

NOTES AND ACTIONS from 4 July 2018 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Chair's remarks</p> <p>MH welcomed Andrew Haines (for the December 2018 timetable item), Polly Payne (DG Rail, DfT), Steve Tyler as the new First Group NTF representative, John Edgley (for Jon Shaw), and John Halsall, Martin Frobisher, Mark Langman and Paul McMahon as the NR RMD reps. Apologies were received from Gary Cooper (RDG), who joined the meeting during item 6, and Rick Davey (Keolis).</p>		
	<p>December 2018 Timetable</p> <p>AH thanked colleagues for their good collaboration in pulling together the proposal to the Secretary of State for the December 2018 timetable change. The recommended hybrid option had been accepted, with some operators going ahead with planned December changes and others rolling forward their May timetable. He noted that there would be some exceptions to the general approach, but that the industry needed to be very disciplined about these exceptions.</p> <p>AH then set out the key activities for the cross industry PMO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completing assurance for the December 2018 timetable; 2. applying the readiness process to the May 2019 timetable planning, recognising the changes deferred from December; and 3. a fundamental review of how the industry plans timetable. <p>AH said that he wanted the industry to lead on all three topics, and that this would need the release of good people within the industry to tackle these challenges. He asked whether there was an appetite for a fundamental review. He said the thinking should not be constrained by the Network Code, as much had changed since the processes were designed at the time of privatisation.</p> <p>TS said that the readiness review process needed to include forecasting how reliably new timetables would operate. He noted that it would be challenging to release resources who might be focused on franchise bidding.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1807_01	<p>RC said it was important that the processes recognised the dynamic nature of the freight businesses. DC added that businesses had signed contracts on the basis of timetable paths that were now uncertain, and that the potential impact on freight was not yet understood. AH agreed that the processes needed to work for freight. There was a need to clarify the net impact of the agreed changes for passenger operators on freight services and then work together to address any issues that were identified.</p> <p>PP noted that Owing Group CEOs had met the Secretary of State earlier in the day. Letters were being produced for each operator on how the commercial implications would be handled. She said there would be discussions with the affected operators, stressing that there was not a blank cheque but that DfT would ensure that operators would be treated fairly. PW confirmed that operators would be held harmless for the impact of the agreed timetable changes.</p> <p>PP asked that all parties approach the May 2019 timetable discussions collaboratively, focusing on what was best for customers (including freight). LD asked whether freight operators would be compensated for any loss of contracts caused by the loss of paths. PP replied that this would be a contractual issue for operators and NR to work through. AP said that he expected the same approach to commercial impacts to be applied for the May 2019 timetable.</p> <p>AH asked operator members to nominate individuals who could support the PMO activities and to contact Paul McMahon setting out how much of their time could be made available. NR would then develop a plan around the availability of resources.</p> <p>RW asked about the next steps for the May 2019 timetable, noting that on the usual timescales the PDMS submissions were due in just a few weeks. AH responded that the DfT needed to consider their priorities and the Readiness Board would map this to the assessment of industry readiness. CR added that the May timetable process would be discussed at OPSG on 6th July, including a proposal for deferral of PDMS from D-40 to D-36, and a recommendation would then be made to the PMO.</p> <p>MF noted that the local impacts of the December 2018 decision would be very different and asked what the industry comms plan was. SG said that RDG and DfT were working closely on the overall messaging, with a press release expected before the end of the week provided the letters on the commercial position were agreed. <i>Post meeting note:</i> Press release issued on Monday 9 July.</p>	Operator members	ASAP

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1807_02</p> <p>1807_03</p>	<p>SG said some operators were not yet ready to describe local detail and wanted the release to be delayed. AH responded that the proposal for most operators had not changed over the last two weeks, so they should already be clear about the impacts. MH noted that it was important to understand when service changes were being deferred to – as this may not be May 2019.</p> <p>All members to ensure that their Comms teams were briefed on the specific December 2018 timetable outcome for their operators.</p> <p>Brief TOC Comms contacts on the discussion and ask them to flag up any genuine issues in understanding and communicating local impacts.</p>	<p>OG members</p> <p>SG</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>ASAP</p>
