRs by amending the signage and rules was now being taken forward. MF said that he had agreed to trial the proposals on LNW in collaboration with Rob Warnes.</p> <p>NB commented that he was not clear how to brief his colleagues on the key messages as the paper reported on the meeting rather than describing core learning. This will be taken on board for future papers.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1706_07	<p>NB suggested that NTF should define a problem statement for managing rolling stock and train crew during disruption, and challenge suppliers to generate solutions, rather than trying to specify the solution. It was agreed that the BOPB should take this forward - ensuring alignment with ongoing Digital Railway and Traffic Management activities. DJ would review what has already been done and bring a paper to the next meeting.</p>	DJ	5 July NTF
1706_08	<p>Paper E: Delay Attribution Board (DAB)</p> <p>RM stated the purpose of the DAB as being to attribute delay accurately to enable better performance. He explained that the Delay Attribution Guidance had now been rebadged as ‘Principles and Rules’.</p> <p>RM noted that DAB were concerned that devolution was leading to increasing inconsistency as some people tried to go their own way rather than adhering to the Rules and Principles. MF challenged this, saying that his team adhered to the Rules because they are accountable for public money and subject to audit. He felt that the quality of training was the issue, not devolution. MH added that there has always been inconsistency in delay attribution processes and that he did not feel devolution was the cause.</p> <p>RM asked for support on the proposed escalation process to DfT and ORR. TS stressed the importance of keeping delay attribution objective and accurate. GC suggested that the escalation of issues should be to NTF. Other members agreed that this was appropriate, while noting that the extent of the current issues was not clear. MH proposed that DAB should report to NTF on a quarterly basis, with additional reporting by exception if required. OB highlighted the need to track the extent of ‘management tins’ and commercial deals, as these mean delays are not fully attributed.</p>	MS	Meeting notes
1706_09	<p>DAB to produce a quarterly report to NTF, starting at the 5 July meeting, on delay attribution issues; tracking KPIs, raising key points of principle or concern and reviewing outstanding disputes. This process would be reviewed in six months time.</p>	RM	5 July NTF then qtly and review for January NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1706_10	<p>Paper F – Asset Reliability</p> <p>JS summarised asset reliability trends, with an overall reduction in service affecting failures (SAFs) of 2.6% in 2016/17. NR had met its corporate scorecard asset management measure - the Composite Reliability Index (CRI) in 2016/17. A further 2% reduction in SAFs is planned in Route Scorecards for 2017/18. JS added that the PPM impact was still worsening despite the reliability improvements. Further improvements in SAFs would come from the Design for Reliability standard applying to all new assets and from the next phase of intelligent infrastructure; a considerable amount of monitoring equipment has already been fitted – the challenge now is analysing the data to drive better and timely interventions.</p> <p>JS said that NR want to work more closely with operators on the opportunities for collecting asset information from service trains – e.g. instrumented pantographs to monitor OLE. MH pointed out that there was not yet enough equipment to meet the demand. GC emphasised that the NTF is here to help if NR needs support in specific areas. <i>Post-meeting note:</i> The next quarterly update on asset reliability will include a brief on the opportunities for asset information from service trains.</p> <p>JS also noted the developments in level crossing risk reduction technologies that could have some benefit in mitigating the risks leading to TSRs due to level crossing sighting.</p> <p>MA noted the reliability improvements, but questioned whether the 2% SAF reduction target was sufficient given that the PPM impact of asset failures had been worsening. He felt that the targets for SAF improvement and PPM were misaligned. JS said that the asset reliability improvement had been offset by the rise in DPI and that this would be addressed through NR’S DPI reduction plans. The increasing use of intelligent infrastructure would also help. GR added that ORR were concerned at the lack of correlation between the improvement in the CRI and PPM during CP5 and would be reviewing this in considering CP6 measures.</p> <p>MH asked that future updates showed asset reliability at route level, comparing performance to the Route scorecards in PPM currency.</p>	JS	28 Sept NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Passenger Impact</p> <p>SR presented some slides on current activity to improve performance through better management of passenger flows, covering work being done by ATL, SWT and NR's Station Capacity Planning. Members were encouraged to share the presentations with their colleagues, noting the TOC contacts who would be happy to discuss.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Better Operations programme was the appropriate forum for these activities. DJ would arrange for SR to present to BOPB.</p>		
1706_11	<p>Paper G – CP6 Metrics Update</p> <p>DW noted the planned publication date of 26 June and demonstrated some tweaks to the website presentation to make the graphs easier to interpret. He also noted that the emphasis on the briefing material was firmly on the transparency provided by the new measures rather than their toughness.</p> <p>NB questioned whether it was appropriate to show trains arriving early. It was agreed that the content had already been determined after extensive consultation, and that the only issue to discuss was the timing of publication. It was reiterated that all the data is already in the public domain.</p> <p>GC noted that, earlier in the day, NR had questioned the planned go live on 26 June in view of its proximity to the election. RDG Comms Group will discuss with NR and RDG CEO and members will be advised of the outcome with the meeting notes. Post-meeting note: It has been agreed to defer 'go live' until mid-late July.</p>	DJ/DW	15 June
	<p>Paper H – CP6 Metrics – ORR</p> <p>GR noted that ORR would not publish anything in advance of RDG and that the format would be consistent with RDG. He added that ORR would not wish to see a significant deferral of publication by RDG.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1706_12	<p>PfN – Suicide Prevention</p> <p>FD noted the good work being led by Ian Stevens and that he needed lots of help. She proposed that Ian be invited to present the next quarterly update rather than taking as a paper for noting. GC advised that there is other industry architecture within RDG and RSSB where Ian is visible as programme lead DB/DJ to make this an agenda item when agenda space allows</p>	DB/DJ	TBC

Other attendees: Dominic Medway (DM), Richard Morris (RM), Mark Southon (MS), Simon Reay (SR), Daniel Wood (DW).