

NOTES AND ACTIONS from 6 June 2018 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Chair's remarks</p> <p>MH welcomed Polly Payne (DG Rail) from DfT, Steve Tyler (for Mac Andrade), John Edgley (for Jon Shaw), and Becky Lumlock, Martin Frobisher and Paul McMahon as the NR RMDs. Apologies were received from Richard Clarke (DB).</p> <p>P&PB: GC reported that P&PB had received papers on punctuality, Informed Traveller, and trespass and had discussed the outcome of the NTF performance seminar. P&PB had requested discussion of the CP6 performance plans and December timetable issues for the 24 July Board meeting.</p>		
1806_01	<p>NR Monitor: GR advised that ORR planned to publish their next NR Monitor on 4th July (the date of the next NTF). He noted that the Monitor would include more Route comparisons and undertook to share the key messages with NTF members ahead of publication by providing a paper summarising key points for the 4 July meeting pack.</p>	GR	27 June
1806_02	<p>Performance Strategy Review: DJ reported that following submission of bids and interviews, it was recommended that SDG should be commissioned to undertake the review. It was planned to commence in mid-June, report emerging findings to the 1 Aug NTF meeting and close out at the 26 Sept NTF. DJ reiterated the importance of completing the Strategy updates for 2018/19 and submitting them for the start of the review. He also asked that members ensure that key people are available and supportive of the review. The recommendations were endorsed by the NTF members.</p> <p>Performance Strategies: Ensure that performance strategy documents are signed off and submitted for the review.</p>	TOC / NR members	15 June
	<p>P2 Performance report</p> <p>DM reported that national PPM in P2 was 87.4%, 3.3 PPM points behind plan. The final week had been materially affected by the timetable change issues, but national PPM was already well behind plan, and it already looked unlikely that year end planned MAA could be met. The national PPM plan level had</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1806_03	<p>only been met on 4 days in the period. TOC-on-self delays had increased partly as a result of the May timetable implementation issues. Northern, GWR and GTR had been the major contributors to the shortfall in national PPM</p> <p>DM then showed the breakdown of the ‘Network management/other’ delay category, highlighting that unexplained and uninvestigated delays were a major component.</p> <p>P2 Performance report: MH asked for a mapping of NTF-sponsored activities against the breakdown of Network Management / Other delays to identify any gaps in the programme.</p>	DJ	4 July NTF
1806_04	<p>Performance report: MH requested a drill down into the key causes of TOC-on-self delays for the 3 TOCs with the greatest variance to plan (Northern, GWR, GTR).</p> <p>It was noted that performance was falling significantly behind plan in 2018/19. MG highlighted that the CP6 performance plans were based on some improvement during 2018/19 and that the further work on reviewing the joint plans needed to take this into account. PW agreed that it was important for the forecasts to be realistic but not to become overly pessimistic. AP agreed the need to be realistic but also stressed that there was plenty of scope for improvement on both sides, by focusing on the basics and ensuring that the performance plans were executed. He expected the independent review to find a lot that was not being done properly. AT pointed out that there were also significant risks later in 2018/19, including Autumn and the December timetable change, and said that it was important that everyone pulled together to tackle these.</p>	DB/DM	4 July NTF
1806_05	<p>Performance report: Collate refreshed performance forecasts for year end in the light of actual performance in the first quarter.</p>	DM	1 Aug NTF
	<p>CP6 Performance Plans</p> <p>GR updated on ORR’s review process. Overall the plans were considered to be much better than before, but the performance figures were not agreed with operators. Arup’s review of the performance plans and modelling had identified specific issues with Wessex, Anglia and South East plans. ORR’s draft determination would be published on Tuesday 12th June, along with the Arup report.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1806_06	<p>CP6 Performance Plans: The draft determination would reference specific comments made by operators in the NTF performance questionnaires. GR agreed to check the tone bearing in mind that the comments had not been made in anticipation of publication.</p>	GR	11 June
1806_07	<p>CP6 Performance Plans: Circulate links to ORR draft determination and Arup performance report, with signposts to key challenges and a reminder of the scope of work to be completed on joint performance plans for mid-July.</p> <p>PW noted that it was important to take account of the actual performance in the first quarter in the further consideration of CP6 forecasts.</p> <p>MG said that feedback from Routes suggested that further engagement over performance plans was proceeding well and asked whether operators had the same view. PB noted that dialogue between Virgin and LNW Route had been arranged, but that there was still a substantial gap. RW added that Northern also had a significant gap and were not happy with the engagement.</p> <p>DB drew attention to the response from Southeastern indicating that they could not fully contribute to a joint plan for CP6 as franchise change was only a few months away. MH responded that incumbent operators were always expected to engage in future planning and PW agreed that DfT expected the operator to engage, with clear assumptions specified.</p>	DB	14 June
1806_08	<p>CP6 Performance Plans: Review Southeastern position on their ability to complete a joint performance plan for CP6 due to the timing of franchise change.</p>	NB	15 June
1806_09	<p>CP6 Performance Plans: Feedback to NTF secretariat if there any problems in completing the further work on CP6 Performance plans for mid-July.</p>	DB	ASAP
