

NOTES / ACTIONS from 27 September 2017 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Chair - opening remarks</p> <p>MH welcomed Chris Rowley (NR Capacity Planning Director) to NTF. He also welcomed Mark Langman (Western) and Martin Frobisher (LNW) as the NR RMD reps, Gus Dunster (Virgin, for Peter Broadley), Julia Wraithmell (Arriva, for Rob Warnes) and Ian Smith (Stagecoach, for Tim Shoveller).</p> <p>Apologies received from Phil Hufton, Graham Richards, Gary Cooper, Pete Wilkinson and Rick Davey.</p>		
	<p>PPB Update</p> <p>MH reported that the NTF annual report paper to P&PB had been well received, with some discussion around the role of NTF in challenging members on the delivery of performance strategies.</p> <p>PDG Update</p> <p>The September PDG meeting had covered the Waterloo blockade, the Industry Performance Plan, Autumn prep and August Bank Holiday works. GR had reported ORR's view that South East Route had done a good job on maintenance prior to the Thameslink blockade to ensure its success and that there may be lessons to apply elsewhere.</p> <p>MH noted that Paul Maynard was expected to attend the 25 October NTF meeting.</p>		
	<p>Paper A – Period 6 report</p> <p>DM summarised another disappointing period with national PPM missing plan by 1.7 PPM points in P6. SWR had been severely impacted by the Waterloo blockade, and subsequent asset failures at Waterloo, with PPM falling below 80%, more than 10 PPM points behind plan. GTR, while continuing to show improvement from last year, also missed plan by 3.8 PPM points.</p> <p>More positively, 10 operators met or exceeded plan, notably EMT who had their best p6 for 5 years at 94.9% PPM, as did Scotrail at 94.1%. Virgin West Coast were ahead of plan until being severely affected by a lineside fire on the last day of the period.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1709_01	<p>DM showed the trends in the MAA for national PPM, with an overall improvement being driven by GTR's improvement over last year, but underlying performance still below that in 2015/16. NB drew attention to the declining trend in SWR performance over 18 months before the blockade and suggested that a major intervention might be required. MH noted that SWR had recently been called in to NTF for a "3 Reds" review, just prior to franchise change and that the appropriate timing of a further review needed to be considered. OB queried the role of NR's IP team in the Waterloo blockade issues. MH asked whether there was useful learning from the experience and whether IP representatives should come to NTF or whether the Route should lead. ML said that NR were moving to RMDs being fully accountable for all activity on their route and that it was therefore appropriate for RMDs to lead at NTF. NB said that he wanted to understand better the handover process from projects to the Route – what issues were left for the Route to deal with?</p> <p>It was agreed that MH and Secretariat would review when to bring SWR back to NTF for a performance update and review of the Waterloo blockade.</p>	MH / DB	10th October
1709_02	<p>DM noted that the national 'on time' measure in p6 was 62.9% with a range from 80.9% for c2c down to 42% for Hull Trains. He added that following the May timetable change, there were still 26 trains that had not arrived on time at destination once. MH asked that a list of these trains be shared with the meeting notes.</p> <p>MF said that LNW and Chiltern were preparing a paper for NTF about the potential misalignment of performance targets, given that the industry had agreed the move using the 'on time' measure while franchise agreements still contained PPM targets. AM said DfT supported the principle of aligning targets, but noted that making changes to franchise agreements was not straightforward when the measures were directly linked to financial regimes. NB said that the misalignment of incentives was a key issue and suggested that this should be aired with the Minister when he visited NTF in October. OB noted that PPM and on time were closely correlated, and MH added that it was important to be sure that the alignment issue was material. MF said the choice of measure did have a significant influence on service regulation decisions.</p>	DM	With notes

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1709_03	It was agreed that AM would provide detail of all the performance measures in existing franchises and the associated financial regimes for inclusion in the paper. Post-meeting note: After further discussion, it was agreed that the incentives paper should not be aired with the Minister before discussion with DfT and ORR at NTF so the paper will be taken in November as originally planned.	MF/AM	22 November NTF
1709_04	DM noted the declining trend in the MAA for the Freight Arrival to 15 and Right time departure measures. MF said that the impact of freight on performance needed to be monitored and asked that NTF be updated on Project Hero. DB to ensure this is addressed in the next Freight Board quarterly update.	DB	22 November NTF