<p>1807_04</p>	<p>PMO Governance</p> <p>AH concluded that the PMO governance process should be determined when the level of industry support was clear. AH then had to leave the meeting.</p> <p>MH noted that the biennial review of NTF was due, and that this would need to incorporate expectations about the governance role, as he did not want NTF to have accountability without authority. PW suggested that NTF, informed by the PMO analysis, should make a recommendation on readiness for the RDG Board to endorse before submitting to the Secretary of State. TS reiterated the importance of NTF addressing whether the timetable change would deliver good enough performance.</p> <p>MH to speak to AH about the role of NTF in governance of the PMO.</p>	<p>MH/AH</p>	<p>By end July</p>
	<p>Performance Strategy Review</p> <p>DJ noted that the SDG review was underway and that all performance Strategy documents had been received, though not all were formally signed off. Some meetings had been diaried but not all operators had yet responded to SDG. Any issues raised at the weekly progress reviews would be escalated to relevant members.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>P3 Performance report</p> <p>DM reported that national PPM in P3 was 85.8%, 3.9 PPM points behind plan. The May timetable implementation issues had a significant impact, though the amendments in early June had led to some improvement. TPE, Northern and GTR were all performing significantly worse than before the change.</p> <p>Northern, GTR and GWR were the largest contributors to the overall punctuality shortfall, although performance on the Southern services within GTR had improved with the new timetable. The largest variances to plan for TOCs were operations and train crew, while for NR it was external.</p> <p>AT said the figures were poor and that the agreement and delivery of effective joint Performance Strategies was essential to turning this round. He also emphasised the importance of completing Autumn preparations to minimise the seasonal dip.</p> <p>RW highlighted the lack of resilience, noting a recent day when PPM for Northern and TPE had been around 90% at 3pm but then dropped substantially due to issues with heat and lineside fires. Fleet and infrastructure reliability was broadly unchanged so the change in the timetable and the overall volume of services might be the main cause.</p> <p>PP asked if this was a common issue with other TOCs. MH replied TOCs had different issues, the principal problem for GWR being the level of network availability due to the amount of engineering access being taken. Performance should improve when the electrification work is complete. MF said there was a common issue with the increase in capacity utilisation as more services are added reducing the overall resilience. JH suggested that a key problem was that no single body evaluated the trade-offs between performance, capacity and journey times. PM added that through the Sale of Access Rights process small decrements in performance were noted but the aggregate impact of changes was not tracked.</p> <p>TS said that how we operate is more important than other factors, noting that the SWR timetable had operated much more reliably in previous years. He said NTF needed to show leadership, making improvement activity more visible to people in the industry, and signing up to agreed minimum standards. NB added that NTF had to become more agile in identifying and addressing issues, citing the need to tackle the understanding of sub-threshold delay as an example.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1807_05	<p>AT reiterated the importance of having joint performance plans, and sharing these to enable NTF to provide some oversight. He also stressed the benefits in motivating people by sharing successes rather than focusing on the analysis of failure.</p> <p>It was noted that the SDG review of the performance strategies should help focus attention on areas for improvement.</p> <p>It was agreed that DB and DJ should commence planning the NTF biennial review, including 1-1 meetings with members and other stakeholders, providing an update at the next meeting.</p>	DB/DJ	1 Aug NTF
