

NOTES / ACTIONS from 22 November 2017 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Chair - opening remarks</p> <p>MH welcomed Martin Frobisher (LNW) and Paul McMahon (FNPO) as the NR RMD reps, and Gus Dunster (Virgin, for Peter Broadley). Apologies received from Rick Davey.</p> <p>IMechE Seminar: MH noted that he and some other NTF members had participated in the IMechE seminar on “Capacity or Performance” on 14 November. There had been a number of interesting presentations generating some good discussion, though the audience was disappointingly small, perhaps reflecting the cost of attendance and the effectiveness of the marketing. RW suggested that NTF should consider holding another performance seminar, as it had done before, ensuring that it was cheaper and easier to access.</p>		
1711_01	DB to draft a letter for MH to send to Richard McClean on behalf of NTF, thanking him for the IMechE seminar.	DB	6 December
1711_02	DJ to make IMechE presentations available to members via the RDG portal.	DJ	6 December
	<p>PDG meeting: MH reported feedback from the Minister on his attendance at the October NTF meeting. The Minister had reinforced the importance of NTF in driving performance, expressed surprise that more senior representatives were not present, and suggested there should be a stronger focus on the delivery of a smaller number of activities. He had also noted the importance of the national activity not undermining devolution and local accountability and stressed the need for clarity on the role of the Route Supervisory Boards in relation to route scorecards and performance management.</p>		
1711_03	<p>Later in the meeting PW noted that the Minister would be writing to NTF following the meeting. It was agreed that MH, GC, PH and PW should meet to discuss how to respond when the letter was received.</p> <p>The need for better modelling of the performance impact of timetable change was also discussed. NB said that this was a fair challenge as far as it related to the May 2018 timetable change, but that the DfT</p>	MH/GC/ PH/PW	TBC

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>were heavily involved and one of the key issues was that franchise specifications and sale of access rights were completed before the performance evaluation. CR agreed, noting that the Thameslink specification was very complex but that the industry was doing its best to make it work. MH said that it was important not to promise extra services too soon, as once public announcements had been made it was very difficult for the industry to say that it would not work. PW agreed that it was vital that performance was considered from the start of the enhancement process. GC reminded members that the IIA narrative had been clear that performance was the top priority and that this had been accepted.</p>		
1711_04	<p>Paper A – Period 8 Performance</p> <p>DM summarised P8 performance which was 2.7 PPM points behind plan and the worst P8 since 2005. Only c2c and Southeastern had met their plan in the period. Main issues in the period included IR, with strikes affecting several operators, high impact fatalities, Storm Ophelia, trespass and vandalism incidents, and the early onset of Autumn.</p> <p>GC observed that there appeared to be a lot of non-systemic issues having a big impact in the period. MF said he felt the impact of fatalities was systemic, with major performance impacts at key locations, and that something different needed to be done in tackling this. TS said the evidence from work at Wimbledon was that the problem could be reduced by making access more difficult at key locations.</p> <p>GC confirmed that Ian Smith had taken over as Chair of the National Suicide Prevention Group and would review the national suicide prevention strategy and whether Routes and TOCs are following best practice.</p> <p>MF said that LNW were investigating options for platform edge protection, as exists on the Jubilee Line, to see whether a business case could be made. PH added that increasing staffing at key locations was also being considered.</p> <p>DJ to arrange for an update on the industry suicide prevention strategy from Ian Stevens on a future agenda.</p> <p>NB noted that trespass was an increasing problem, with a lot more interventions to prevent trouble, in addition to the increase in actual incidents. GC said that there was as industry trespass review meeting</p>	DJ	TBC