1709_05	DM concluded by showing latest performance forecasts for the end of 2017/18, showing forecasts against Route scorecard measures and ‘Forecast Pro’ forecasts for PPM against the Performance Strategy PPM measures. These highlighted that only a small number of operators are currently confident of meeting year end targets. DM was asked to update the table to show national totals for use at the 16 October PDG meeting.	DM	10 October
1709_06	It was agreed that EMT should be invited to a “3 Greens” presentation on their performance improvement. DB to review appropriate timing in developing the October meeting agenda.	DB	25 October NTF
	<p>Paper B – Route Scorecards and Route Supervisory Boards</p> <p>DW introduced the draft guidance for 2018/19 scorecards, noting that it was broadly the same as last year and inviting members to comment on what they would like to change.</p> <p>AP asked whether the weightings in the scorecard could be changed, noting that GA’s PPM accounted for a very small proportion of the total Anglia Route scorecard, and that last year there had been no flexibility around the weightings. DW replied that changes to the weightings could be agreed. AP also noted that a journey time metric would be important in Scotland.</p> <p>AP asked what the process was if the Route and customers could not agree the scorecard measures, and what role the Route Supervisory Boards should play. DW replied that the Boards should review and</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1709_07	<p>endorse the scorecards. MH added that the figures in the Performance Strategies form the regulated outputs, and that it was still unclear how disagreements were to be resolved.</p> <p>NB said that only two lines in the SE Route scorecard were of direct interest to GTR. The remaining detail covered measures that customers would take as given and would expect ORR to hold NR to account over. GTR only account for a proportion of the level 2 scorecard so the process does not feel strongly customer-focused. MF responded that the scorecards are intended to provide a balanced view of all aspects of the Route business and that the measures are inter-linked: good performance delivers good financial measures, good asset management deliver good customer service. NB acknowledged that this was appropriate for measuring the NR business but reiterated that there was not enough emphasis on outputs for customers.</p> <p>MG said that while there was a framework for the scorecards there would be more scope for variation in the 2018/19 scorecards than before. DW reiterated that NR was very keen for customers to engage early and help develop the scorecards. MH noted that there had been similar messages before but these had not always been reflected in Route behaviour, and that the process had sometimes felt constrained by NR's centre.</p> <p>MH summed up that there were still some questions to be answered about the relationship between scorecards and performance strategies, the role of ORR, the scope for local variation and managing the process for multi-operator routes. These needed to be resolved before Christmas. It was agreed that MH would follow up with GR on clarifying the role of ORR.</p> <p>Route Supervisory Boards</p> <p>DW said that PWC had carried out a review of the emerging Route Supervisory Boards (RSBs) against reference criteria for governance boards. The report contained several key recommendations relating to clarity on priorities, governance structure, involvement of other parties, reporting requirements and structure for monitoring performance. DW said that NR would like to involve operators in responding to the report.</p>	MH/GR	By 25 October NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>NB asked what problem the RSBs were intended to solve, as he could not see how a Board would add value to existing processes, including the GTR/NR Alliance Board and each company's internal governance. OB asked what role the RSB should play in relation to performance monitoring if this falls below plan.</p> <p>MF commented that the focus of the existing Boards varies: on LNW the RSB was not looking at performance but it was proving valuable in bringing stakeholders together on funding issues. ML said that the Western RSB focus was on performance as this was a current concern. MH added that the RSB did review the route scorecard. DW concluded that while NR believed the RSBs would be valuable, they would not be imposed where they were not supported.</p>		
