

NOTES AND ACTIONS from 9 May 2018 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1805_01	<p>Chair – Opening remarks</p> <p>MH welcomed Andy Thomas (NR, continuing to cover for Phil Hufton) and Bill Kelly (Wales) as the NR RMD rep. Apologies were received from Pete Wilkinson, John Halsall, Rick Davey and Joel Mitchell. Apologies for late arrival received from Graham Richards.</p> <p>RDG Board: GC reported that the performance seminar headlines had been discussed with the Board, who were supportive and committed to providing personal leadership on improving performance. GC had reminded the Board that the RDG review of Informed Traveller compliance led by DB was continuing to look at root causes and was separate to the short-term recovery plan.</p> <p>NB asked that it be made clear in the Informed Traveller work that TW-12 is not just for the benefit of customers – it is also important to operators to enable efficient planning of train crew rosters, train diagrams, buses and more.</p> <p>PDG: MH reported that the first PDG meeting had been held with the new Minister, Jo Johnson. Issues around current performance, new fleet and Informed Traveller had been explained and the Minister had made clear that the Government’s top priorities for rail were punctuality and franchise reform.</p>	DB	Next report
	<p>Performance Report – 2017/18</p> <p>DM briefly summarised 2017/18 performance: national PPM finished the year 2.3 PPM points behind plan and every single operator fell short of PPM and CaSL plans. Key messages were the need to tackle network management, fleet and external delay categories.</p> <p>MH said it was important to get at the root causes of the increases, noting that train crew attributed delays were high despite train crew numbers being as high as ever. NB noted that Class 700 performance had been very poor but was now improving steadily, however train crew issues were continuing. RW added that late handback of infrastructure from projects and the quality and timeliness of route DVDs for drivers were other factors contributing to the train crew issues.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1805_02	MG noted that the ‘Network Management / Other’ category covered a broad range of issues and proposed that it be broken down for future reporting.		
1805_02	Fleet challenge paper to June meeting should clearly set out the performance impact of fleet, rather than focusing on MTIn.	DB/BD	6 June NTF
1805_03	Period 2 performance review to provide a breakdown of the “Network Management/Other” category and insight into underlying trends and performance against plan.	MG/DM	6 June NTF
1805_04	A future NTF meeting to review train crew impact and to drill down into root causes. DM/DB to identify a suitable Route/TOC pair for analysis and identify when to bring this to NTF.	DM/DB	4 July NTF
1805_05	Regular performance slot to have an overview of performance at the end of each quarter, similar to the year-end review.	DM	From 1 Aug NTF
	DM moved on to period 1 2018/19, where performance had been 1.8 PPM points behind plan, with GWR and Northern contributing a large proportion of the overall national shortfall. He highlighted some new analysis of PPM during the day that suggested recovery after the morning peak was getting weaker with worse performance at the start of the evening peak.		
	AT explained that he was challenging Routes to focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performance improvement in the AM and PM peaks; • delivery at the weekends; • ensuring that joint seasonal preparation plans were implemented; and • tackling reactionary delay. 		
1805_06	Performance report - Three Reds: After discussion it was agreed that LNE Route / VTEC should be to be asked to present in the ‘Three Reds’ slot at the June meeting.	DB	6 June NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1805_07	<p>Performance report: Review the Network Management performance data to identify an appropriate topic for deeper review at the July meeting, considering trends in possessions over-runs and impact of late notice access as possible topics.</p> <p>SWR/Wessex: GR explained that ORR had been reviewing performance of SWR/Wessex, looking at whether the reasons for poor performance were properly understood and whether there was a plan to deliver sustainable improvement. He added that ORR would wait for the Holden Review to report before making any decisions about enforcement action.</p> <p>FW noted that the Holden Review for SWR/Wessex Route was being carried out in three phases, the first phase being due to complete by the end of June. Further work would look at incentives and processes, and at implementing timetable change.</p>	DM/DB	4 July NTF
1805_08	<p>Performance report: Agree with SWR/Wessex an appropriate date for briefing NTF on the outcome of the Holden Report Phase 1.</p>	DB	25 May
1805_09	<p>Performance Seminar outcomes</p> <p>DB summarised the key themes and members endorsed the summary and planned next steps.</p> <p>RW asked how the NTF's role in performance leadership could be demonstrated to front-line people, giving visibility of national activities so that they were clear how they were being supported. NB added that the NTF brand was not widely recognised.</p> <p>AP said there was a need to be honest about the effectiveness of joint working between NR and operators which he felt had got worse. Members needed to make clear that performance was a top priority and be role models for collaborative working. Improving performance needed good personal relationships at all levels and a culture where everyone cared about performance.</p> <p>Performance plan: NTF secretariat to consider how to communicate NTF activity more widely so that front-line staff have a clearer understanding of how it supports them.</p>	GC/DJ/ DB	29 Aug

