

### Notes and Actions from 24 October 2018 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>Chair's remarks</b></p> <p>Alternates: Alex Foulds (for Steve White, GTR).</p> <p>NR RMDs: Meli Duymaz (Anglia), Mark Langman (Western).</p> <p>Guests: Neil Bamford (FCSG Chair), Neil Foster (FCSG).</p> <p>Apologies: Joel Mitchell (Trenitalia), Richard Clarke (DB), John Halsall (NR).</p> <p><b>PDG:</b> MH reported that the PDG meeting on 15 October had focused on Autumn preparation and timetable readiness. PW said that confidence in the industry was low and that it was important that the December change went smoothly as increasing risk aversion could inhibit the introduction of beneficial changes.</p> <p>TS noted that the PMO process provided greater assurance around the risk of a severe performance impact (i.e. extensive cancellations) but that there would inevitably be some impact on punctuality as the changes bedded in. It was important that this was managed effectively both in additional operational resourcing on the day and through communications. PW stressed the importance of effective communication with passengers at all times and, in particular, ensuring that local staff are empowered to assist passengers, particularly those with disabilities, in times of disruption.</p>		
<b>1810_01</b>	DJ to contact RDG accessibility team to find out what is already being done on improving information and support for disabled passengers.	<b>DJ</b>	<b>9 November</b>
<b>1810_02</b>	The Timetable Readiness PMO to provide an update on December 2018 timetable change readiness to the November NTF meeting, co-ordinating input from operators on readiness of diagrams/rosters and plans for deploying extra resources in the early days of the timetable.	<b>PMcM</b>	<b>21 Nov NTF</b>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>P7 Performance Report</b></p> <p>DM noted that PPM in P7 was 85.1%, 4.7 PPM points behind plan. Key factors driving the gap were storms and issues with ESRs and track quality on Wessex Route. Overall delay minutes to NR were 47% worse than plan in the period (TOC-on-self +17%) and 28% worse in the year to date (TOC-on-self +32%).</p> <p>Northern and TPE are still substantially behind plan as a result of the ongoing issues associated with the timetable change, and operators on the ECML continue to have substantial adverse variances. The severe weather delay category had the largest variance to plan in the period, while track and externals (notably trespass and fatalities) have the largest variances in the year to date.</p> <p>Adhesion related delays are currently lower than this time last year while overall leaf-fall is slightly ahead, though this varies considerably with much higher high leaf-fall in Scotland and the North compared to the South.</p> <p>The latest forecasts of end-CP5 national performance ranged from 82.8% to 86.2%, with the most likely outcome being 84.5 – 85%. This compared to an 86.6% out-turn assumed in the SBP for CP6.</p> <p>RW noted that TPE timetable changes being made in December should directly improve TPE's PPM and benefit Northern as the transfer of delay across the Pennines should be significantly reduced. He added that the earlier start of railhead treatment circuits had made a real difference with a big reduction in the amount of wheelset damage experienced.</p> <p>TS said there was a critical need to get everyone in the industry focused on delivering 'on time everywhere' and members needed to provide visible and vocal leadership. He added that RDG Board had asked NTF to develop a 'campaign' approach to performance in the next financial year. Winning hearts and minds was critical to improving performance. AP agreed that there was a need to restore consistent delivery of the basics and stressed the importance of right time starts. MH said it was not clear why performance in some areas was doing well while in others it had collapsed. PB said the issues varied around the network and that he felt his teams were performing the basics well and could deliver very good performance, but that there was a problem with service recovery. OB said that leadership needed to find ways to make it easier for the front-line and not to impose burdens on them.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<b>1810_03</b>	<p>MH questioned whether a national campaign was appropriate or whether it was better for individual businesses to respond. AT said the focus should be local as the challenges were not the same everywhere. MG reiterated the conclusions from the Steer Review of Performance Strategies and the need to develop a structured plan to respond. He said it was important to focus on the overall performance management system and putting this at the heart of all businesses.</p> <p>NR to bring a paper responding to the Steer Review with proposals for effective performance strategies as part of a broader performance management system.</p> <p>TS felt that some national coordination and preparation of messages was necessary for a campaign to succeed, rather than just exhorting people to work harder, and suggested preparing for a launch in the New Year, rather than immediately. MH suggested that the approach could be for central preparation of key messages to be briefed out through individual organisations. ML noted it was important to tell people what they could stop doing in order to focus on performance delivery.</p>	<b>AH</b>	<b>21 November NTF</b>
