

**NOTES / ACTIONS from 5 July 2017 NTF meeting**

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>Chair - opening remarks</b></p> <p>MH welcomed Becky Lumlock (Wessex) as the NR RMD rep, Greg Sugden (NR, for Fiona Dolman) and Gus Dunster (Virgin, for Peter Broadley).</p> <p>Apologies received from Nick Brown, Oliver Bratton, Alex Hynes and Rick Davey.</p>		
<p><b>1707_01</b></p> <p><b>1701_02</b></p>	<p><b>Verbal Updates</b></p> <p>Schedule 8: GR confirmed that ORR had decided to drop the proposed change to the Schedule 8 regime for TON-on-TOC for CP6. This reflected the depth of feeling expressed by industry practitioners. He added that the issue is not closed and that ORR will be revisiting it in the next control period.</p> <p>CP6 Metrics: DJ said that the publication of the new metrics on the RDG website was now scheduled for July 17<sup>th</sup>. <b>Post meeting note:</b> launch rescheduled for July 18<sup>th</sup> because of other government announcements to be made on 17<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>Gibb Report: It was noted that the Report had been published and DH reported that it had been debated in the Commons the previous day. DH said that 34 of the 38 recommendations were being taken forward – and were either already complete, underway or assigned to owners to deliver. PW added that some recommendations were very specific to GTR, while others had wider relevance.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Gibb recommendations and their status would be shared with the meeting notes.</p> <p>The NTF secretariat would review the alignment with existing NTF activity and prepare a paper for the August correspondence pack, identifying any issues that need to be managed through NTF processes.</p>	<p><b>DB/DJ</b></p>	<p><b>With notes</b></p> <p><b>By 30 August</b></p> <p><b>NTF pack</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1707_03	<p><b>Paper A – Period 3 report</b></p> <p>DM reported that national PPM has missed the plan by 2.1 PPM points in P3, largely due to the impact of the very hot weather. While better than the very poor P3 in 2016/17, PPM was well short of the levels achieved in the previous 5 years.</p> <p>The impact of the heat was reflected across all operators and most delay categories, particularly non-track assets and fleet.</p> <p>TS noted that LNE seemed to have performed well and asked for some analysis of the variation by Route. MH added that electric train fleets had performed better than diesels, and that there were problems with air conditioning on older trains that had not been designed to cope with recent temperatures.</p> <p>RW noted that there were a number of significant track projects taking place over the summer and expressed concern that this work should not be deferred. He also noted the known impact of pollen on diesel train radiators, with the business case for modifications dependent on the residual life of the fleets.</p> <p>GC reiterated that the Key Train Requirements should capture any changes in the need for new or refurbished fleets to deal with different conditions. PW added that the Rolling Stock Strategy should address the investment needs.</p> <p>DM to present further analysis of heat related failure causes and of variations in performance between Routes. <b>Post meeting note:</b> Analysis of relative fleet performance in the heat will be addressed in the Fleet Challenge update paper.</p> <p>DM summarised the overall performance impact of the Manchester and London Bridge attacks. RW asked whether PPM plans and forecasts could be revisited in light of the impacts. GC restated that headline plan PPM figures would not be changed, with the analyses being used to explain overall variance, but that parties were free to refresh their internal targets and processes to ensure that people remained appropriately motivated.</p>	DM	2 August NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<b>1707_04</b>	MH requested that the delay minutes table in the POPR should show NR and Operator totals. He also noted the significant adverse variance in TOC-on-TOC delay and asked for analysis of this at the next meeting.	<b>DM</b>	<b>2 August NTF</b>
	<p><b>Paper C – Waterloo partial closure</b></p> <p>BL summarised the scope of works at Waterloo in August with platforms 1-10 closed and the international platforms, which have been commissioned, temporarily in use. The purpose of the works to create capacity for 10-car trains. The plan is to run 57% of the usual service and planning assumed around 85% of the normal passenger demand. The Comms campaign reported 85% passenger awareness and around one third planning to change travel plans by taking leave of working at home. Some stations would be closed and queueing arrangements would be in place at busy stations.</p> <p>TS stated that following the late change in the possession footprint it had been established (contrary to the meeting paper) that the planned peak timetable would not work. Some off-peak services have been taken out but the decision had been made by NR and SWT to run the planned peak service in order to minimise the overall impact on customers. This will have an impact on PPM for SWT - and could also materially affect national PPM. When questioned, SWT and NR were unable to quantify the performance impact, but it will be significant and the plan has little resilience to perturbation. In response to a question from GC it was confirmed that there was no allowance for PPM impact in the Performance Strategy owing to the late identification of the possession change.</p>		
	<p><b>Paper B – 3 Reds – SWT / Wessex Performance</b></p> <p>BL noted the decline in performance over 2016/17, resulting in the development of a set of detailed performance improvement plans (PIPs) that were fully owned within the business. MK added that a significant number of fleet modifications had caused some disruption but that fleet reliability was starting to improve as a result.</p> <p>PW said there may be lessons for SWT from the Gibb Report and asked about the trend in delay per incident. BL replied that this was a key focus, analysis of incident response having led to a new team</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>being put in place at Surbiton. The new Chief Incident Officer / Incident Officer structure would help drive improvement.</p> <p>MA noted that there had been a large improvement in the CRI measure of asset management but that PPM had worsened. GR added that the lack of correlation between CRI and PPM was a concern for ORR and that their analysis suggested that CRI only affects 25% of PPM. The conversation at the June NTF about the industry developing better capability to relate programme measures to punctuality measures refers.</p> <p>SWT and Wessex Route did not ask for any assistance from NTF.</p>		
	<p><b>Paper D – ORR: Network Rail Monitor</b></p> <p>GR summarised the key messages from the Network Rail monitor (now expected to be published on 18<sup>th</sup> July) covering financial performance, punctuality, asset management and enhancement delivery. Southeastern performance had been the subject of detailed analysis because it was the one operator where NR's share of delay had risen. A separate report would be published alongside the Monitor. The Thameslink project had severely affected Southeastern performance and it was important that lessons were learned from this.</p> <p>PH stressed the importance of Sponsors engaging at the concept stage of projects in considering maintenance plans, both during and after construction, ensuring an optimal WLCC approach. He also noted the importance of engineering access, noting that a lot less access had been taken in CP5 than had been forecast during PR13. MH and RW said it was important to give more attention to planning the enabling works and delivery process for projects, including early consideration of diversionary routes. RW also noted that importance of being realistic about the performance impacts of major works.</p> <p>PW called for NTF to get behind NR, stressing the importance of collaborative behaviour, particularly in the development of delivery and access plans.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1707_05	<p><b>Paper E: Better Operations: Stock and Crew Industry position</b></p> <p>DJ introduced the paper, seeking members' support for the proposal for ownership to rest with the Digital Railway programme, noting that it was not currently funded.</p> <p>MH asked PB whether the programme had the right resources to tackle the task. PB confirmed that it did. RW pointed out the lack of progress in this area although interface specifications with Traffic Management had been agreed with NR years ago. He felt a collective approach was needed to the solution, though others felt this would be challenging to agree. MH highlighted the age and manual nature of some of the existing systems and stressed the need for Traffic Management to have Stock and crew capability.</p> <p>TS observed that no other railways had yet cracked the problem and that it was technically very difficult. He suggested that development should be a high priority for funding from a performance fund if this is established for CP6.</p> <p>PW indicated that DfT were open to the idea of specifying in franchises, but needed to know what to specify. He also said that the money available to the Digital Railway Programme could be used to fund development.</p> <p>GC summarised the challenge to DRSG for the Stock and Crew capability as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) What does good look like?</li> <li>(2) What is the framework for developing it?</li> <li>(3) How can it be funded?</li> </ul>		
1705_05	<p>Members endorsed the proposal that DRSG should lead this activity and asked that regular updates were provided to NTF.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note:</b> DJ presented to DRSG on 6<sup>th</sup> July and they agreed to take ownership of the issue and provide progress reports to NTF.</p>	DJ	Quarterly or for cause