	<p>Fleet Challenge</p> <p>BD introduced the paper, spelling out that overall fleet performance was disappointing, that the reasons for under-performance were known, and that action plans were in place to address the problems. He noted that part of the reason for the shortfall against the CP5 target was that the IEP fleet introduction,</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1806_10	<p>which had been expected to deliver significant improvement, was delayed. In addition, there had been other new fleet introductions that had not been in the base forecast that had seen very poor early levels of reliability. MF noted that the IEP delays had a knock-on impact on withdrawal of HSTs, which in turn were delaying the exit from Old Oak Common depot which was on the critical path for the HS2 project.</p> <p>AT asked whether the fleet reliability plans were built into the CP6 performance plans. It was agreed that this needed to be tested during the further work on performance plans up to mid July. MG welcomed the increased focus on delay minutes as well as MTIn in the paper.</p> <p>TS highlighted the risks with the number of new train designs from new manufacturers coming on to the network. BD said that FCSG shared this concern.</p> <p>MH noted the extent to which new fleets, with associated risks, are replacing existing fleets with very high levels of reliability. He said it was important to avoid optimism bias in the reliability projections and asked that FCSG review the current forecasts to ensure they are realistic.</p> <p>PB queried the industry's overall maintenance capability, noting that experienced people were people were being attracted to new jobs with the new fleet manufacturers. BD agreed that this was an issue as there was a need to maintain ageing fleets, and influence the design and testing of new ones. MH added that operators were seeing poor quality output from existing suppliers due to the loss of people, and that some depots were closing with no local alternative for the skilled workers. PW noted that DfT recognised this and were seeking to encourage the location of new facilities in other parts of the country. He asked that RDG seek to work with the RSG in developing a joined-up approach. GC noted the success of a previous industry forum focused on the managing the risks with the removal of slam door trains from the network, and suggested that there might be benefit in a similar industry event looking at the new fleet introduction, involving TOCs, NR, ROSCOs and fleet manufacturers (particularly those new to the UK network).</p> <p>Fleet challenge: Carry out a further review of the fleet reliability assumptions for CP6, ensuring that they are realistic but not pessimistic.</p>	BD	26 Sep NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1806_11	Fleet challenge: Consider how to engage effectively with new train manufacturers, including use of the RSG relationship and whether to bring them to an NTF meeting.	GC/BD	4 July NTF
	<p>Vegetation management</p> <p>JE explained the guidance issued to NR Route teams following the Secretary of State’s direction to stop tree felling during the nesting season. He assured members that all safety related work was continuing, including managing adhesion, and that Routes did not think there would be an adverse impact on readiness for the Autumn season. NB questioned whether it was realistic to expect front-line staff to be able to apply the guidance effectively. JE replied that the guidance was largely reiterating existing practice so this should not be a problem.</p> <p>MH noted that the increasing use of bi-mode trains would impact on vegetation management needs on routes where the trains ran in diesel mode, to ensure that pantographs were not contaminated by vegetation that would affect performance when the pantograph was next raised.</p> <p>JE added that vegetation management was not just about dealing with the existing vegetation and that increasing biodiversity was an important aspect of the vegetation policy.</p>		
	<p>Delay Attribution Board report</p> <p>RM summarised the key points from the pack, noting that delay attribution was in better shape than some people claimed. However, while the level of uninvestigated delay in 2017/18 was lower than the previous year, it remained higher than 2015/16. The level of attribution accuracy was 90%, but it was noted that this definition treats commercial settlements and residual unexplained delays as “accurate”.</p> <p>RM reiterated concern that some NR Routes were not applying the delay attribution guidelines and suggested that Schedule 8 incentives were sometimes conflicting with accurate delay attribution. He highlighted a key issue over the ADA33 dispute determination which had the potential to significantly change the basis of delay attribution requiring a rewrite of the regulations. TS asked what the appeal process for ADA33 was and whether there was a plan to challenge it. MG replied that NR shared the DAB concern and were considering next steps around an appeal.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1806_12	<p>DAB Report: Provide note setting out proposed next steps on the ADA33 determination to next NTF meeting.</p> <p>RM also expressed concern over ORR's review of delay attribution and the clarity of communication about this activity. GR replied that ORR's specific focus was on accurate information feeding into Schedule 8.</p>	MG	4 July NTF
1806_13	<p>DAB report: Follow-up at ORR to clarify communication with DAB over ORR's review of attribution.</p>	GR	15 June
1806_14	<p>DAB report: DM noted that reviewing TRUST DA was part of the longer-term systems plan for CP6 following the completion of ITED, and agreed to address this during the next NTF update on the train location services programme.</p>	DM	1 Aug NTF