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	in week beginning 27 November to look at how to bring together NR, BTP and RSSB activity and develop a national strategy.		
	<p>Autumn: DM noted that Autumn had started early with a significant impact in P8, but that P9 had been better so far. GR pointed out that the chart showed the worst PPM impact to date for 7 years. TS added that his TOCs had experienced more wheel flats than ever before. The WSP fitment by EMT had been effective for those fleets, but other fleets were suffering more.</p> <p>MA questioned what further intervention was required to deliver a step change. TS said there was as significant impact on fleet costs as well as on PPM. RW reminded members that work had been done for the IIA showing that the overall costs of the Autumn performance dip to the UK economy were huge and that this case had been made to a previous Rail Minister. He said there needed to be more focus on looking 5 years ahead at what more radical work could be done.</p> <p>MH noted that lots of Autumn preparation work had been said to have been completed, but that this was not reflected in the actual performance. There were a lot more vehicles out of service and the short-formation trains led to crowding and an increase in station dwell times with a further performance impact. He added that he had tried to push WSP fitment to the 15x fleets to build on the positive experience of Greater Anglia and EMT but was struggling to make further progress.</p> <p>AP stressed the importance of good operational practice and questioned whether sufficient vegetation management work was being undertaken.</p>		
1711_05	JS said that the Adhesion Working Group would consider all the issues raised, and the work of the Adhesion Research group, and come back to NTF with a view on the key priorities and required support. [Note – links to later action 1711_07].	JS/John Edgley	17 Jan NTF
	<p>Paper B - Key Performance Issues</p> <p>DM presented analysis of the current performance levels and trends, noting the rising level of reactionary delay (now 70% of total) and the level of external causes of delay (over 15%) and showing a picture of all the influences on performance. AP asked whether the delay mins data was pre or post final attribution. DM advised that it was all post-attribution except for the most recent period. He then</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1711_06	<p>showed the chart of PPM attrition by operator. NB asked whether there was a simple definition of the attrition categories, particularly specification delay. DM replied that specification delay included the delay on the best 5% of days to try and give some insight into the level of delay occurring even when no there were no major incidents. RW challenged whether this was meaningful, as for large operators, even the best 5% of days would include a number of incidents affecting some of their services, and suggested that presenting the figures at service group level would show a much lower level of specification delay.</p> <p>Definitions of the attrition categories and the performance influences slide to be circulated with the notes.</p> <p>DM then presented a heat map of delay mins by categories and NR Route, comparing this year's levels with the 5-year average and showing the relative variance in delay minutes (not the absolute contribution to delay minutes). The top 6 categories in this matrix were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network management – particularly the level of unattributed / unexplained delay; • Trespass / fatalities; • TOC 'other' – external factors for which NR does not have detailed data; • Stations – lack of data on station dwells was noted. OB said it was important to identify cause and effect – as station dwells can be due to other issues causing short-formed or late services leading to crowding and increased dwell times; • Train crew; and • Track – including impact of TSRs. <p>DM finished by noting some qualitative factors that are affecting performance but are difficult to measure and that are difficult to quantify and demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourcing / experience; • Incentives and industry culture; 	DB	6 December