<b>1810_04</b>	<p>It was agreed that right time starts from origin was an important theme that should be the first focus of the campaign. NPAT to produce a report for regular tracking at NTF of right time starts by service group from origin for the current and future periods from the next meeting.</p>	<b>DM</b>	<b>21 November NTF</b>
<b>1810_05</b>	<p>NTF Secretariat to develop a plan for the performance ‘back to basics’ campaign to commence in 2019.</p>	<b>DJ/DB</b>	<b>21 November NTF</b>
<b>1810_06</b>	<p>It was agreed that, ahead of the campaign plan, all members should be providing visible and vocal leadership for their organisations to focus on consistent delivery of operational basics to drive better performance. There is no time to wait for the campaign.</p>	<b>All</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>1810_07</b>	<p>PW, supported by TS, is to write a letter to all TOC and Route MDs asking them how to explain how they are addressing the challenge to deliver the operational basics to improve performance delivery.</p>	<b>PW/TS</b>	<b>16 November</b>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1810_08	<p>MD noted that TfL Rail had a different approach to delivery and were achieving relatively good performance. It was noted that NT had previously received a paper on this topic and agreed that an update to share good practices would be useful at this time.</p> <p>Bring an updated paper on the learning from what TfL Rail do differently, including experience of operating on Western as well as Anglia.</p>	OB/DM	13 March NTF
1810_09	Steer Review: Ask Steer to identify good practices within the performance strategies.	DJ	21 November
1810_10	Steer Review: Contact all Routes/TOCs to ask them to provide their individual reports to be made available through the RDG members area.	DJ	2 November
	<p><b>CP6 Performance – PR18</b></p> <p>GR summarised the performance aspects of ORR’s Final Determination for PR18 that is due to be published by the end of October. He confirmed that there would be a Performance Innovation Fund that would be aimed at removing blockers and enabling people to do things differently. The governance detail was still being worked out but there would probably be a role for NTF.</p> <p>GR went on to describe the ‘three pillars’ of ORR’s approach to performance: agreement and delivery of Scorecards, delivery of CRM-P trajectories, and effective management of reactionary delay – which he proposed should be reviewed quarterly at NTF. He outlined scenarios under which ORR would consider intervention, a key point being that not meeting the performance target on the scorecard would not trigger automatically intervention without other factors. MD asked what would happen in the event of Route and TOC not agreeing the scorecard performance figures. GR replied that it was not ORR’s role to arbitrate. FW added that the DfT intended to get involved in the scorecard dialogue at an earlier stage. GR concluded that ORR would also focus on Route comparisons, producing league tables for CRM-P, to strengthen the reputational incentive for performance improvement.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1810_11	<p><b>Autumn / Winter briefing for MPs</b></p> <p>AT noted that the Autumn/Winter preparations briefing for MPs had been postponed from 30 October – revised dates were being considered. The draft briefing paper that had been circulated needed further work and input from Public Affairs to present the technical issues in plain English. He invited comments on the paper by the end of the week.</p> <p>TS said the paper needed more detail on vegetation management to help people understand why it is essential for performance and suggested including pictures to demonstrate that the current level of lineside vegetation is far more extensive than it used to be. TS also offered to support the meeting, with MH, AT and John Edgley.</p>	All	26 October
	<p>Provide comments to John Edgley on the draft paper on Autumn and Winter preparations.</p>		
	<p><b>Infrastructure asset reliability</b></p> <p>JS summarised infrastructure asset reliability trends, noting the adverse impact of the very hot summer on asset reliability with an increase in the level of TSRs, due to embankment shrinkage, and in the failure rates of some signalling and points assets. He noted that the improved management of rail was reflected in a much lower level of track buckles than experienced in previous very hot summers but concluded that asset resilience was well short of where it needed to be. He noted the success of the LED light engine redesign as an example of how the rigorous focus on design for reliability and associated product acceptance would ensure that new assets were more resilient. He also noted progress with trials of enhanced condition monitoring systems, reiterating that the focus on improved analytics through the intelligent infrastructure programme (supporting ‘predict and prevent’) was the key to driving a step change in asset reliability. A review of rail stressing was underway, considering whether the regime needed to be adapted for higher temperatures in future.</p> <p>JS reported that the overall number of TSRs had risen by 20%, largely as a result of clay embankment shrinkage and restrictions on carrying out maintenance activities such as tamping when rail temperatures were very high. The new decision support tool was helping Routes to prioritise work. Wessex had suffered from TSRs in high impact locations as well as the impact of reduced tamping. The need to</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>undertake more planned tamping in Spring and Autumn rather than Summer in the future was being assessed, but would have resource implications.