	<p>Paper C – Sub-threshold delay</p> <p>JH introduced the presentation, noting that at previous NTF meetings he had drawn attention to the scale of sub-threshold / unattributed delay in the South East and commissioned analysis to understand the causes and enable improvement action. AK described the analysis undertaken to date and some of the insights emerging. He noted the criticality of accurate – to the second – train running data to enable analysis, the scale of the data set to be analysed and the need to put the resulting information in front of a lot of different people. The analysis has addressed station dwell times and section running times and looked to identify root causes which could include people, engineering and timetabling issues. He highlighted analysis of dwell times at East Croydon – identified as the biggest problem area and hence opportunity – noting that the increased data-driven focus (on achievement of dwell times by platform and time of day) was already producing improvements ahead of a planned increase in platform staffing. AK stressed that it was not a one-off data crunching exercise, the data is now produced continuously.</p> <p>MH welcomed the presentation and asked whether the tools and processes were readily transferrable to other Routes. JH replied that they were not quite finished but would then be available for wider use subject to suitable commercial arrangements. DM noted the potential overlap with the capability being developed under the Train Location Services (paper H) and the need to ensure alignment for CP6. NB noted that GTR strongly supported the approach and had worked closely with NR. AP said that the work further underlined the importance of basic operational rigour in improving performance, adding</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1709_08	<p>that it was important not to see flexing the timetable as the prime solution, as operators wanted to improve journey times.</p> <p>MH asked that an update on the sub-threshold analysis and actions be provided to NTF in three months.</p> <p>MH also asked that DB and DM consider how to align the work with the Better Operations activity and other forums. Post-meeting note: DM proposes to share at Quarterly Performance Analysts workshop and to consider sharing with the Planning & Performance Forum.</p>	JH	17 Jan NTF
	<p>TSR Update</p> <p>JH provided a short update on the TSR recovery programme, recapping the initial focus on cyclic top and the actions taken and the increasing focus on removing TSRs with the largest performance impact. He noted that the number of TSRs had not risen over recent periods as has generally occurred in the past. He acknowledged that there is much work to do tackling some longstanding TSRs. He concluded by noting that operators had the opportunity to discuss (with their lead routes) the inclusion of TSR reduction or impact targets in the 2018/19 Route scorecards.</p>		
	<p>Paper D – 3 Reds – GWR/Western Performance</p> <p>RM and GV summarised the performance issues, explaining that the problem had been recognised several periods before and a co-located Joint Performance team put in place to tackle it. An early action had been to strengthen the leadership at the Thames Valley Signalling Centre. Causes of poor performance included fleet availability attributed to the loss of depot staff, and the reduced willingness of train crew to work rest days. GWR are negotiating over the inclusion of Sundays in work rosters. The period of very hot weather had caused problems, including three closures of Paddington. The root causes of these incidents are being reviewed and a draft report produced on how to improve seasonal preparation ahead of summer 2018.</p> <p>AP challenged the lack of heat resilience, questioning whether the heat related speed restrictions were really necessary. IS asked whether it had really been that hot. JS responded that it had been very hot and that the critical factor was the very high diurnal variation. GV added that Western had seen their</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>highest ever CRTs this summer as rail temperatures continued rising over several days of sustained high air temperatures.</p> <p>IS suggested there were lessons for all to learn about the system impacts of major enhancements with changes to infrastructure and fleets and associated impact on people – recruitment and training. JW noted that the issue of Sunday rostering had been aired at NTF before and DfT (PW) had expressed support for changing Ts and Cs.</p> <p>NB questioned whether deferral of rolling stock replacement was causing problems. RM confirmed that it was, with C6 exams having to be carried out, taking stock out of service at key times. MG asked whether there should be wider consideration of fleet performance. MH explained that the Fleet Challenge Steering Group was driving this and highlighted the issue over needed life extension of unreliable diesel fleets while better performing electric fleets were being scrapped. The expected performance impact would be covered in the next Fleet Challenge NTF paper for October.</p>		