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation and IR issues; • Optimism bias; and • Prioritisation of performance with other factors. <p>MH agreed that prioritisation was an issue and noted that companies tended to put their best people onto major change projects rather than business as usual operations. He said there was a need to look more closely at service group level performance to understand why there were such variations and suggested that improving specific service groups could form challenge projects for future cross industry leaders.</p> <p>MF added that the industry tended to invest for capacity and not performance. SD cited an example from the ECML where investment to tackle a particular junction bottleneck to improve performance had successfully removed all delays at that location, enabling more trains to be operated which led to no net improvement in headline performance.</p> <p>RW cited TPE enhancement as an example where DfT were now specifying more trains <u>and</u> the required reliability, so that this could be designed in. He added that it was important that the performance resilience is not ‘value engineered’ out later in the project.</p> <p>JS said it was vital not to ignore capability and competence and noted that these did not appear anywhere in the Industry Performance Plan and governance. TS agreed – noting a review of an operator’s control function that found nobody with more than a year’s experience.</p>		
	<p>Paper C – NTF Governance</p> <p>The meeting moved on to discuss whether the existing Industry Performance Plan (IPP) and NTF sub-groups were adequately addressing the performance issues that had been identified.</p> <p>NB suggested that there was a need to reinvigorate some of the working groups and ensure there was a clear challenge from NTF for these groups to drive improvements. PH said the challenge should be to ask why performance was not 100% rather than what marginal improvements could be made. MH concluded that all the working groups should be challenged to say what needed to be done, and what help and resources would be required to make this possible.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1711_10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> local delivery of the Performance Strategies is the key focus of the Industry Performance Plan – do members feel delivery is good enough; plans to tackle delay per incident should be integral part of the Strategies; Performance Strategies are intended to be rolling 5-year plans but there is little evidence of planning into CP6; and there is limited evidence that Strategies are being materially updated in the face of some significant shortfalls in performance against plan. <p>MH said that the imperative to improve performance was not coming out in the reviews and that there was a need to reinvigorate the whole process. TS agreed that the businesses should be challenged on delivery of the plans. AP suggested that there should be a one-off independent review of the adequacy of the Performance Strategies and this was supported by other members.</p> <p>MG said he would review the role of the National Performance Analysis team in the Performance Strategy process and report back on proposed changes to the ‘business as usual’ process.</p>	MG	17 Jan NTF
1711_11	<p>It was agreed that GC would develop a proposal for a one-off independent review of the Performance Strategies during Q4. The aim would be to review the adequacy of the plans and report back to individual TOCs / Routes on identified weaknesses and to report to NTF on good practice.</p>	GC	17 Jan NTF
	<p>Paper F – Alignment of Incentives</p> <p>MF explained the background to the paper. Chiltern have PPM targets specified in their franchise agreement and were concerned at the risk that the adoption of the new ‘on time’ measures in the Route Scorecard could lead to different behaviour that would adversely affect PPM. LNW/Chiltern had therefore approached DfT suggesting a change in the franchise agreement to change from PPM to on time. In discussion, it had been established that franchise change was not easy or quick and the proposal was therefore that CP6 Route Scorecards should align to PPM. PW explained that DfT wanted the ‘right time railway’ and wanted to ensure the right front-line behaviours to deliver this. He had agreed with</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1711_12	<p>Mark Carne to review all the existing franchise agreements within the next two years and to make changes to the agreements if these were necessary to meet this objective.</p> <p>AP asked whether there would still be a conflict on incentives with different operators working to PPM or ‘on time’ on the same route. MF agreed that there could and that this would need to be tackled locally. He added that South East Route, GTR and Southeastern were already focused on ‘on time’. GR questioned whether the proposal in the paper effectively meant that the adoption of the CP6 metrics was being deferred to CP8. MH disagreed, stating that there was no constraint in his franchise agreement and that there was a willingness to change.</p> <p>OB questioned whether there was really a conflict between ‘on time’ and PPM and said he was not convinced by the example in the paper.</p> <p>RW said that the key issue within some franchise agreements was the ‘multiplier’ and that this should be a key focus for early review. PW pointed out that changes to franchise agreements could have material financial consequences for Government and that the agreements would only be changed if there was a clear need.</p> <p>DW said it was NR’s intention to have shadow running of the performance metrics in parallel in the 2018/19 scorecards, with all the measures being tracked.</p> <p>It was agreed that DW would circulate a paper on Route Scorecards setting out the proposal to shadow run PPM and on time measures next year to inform choices for CP6 scorecards / transition. This would be circulated in draft as part of the December correspondence pack to enable feedback before debate at the 17 January meeting.</p> <p>Paper G – Better Ops</p> <p>TS summarised the key points from the paper, stressing the need for industry support on the Crew and Stock strategy in sharing data and in ensuring the coordination of any work undertaken by individual Owning Groups with the RDG activity. PW noted that having Crew and Stock capability was now being specified in all new franchises. TS pointed out that no party yet had a working solution. MH added that there could be individual or national solutions to the challenge and that the ‘ask’ should be for operators</p>	DW	20 Dec NTF pack

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1711_13	to demonstrate collaborative working with NR over the use of Traffic Management, CDAS and other systems. <i>Post-meeting note:</i> TS to contact Owing Group representatives concerning access to data in support of the Crew & Stock strategy.	TS	10 December
1711_14	TS also highlighted the proposal to review the ROC and regulation policies and said BOPB would develop a detailed proposal and bring this to a future NTF to endorse.	TS	14 Feb NTF
	Paper H – Freight Board Quarterly Update PM summarised the headlines from the Freight Board paper, noting that Performance Strategies had now been agreed with all freight operators, following the TOC model. He also highlighted the focus on FDM improvement through detailed reviews to improve performance at specific locations.		
1711_15	AOB Review future agenda / plan to reflect agreed actions.	DB/DJ	20 Dec NTF pack

Visitors: Dominic Medway (DM), James Nattrass (JN), Stephen Draper (SD), John Thompson (JT).

Next meetings:

Wednesday 20 December – correspondence pack only.

Wednesday 17 January 2018