</p> <p>GC questioned whether Routes were delivering the actions in their published Weather Resilience and Climate Change Adaptation (WR&amp;CCA) plans for CP5. JS said that drainage and RCM works were being done but that the CP5 plans had not considered revising the seasonal timing of tamping, which would be a significant change to current practice. GC commented that this was a surprise given discussions after the last Curley review. JS added that the WR&amp;CCA plans for CP6 were currently being updated as part of Route CP6 Delivery plans. MH noted that an increase in the planned volume of tamping in Spring could generate additional access requirements and it was important that these were identified and consulted with operators as early as possible.</p>		
1810_12	<p><b>New Train Introduction</b></p> <p>JS outlined the cross-industry forums addressing the challenge of introducing new trains at high levels of reliability, noting that a fuller discussion of the activity and learning would be shared at the next NTF Better Assets focus slot in February. The Chief Engineer's Vehicle Introduction Forum brought together NR, TOCs and manufacturers to share learning on specification and procurement, and the testing of new vehicles.</p> <p>NB asked for TOC Owning Group support in sharing learning between operators, noting the need for better TOC attendance at the New Trains Reliability working group. He highlighted the RDG's New Trains Colloquium taking place on 26 October. NB noted the key challenge around software integration and that he was seeking Engineering Council support for work in this area.</p> <p>NB went on to stress the importance of honesty around delivery dates for new trains as this also affected planned rolling stock cascades. MH observed that many of the assumptions about fleet cascades were too tight, with very little time planned between the arrival of a new train and the cascade of an existing one, and that it was important to flag these delivery risks. DH noted the need for ORR to be involved earlier in the new trains acceptance process. GR agreed the need for timely ORR involvement.</p> <p>All operator members to ensure that an accurate assessment of new train / cascade delivery dates is provided to FCSG to support the production of a consolidated cascade programme.</p>	All	Ongoing

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	AP drew attention to the limited capacity and poor quality output from the fleet refurbishment market as a challenge for the industry. There is an industry meeting on 31 October to address this.		
1810_13	<p><b>Fleet Challenge</b></p> <p>NB summarised fleet reliability trends, noting the impact of the very hot summer, as well as the continued performance impact of reduced availability due to rolling stock damage sustained during the ‘Beast from the East’. As well as trains out of service or under-powered, this reduced the maintenance ‘touch time’ for other units leading to work being deferred. He noted that taking some short-term pain by taking stock out of service to address defects (as LNER have done) might be better for longer-term performance.</p> <p>NB said there was a huge challenge dealing with the overall volume of fleet change in the industry and highlighted the need for engineering teams to engage with business change programmes, being active sponsors rather than recipients. The alignment of rolling stock and depot changes was a key part of the challenge.</p> <p>NB noted good progress with the retro-fitment of WSP on Class 15x fleets, with some equipment about to be activated and momentum building for fitment by other operators, although Northern were unable to make a business case.</p> <p>AH thanked NB for highlighting the challenges faced and said that these needed a collective response. MH commented that this was another area where attention to basic rules and principles was required and that there was a need for fleet engineers to stand up to others in ensuring that necessary maintenance work was done. GC reminded NTF, with agreement from NB, that there are 3 basic rules the industry agreed as part of N-FRIP that should be restated as part of the back to basics industry campaign. AH asked whether there was a check list for the introduction of new trains and fleet cascades. GC replied that there was a lot of detailed material on good practices in the 20-point plan but that it would be valuable to produce an update of a high level summary for wider industry reference.</p> <p>Produce a simple summary of good practice on new fleet introduction and fleet cascades.</p>	GC/BD	13 Feb NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1810_14	<p>MH asked that the next Fleet Challenge update focused more on the operators having the largest overall adverse impact on fleet performance against plan.</p> <p>PW said that the overall level of performance of around 10,000 MTIn was unacceptable and harming performance. He asked that everyone be honest about what could be done and said that the DFT was willing to engage with operators if there was a need to review the speed of introduction of new trains to enable better overall performance. RW highlighted the critical deadline for Pacers needing to comply with PRM regulations. PW indicated that this could be also be reviewed.</p>	NB	13 Feb NTF