	<p>Timetables</p> <p>PW opened the discussion on the timetable situation by setting the DfT's view. He said the industry had put Ministers in an unacceptable position and lost public trust, as a result of a collective underestimation of the scale of the timetable change and the industry's ability to deliver it. He added that it was still a fantastic railway and that it was important that people did not lose confidence and kept their eyes on the ball, particularly over safety. He asked that everyone pulled together and collaborated fully to sort the problems out, setting aside commercial issues that could be worked through later.</p> <p>PW noted the imminent issue of the December 2018 timetable offer and said it was critical that a better and more resilient timetable was delivered. The industry needed to be certain about infrastructure availability and the level of change that could be accommodated.</p> <p>MH welcomed Andrew Haines, NR's CEO-elect, to the meeting. AH said that performance was a top priority and that he would attend future NTF meetings. He said his immediate focus was on the December 2018 timetable and he reiterated the need for all parties to ensure that contractual issues did not get in the way of delivering a resilient timetable.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Informed Traveller: CR advised that the recovery plan was currently on track with the first step back up from T-6 being made. The process was working fairly well and only GWR (due to late access changes) and GTR (due to late May timetable completion) had not met T-6. Risks remained from late access changes, although more discipline was being imposed, and from staff burn-out as many people had been working long hours for a long time. The initial indications were that the GTR timetable was working well and that the main weakness with the timetable was errors in platforming at Leeds, which were in the process of being addressed.</p>		
	<p>December 2018 timetable: CR said that the December change, allowing for Cardiff electrification not being ready and the change to the original SWR bid, was on a similar scale to May (around 4 times the size of recent changes).</p> <p>CR described options for the December timetable:</p> <p>Option 1: decrements - processing the offer as normal and then identifying specific services that could be taken out. However, there are few places where this could be done without substantial reworking being required.</p> <p>Option 2: defer the start date to February '19. There had been little support for this from TOCs.</p> <p>RW said he was not confident that the infrastructure would be ready for December and that people could not cope with another timetable rewrite. Deferring to February '19 would help but May '19 would be better.</p> <p>MH asked how soon option 2 would need to be agreed. CR replied that NR was due to offer on Friday 8 June in line with contractual processes so any change in process would need collective agreement. NB said there was a need to rise above the Network Code and make pragmatic decisions. PW stressed the need to establish a resilient timetable, accepting that this meant deferring some of the anticipated benefits.</p> <p>MH asked whether some bids had dated service changes and GC supported the use of the 'Permanent Alteration' cycle to make incremental changes. CR noted that some GWR services in the December '18</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>timetable bid had dated changes for February '19 and that some Northern and Thameslink incremental changes to the May '18 timetable were also being handled in this way.</p> <p>AH said his main focus was to establish a reliable base December timetable proposition, and then to address the essential changes that customers must have. The impact on May 2019 would also be considered.</p>		
	<p>Infrastructure readiness: PMcM outlined NR proposals for establishing a PMO for industry readiness for change to take a network-wide view of tracking key infrastructure project milestones and dependencies, asking for TOC owning group support in establishing an industry group. The key focus would be on the December 2018 and May 2019 timetable changes, but it was anticipated that the group would continue.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> PMcM circulated proposal to members by email on 7 June.</p>		
1806_15	<p>PP concluded that the Secretary of State would be happy to receive a December 2018 timetable proposal by 19 June, with an assessment of industry readiness, and reiterated that the Government would be prepared to defer some benefits.</p> <p>Timetables – December 18: AH to develop a proposal for the December timetable change, holding 1-1 meetings with operators with significant changes, and testing the proposal with NTF members in a teleconference on 18 June, ahead of submission to Secretary of State on 19 June.</p>	AH	18 June
1806_16	<p>Timetables – December 18: PW and AH to provide an update on the proposal and subsequent discussion at the 4 July NTF meeting.</p> <p>Informed Traveller: DB provided a brief update on the RDG review of Informed Traveller compliance, reminding members that it commenced shortly before the May 2018 timetable issues became apparent and the Informed Traveller process was suspended. Further work would focus on how to avoid a recurrence of the earlier problems and would identify an outline industry programme of work to address</p>	PW/AH	4 July NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	this. The report would be completed for the 1 August NTF meeting. GC emphasised that the processes had worked effectively before and did not need to be changed – they just needed to be followed properly.		
	<p>Chair's conclusion</p> <p>Concluding the meeting, MH reminded members of the critical points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting AH in the development of the December 2018 timetable proposal; • completing and submitting 2018/19 Performance Strategies for the independent review; • improving the joint performance plans for CP6; and • maintaining a focus on consistent delivery of the basics. 		

Other attendees: Polly Payne (PP) DfT, Richard Morris (RM) DAB, Mark Southon (MS) NR – DAB.