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1805_10	<p>Ill Passengers: MH noted that there was a national forum for ambulance services and asked that the opportunity for an NTF representative to attend be looked at - DJ to speak to Peter Lovegrove at RDG.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: This was discussed at the 11 May P&PF meeting and an action taken to gather together existing TOC policies and guidance to enable a comparison and gap analysis. The output from this analysis will be presented to the August NTF.</p>	<p>DJ</p> <p>DJ</p>	<p>25 May</p> <p>1 August NTF</p>
1805_11	<p>CP6 Performance Plans</p> <p>GR reiterated ORR's desire for NR Routes and their customers to agree performance trajectories for CP6 and that further effort to close the gap was needed by mid-July. ORR's draft determination in June would not set out any performance figures but would ask for specific issues to be addressed and evidence provided. Arup's analysis of Route performance plans was not yet finished but suggested that the process followed was reasonable, with the exception of Anglia. Their work identified scope for improvement and would specify details to be followed up. The Arup report would be completed by 12 June and would be published.</p> <p>AT said that Routes would engage with operators in the further round of work and would make changes to performance trajectories where there was sufficient evidence to justify this. However, he stressed that Routes had already done detailed work and were adopting realistic numbers – not setting low ones. GC challenged saying that the NTF has a role (as it has since 2004) to challenge if the performance forecasts for future years are inappropriate and that this discussion will be required at the 1 August meeting.</p> <p>CP6 Performance plans: Establish process for reviewing progress with the CP6 performance plans at future NTF meetings.</p>	DB/MG	6 June NTF
1805_12	<p>CP6 Performance plans: It was noted that the CP5/6 performance trajectories chart in the pack was based on period 10, since when there had been a further drop in performance. It was agreed that DM would update the graph for actual data up to P13 for circulation with these notes.</p>	DM	With notes

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1805_13	<p>Independent review of Performance Strategies</p> <p>DJ summarised progress with procurement for the review and stressed the criticality of getting the ongoing updates of the Strategy documents completed and signed off to enable them to be reviewed. He noted that AP had agreed to join a steering group for the work (with GC, DB and DJ) and asked for an NR representative. DJ reaffirmed that the Performance Strategy review would focus on 2018/19 and that the NTF secretariat required individual strategies to be submitted by the 1st of June.</p> <p>Performance Strategy review: AT to identify an NR representative to join the Steering Group for the independent review of performance strategies.</p>	AT	18 May
	<p>Informed Traveller</p> <p>CR provided an update on the recovery plan, noting the intention to develop a template for future updates. The intent was to stabilise at TW-6, then build offer/response time back in, before gradually moving back to TW-12 in time for the Christmas period. So far NR had met the principle of offering on time to every operator who bid on time. The only operators who had not been able to bid on time were GTR, because of the late completion of the May timetable, and GWR, because of continuing issues with late notice engineering access. Northern also had some gaps in their bids due to the late deferral of electrification works. NB noted that some of the offers were not of good enough quality and led to further TOC work. It was also noted that continuing issues with late notice access on GWR and Northern were diverting effort away from meeting the TW-6 plan and posed a risk to delivery of the recovery plan.</p> <p>CR noted further risks associated with the effort required for the December 2018 timetable, which also involves substantial changes, noting that D-26 fell in mid-June. There were still a lot of issues to resolve with the SWR timetable bid, and risks remained in the North West although NR had confirmed that the electrification infrastructure would be ready in time. OPSG were meeting on Friday 11 May and were reviewing the December 2018 position.</p> <p>OB said the recovery plan was looking reasonably good for most operators, but noted that the timetable planning community were working very hard as a result of errors made elsewhere. He described the</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>training was required. OB and CR agreed that NR's approach did not create a risk of poaching of competent planners from operators.</p> <p>CR added that the May and December 2018 timetable changes were vastly greater than normal and that this was the main cause of problems, with a huge level of overtime being worked at present. MH suggested there was a risk of burn-out from prolonged overtime and questioned if the current activity was sustainable. CR said the real benefits of the additional recruitment would not be felt until the December 2019 timetable process.</p>		
1805_16	<p>Infrastructure asset reliability</p> <p>JS summarised the paper, noting that a 2.8% reduction in service affecting failures in 2017/18 was positive but did not have a great impact on performance. The key to delivering a step change in asset reliability was the intelligent infrastructure programme, with the development of advanced analytics for establishing degradation rates and predicting failures.</p> <p>PB expressed concern about a rise in track defects and the sufficiency of power supplies. JS replied that he is keen to get more measurement equipment fitted to service trains to get quicker and better information about developing faults.</p> <p>Weather resilience: Discuss status of RSSB activity and working group on Weather Resilience and Climate Change to inform thinking about ongoing cross industry engagement. Update at next planned NTF agenda slot.</p>	GC/JS	4 July NTF
	<p>Winter Review</p> <p>PMc noted the key points from the review of the 'Beast from the East' snow event, stressing the importance of contingency plans and the use of key route strategies.</p> <p>MH questioned whether it was realistic to have contingency timetables for such events, given the potential for localised complete blocks of routes. It was hard to see what question contingency planners would be asked to address.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1805_17	<p>AT noted that there had inconsistent approaches and suggested that agreement on some principles in advance would have reduced the pressure on individuals to make key decisions on the spot.</p> <p>PB said that a key problem had been uncertainty over when lines might be able to reopen, with lots of short notice changes to the advice to operators. AP added that trying to run too many trains had resulted in damage to traction motors affecting fleet availability on subsequent days.</p> <p>MH concluded that the paper had not been particularly helpful and highlighted the limited evidence of operator involvement in the review. If there had been difficulties getting operator engagement then this should have been escalated.</p> <p>Winter review: updated paper to be brought to the September NTF meeting setting out what learning and good practice has been briefed to Routes and TOCs following the winter review, and providing an update on winter preparations.</p>	PMc	26 Sept NTF
	<p>Winter – Fleet: Fleet challenge paper in September to address status of winter preparation for fleet.</p>	DB/BD	26 Sept NTF

Other attendees: Pete McCreery, NR (PMc)

Next meeting: Wednesday 6 June