1810_15	<p>NB to contact MDs / OG reps where attendance at FCSG has been poor and to advise NTF who these were.</p> <p>DH questioned whether there was a wider industry business case for WSP fitment on Northern, allowing for other operators suffering from TOC-on-TOC delay. MG explained that cross industry work had been done to try and make the case but that the numbers had not stacked up.</p>	NB	9 November
1810_16	<p>Revisit the business case for WSP retro-fitment for Northern 15x fleet, considering whether any new evidence from successful operation to date strengthens the case.</p> <p>NB concluded by thanking Bryan Donnelly for his support for FCSG and NTF during his time at RDG.</p>	MG/FW/ RW	30 November
	<p><b>Review of reviews</b></p> <p>DJ explained that, following discussion at the previous meeting, Nick Donovan had been commissioned to carry out a review of recent performance reviews to identify common themes and learning. His report would be presented to the 21 November meeting.</p>		
	<p><b>NTF Biennial review</b></p> <p>DB summarised the key recommendations emerging from the NTF Biennial Review following the previous NTF discussion and further 1-1 meetings, noting in particular:</p>		



ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p><b>1810_17</b></p> <p><b>1810_18</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proposal for extending RDG Board meetings with a performance section (including ORR and DfT reps), receiving an assurance report from NTF and tackling the structural blockers;</li> <li>• NTF role in mandating and assuring delivery of Performance Strategies and other industry good practice;</li> <li>• a reduction in material coming to NTF with empowered sub-groups and theme-focused agendas; and</li> <li>• the need for additional funding for further independent Performance Strategy reviews and additional programme management resource.</li> </ul> <p>DJ provided further detail on proposed changes to NTF architecture and reporting lines. RW queried what would happen to the groups that were proposed to be “decoupled” from NTF, as activities such as weather resilience needed to continue.</p> <p>The final recommendations from the biennial review to include a disposition statement for all activities that will no longer report routinely to NTF, setting out the rationale for the change and clarifying the future governance and relationship with NTF.</p> <p>Paper to be prepared for RDG Board on 6 November with proposals for NTF engagement with RDG Board.</p>	<p><b>DB/DJ</b></p> <p><b>GC/AH</b></p>	<p><b>21 November NTF</b></p> <p><b>Done</b></p>
<p><b>1810_19</b></p>	<p><b>Timetable assurance</b></p> <p>CR explained that NR were responding to a DfT request for an assessment of the performance impact of the revised May 2019 timetable plans. PW had also written to TOC MDs asking them to support this exercise. CR noted that this would involve gathering previous analysis of changes some of which had originally been planned to have happened earlier, and in some cases, to a different specification. It would not be a precise model-driven exercise.</p> <p>Paper on assessment of performance impact of May 2019 timetable changes to be developed with OPSG and shared at the November NTF meeting.</p>	<p><b>CR/OB</b></p>	<p><b>21 November NTF</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>AH said that industry must not expect the timetable assurance PMO to do everything for them. He pointed out that no industry resources had been committed to the PMO following his request for support at an earlier NTF. OB disputed this, saying that resources had been offered but not taken up.</p> <p>AP reiterated the role of the PMO Steering Group in making recommendations, not decisions, and drew attention to the Steering Group's view that the prioritisation of HS2 at Euston in the May 2019 timetable exercise was inappropriate and inadequately justified.</p> <p>PW asked what was happening on longer-term timetable planning system development. CR said that there was a pilot scheme underway with Scotrail giving the TOC direct access to TPS. PW said that it was essential that a single planning system was used in future and indicated that DfT would require that future TOC bids included an assessment of the PPM impact and a demonstration that stock and crew plans to deliver the bid were in place.</p>		
1810_20	<p><b>Route Scorecards – paper for noting</b></p> <p>NR to set out the timeline for Route scorecards and the proposed engagement with NTF.</p> <p>AH questioned the use of the 'on time everywhere' metric given that it produced a much lower headline figure. GC pointed out that the development of the new suite of performance metrics for CP6 had been overseen by NTF with regular discussion of the issues over more than 18 months. A key point from previous discussions was that there remained a choice of what threshold was used when reporting externally (e.g. the on time measure could be reported as on time to 59 seconds, 3 minutes or 10 minutes). He added that the 'on time to 5 at all stations' gave a higher figure than PPM when last compared.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> RDG publishes the distribution of on time at all stations here: <a href="#">RDG performance page</a>.</p>	MG	19 December NTF (Corr)

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	TS noted that the Better Operations Programme Board (BOPB) were starting to look at the impact on train regulation of making 'on time at all stations' the key metric and would address this within a broader update on the CP6 metrics transition programme at the 7 December BOPB meeting.		

Next meeting: Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> November