<p>1709_09</p>	<p>Paper E: Asset Reliability</p> <p>JS noted the earlier discussion on the impact of heat and committed to an update on summer preparations in the next asset reliability update to NTF.</p> <p>JS noted continuing steady improvement in asset reliability and said that the intelligent infrastructure programme would be a game changer, introducing TF to present an overview. TF set out the key objectives of the II work, stressing that the focus was now much broader than the fitment of monitoring equipment – the real impact would come from how the information was used to optimise maintenance regimes.</p> <p>TF stated that NR had reviewed the opportunities to collect asset information from in-service trains, but had concluded that it was not yet possible to obtain the sufficient information to remove the need for a dedicated monitoring fleet. He said that the Perpetuum system had been tested but found not to provide useful information for track maintainers. Work was continuing on use of UGMS systems, the fitment of OLE monitoring equipment to a Pendolino, and the potential for more use of pantograph cameras.</p>	<p>JS</p>	<p>Feb NTF</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1709_10	<p>AP noted the need to ensure that the ‘flight engineer’ role was fully resourced, and that Route teams were fully joined up with the centre as Scotrail were looking at trial of Perpetuum. JS said that this was a key aspect of TF’s role.</p> <p>MH drew attention to some recent telecoms asset failures that had led to significant delay incidents because the arrangements for speedy response from the national telecoms team were inadequate. JS acknowledged that this was an issue and agreed to update on how this is being managed in the next quarterly report.</p>	JS	17 January NTF
1709_11	<p>Paper F – DAB Quarterly Report</p> <p>MS summarised the paper, highlighting concern over behaviour, with instances of discussion of attribution taking place before making operational decisions.</p> <p>NB raised a recent major performance incident attributed to the operator where the root cause of failure in a depot was a cable (which NR were responsible for maintaining) that crossed the network/depot boundary. MS responded that DAB had published guidance on the attribution of off-network incidents.</p> <p>OB asked what was being done about Management TINS and whether there were any related KPIs, suggesting that NTF would wish to understand how many there were and how many were properly reallocated later. MH added that it was important to get a measure of the accuracy of attribution; some operators are disputing a large proportion of incidents and it is useful for NTF to understand the extent to which operators are correctly challenging inaccurate attribution. MS explained that DAB had a more detailed pack of indicators and it was agreed that MS and DJ would review this to identify what additional material to share with NTF to provide greater insight.</p>	MS/DJ	10 Oct 2017
	<p>Paper G – Trespass</p> <p>JN presented the briefing paper from the RDG Policing and Security Group (P&SG) noting the rising trend on trespass affecting performance, and concern over the adequacy and transparency of BTP</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	resource deployment. It was agreed that the RDG P&SG was the appropriate forum to continue to address the issues discussed.		
1709_12	<p>Paper H – TLS – ITED Update</p> <p>DM reported that the Industry Train Event Data (ITED) project design was now complete and the build phase would start in October. It was planned to be complete by January 2019 and would have 2 years data available in a cloud based version and up to 7 years data on NR’s network. It was noted that ITED would not immediately replace PSS as the official train performance reporting system. DM also noted that the system would not hold real time data but would be populated overnight.</p> <p>Paper I – Gibb report recommendations</p> <p>DB presented the paper noting the mapping of Gibb report recommendations to existing NTF workstreams where appropriate. He picked out two issues for members’ consideration: level crossing closures and the Thameslink 2018 Readiness Board. On level crossings, AM said that DfT were not progressing early legislation to implement the Law Commission recommendations, partly because of the impact of Brexit on the legislative timetable, but also because there was limited confidence in being able to secure the changes, and because NR’s progress in closing crossings has been ahead of expectations. It was therefore proposed to continue seeking closures through existing processes.</p> <p>NB said that operators had submitted bids for the 2018 timetable and that initial modelling had not demonstrated that the timetable would work. CR noted that the scenarios modelled were already out of date and added that NR Capacity Planning, the SE Route and GTR were all working very closely together to try and resolve the issues – progress was being made but there is a great deal still to resolve. IS noted that there are major timetable changes affecting other parts of the network in 2018. CR agreed to produce an overview of all the significant timetable changes for the next meeting.</p>	CR	25 Oct NTF

Other attendees: Denise Wetton (DW), Andrew Kennedy (AK), Rob Mullen (RM), Gareth Vest (GV), Tim Flower (TF), Mark Southon (MS), James Natrass (JM).

Next meeting: Wednesday 25 October