	<p>Informed Traveller recovery plan</p> <p>CR reported that good progress had been made in delivering the recovery plan. However, the agreed approach to the December timetable change would undermine this as the new base timetable would be completed later than usual. Industry planning teams were making every effort to minimise the impact, keep as many reservations open as possible, and try and avoid a general retreat to T-6 or 7. CR expressed a concern over morale as people had been working very hard for a long time on the recovery plan, making it very important to explain that the decision had been taken for the right reasons, and ensure that people did not feel that their hard work had been undermined.</p> <p>CR said that OPSG would continue to focus on minimising the impact and would report progress at the next meeting. TS encouraged a particular focus on the Christmas holiday period, to get the engineering access plan locked down early, and enable operators to open reservations.</p>		
	<p>CP6 Performance Plans</p> <p>GR briefly summarised key points from ORR’s draft determination, noting the ongoing work to review CP6 performance plans and trajectories for a further submission in mid-July. JH said that South East, GTR and Southeastern had already worked closely on producing joint plans, and that their numbers would not change.</p> <p>RW said that given the current position at Northern it was impossible to make meaningful forecasts for future years and this would not be possible until a stable timetable had been delivered. PW asked</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>whether the franchise contract inhibited the discussion on performance. RW replied that the problem was the level of uncertainty created by the timetable issues.</p> <p>PW reiterated that the DfT were looking for a joint TOC/NR view on the level of performance that was realistically achievable. If this fell short of commitments in franchise agreements then the franchise change process could be used to address this, but this could only start from an agreed position with supporting evidence.</p>		
	<p>Autumn Readiness review</p> <p>JE reported that not all parties had submitted their Autumn plans for review and that some operator responses on Stagegate 1 reviews were awaited. His assessment was that the current position was reasonable, but that there was a great deal of work to be delivered to ensure that the industry was ready. He would write to MDs to highlight any ongoing concerns.</p> <p>LD noted that FOCs had concerns over NR dealing with defined vegetation hotspots. JE replied that AWG had clear guidance on tackling these and that this would be monitored throughout the process.</p> <p>AT stressed the importance of joint Autumn plans being signed off by Routes, TOCs and FOCs, and any issues being flushed out as early as possible. Autumn plans were a key element of joint performance strategies.</p> <p>PW reminded operators of their obligations in their franchise agreements for delivering effective seasonal preparations and said that the DfT took this delivery very seriously and wanted guidance on any TOCs or NR Routes who were not delivering industry good practice.</p>		
	<p>Delay Attribution – ADA33 determination</p> <p>MG summarised the implications of the ADA33 determination. By shifting the core principle from ‘prime cause’ to ‘root cause’ the basis of the existing delay attribution principles would be changed, affecting Schedule 8 benchmarks with an estimated 10-15% change in attribution. The paper indicated that NR is considering whether to appeal the decision. GC asked what support or guidance was being sought from NTF, as the paper did not make this clear.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1807_06	<p>In discussion, there was strong support from members for maintaining the existing approach to delay attribution.</p> <p>Delay attribution: MG was asked to prepare a paper making clear the potential ramifications of ADA33 and setting out options for how to maintain the existing approach for NTF members to agree.</p>	MG	1 Aug NTF
	<p>Better Operations Board Update</p> <p>TS asked that members review their representation on the BOPB and put forward additional people if appropriate. He highlighted BOPB's engagement with the RSSB-funded 'PERFORM' R&D programme and asked members support the workstreams. He noted the progress made in reviewing rules and standards and asked members to be ready to implement Rule Book changes including Emergency Special Working. He also questioned whether following the Rule Book should be made mandatory, as some parts of the network were not applying all the rules.</p> <p>TS pointed out the gap between Digital Railway led work on Traffic Management (TM) and the Crew and Stock strategy, saying that TM could not deliver the expected benefits without connecting to Crew and Stock systems, and suggesting that the current approach to procurement of TM was wrong.</p> <p>AT expressed support for the RSSB programme and the plan for sharing the detail with NR's Route Chief Operating Officers.</p>		
1807_07	<p>Industry Performance Plan</p> <p>The paper was noted. DB/J to continue developing the IPP, taking account of the SDG review of performance strategies and the outcome of the biennial review.</p>	DB/DJ	Ongoing

Other attendees: Andrew Haines (AH), Polly Payne (PP), Duncan Clark, GBRf (DC), Seb Gordon, RDG (SG).

Next meeting: Wednesday 1st August