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1707_06	<p><b>Paper F – TLS Programme Update</b></p> <p>DM summarised progress with TLS. GPS fitment on trains is now close to 60%. Work on the GPS gateway, that will process GPS data to feed Darwin and potentially ITED, is underway (led by RDG) and due to complete in March 2018. ITED requirements had been established and an outline design solution developed. The detail and costs were being formed up by the end of August, but a shortfall against available funding was expected. An update will be provided in September.</p> <p>PW said that ITED was vital for driving improvement in the right time railway and the project must not be allowed to fail for lack of funding.</p> <p>JS asked whether level crossing technology could tap in to the GPS data. MH responded that the GPS spec was not designed to support safety critical functions. GC added that there were other industry forums for addressing this.</p>	DM	27 September NTF
1707_07	<p><b>Paper G – OPSG Update</b></p> <p>GS summarised the outcome of the OPSG workshop in June, noting the value of the pre-work by owning groups on their priorities, and setting out the agreed themes. He invited comments on the themes and sought assistance in getting remaining owning groups involved. It was agreed that MH would contact MTR and GS c2c. GC asked and received confirmation from GS that the priorities constitute the workstreams for the Better Timetables Theme in the National Industry Performance Plan that requires to be formally signed off by the NTF 2 August.</p>	MH	By 14 July
1707_08	<p>MH noted the discussion at an earlier NTF on the importance of recognising the revenue impact of timetables of emphasis and encouraging journey time improvements. This should be considered within all the emerging workstreams. MH also noted the importance of building and maintaining planning capability. GS agreed to take this back to OPSG.</p>	GS	7 July



ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<b>1707_11</b>	<b>Papers for Noting</b> The System delay paper had been shared for consideration. It was agreed that this should be discussed at the next meeting.	<b>DB</b>	<b>2 August NTF</b>

Other attendees: Phil Barrett (RDG) for Paper E