

Notes and Actions from 21 November 2018 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Chair's remarks</p> <p>Alternates: Jake Kelly (EMT, for Tim Shoveller – departing early).</p> <p>NR RMDs: John Halsall (SE), Rob McIntosh (LNE, Paul McMahon (FNPO).</p> <p>Guests: Robin Gisby (LNER)</p> <p>Apologies: Pete Wilkinson (DfT), Richard Clarke (DB), Lindsay Durham (Freightliner), Joel Mitchell (Trenitalia), Rick Davey (Keolis).</p>		
	<p>PDG: MH reported that the new Rail Minister was highly engaged and keen to establish was needed from Government.</p>		
1811_01	<p>RDG Board: GC reported that RDG Board on 6 November had endorsed the proposal for a Part B to each Board meeting to focus on performance, receiving assurance reports from NTF and tackling system blockers to performance improvement. Senior ORR and DfT representatives would attend. The Board had remitted GC to bring a paper to the December meeting setting out the detail of how this would work. GC added that RDG Board also reiterated the need for NTF to be more assertive in addressing the decline in performance.</p> <p>MH noted that not all TOC performance managers were aware of their individual Steer review reports, which had been sent to TOC MDs, and reminded members of the need to ensure that NTF material was cascaded effectively, and to ask for support if necessary.</p> <p>Paper to RDG Board detailing the Part B meeting arrangements to be included in the 19 December NTF meeting pack.</p>	GC	19 Dec NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1811_02	<p>P8 Performance Report</p> <p>DM reported that overall PPM in period 82.8%, 2.6 % points behind plan. Northern, SWR and Scotrail were the biggest contributors to the overall plan shortfall, with SWR and Scotrail being significantly affected by NR performance. In contrast to recent periods, a significant number of operators had beaten plan in the period, with GTR and Southeastern both more than 3.5 % points ahead.</p> <p>Performance Report: Clarify the RAG status thresholds on the period performance summary slide.</p> <p>Autumn leaf-fall had reached 80%, well ahead of the same date in the last two years, but delay minutes were no higher. Wrong side track circuit failure (WSTCF) numbers were high, partly attributable to better information generated by intelligent infrastructure. Lightweight Class 14x and 15x fleets were the most likely to be involved in station over-runs and WSTFCs.</p> <p>MH said that while retro-fitment of WSP on older fleets was proving effective, WSP on the Class 158 fleet was not performing well. JK added that WSP on the retro-fitted units was performing better than expected, but EMT were experiencing more wheel-flats than usual on the units still awaiting fitment, resulting in units out of service and short formation services. RW noted that he and FW were meeting to review the case for WSP fitment on Northern.</p>	DM	19 December NTF
1811_03	<p>Fleet Challenge Steering Group (FCSG_) to review the occurrence of wheel-flats this Autumn and consider whether there are any further fleet mitigations that can be undertaken.</p>	NB	13 February NTF
1811_04	<p>Adhesion Working Group (AWG) to assess the reasons for the more significant wheel-flat impact this Autumn and identify any mitigating actions.</p> <p>DM presented information from the BTP Fusion unit on the performance impact of suicide and trespass over the last 18 months, showing incident numbers and hotspots for performance. He also showed the overall impact of train crew and rolling stock caused reactionary delay, accounting for 2.6% points of PPM failure. TS pointed out the opportunity presented by the level of investment in new rolling stock, creating a bigger supply of units that could be maintained on ‘hot stand-by’ – subject to funding. SW</p>	JE	13 February NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1811_05	<p>said that it was also important that procurement of new fleets included sufficient spare capacity to ensure resilience.</p> <p>In response to the request for reporting of right time starts from origin at the previous meeting, DM showed the current real-time reporting screen in use at NR and said that this would be added to the standard data feed received by the rest of the industry. GC said this was helpful, but noted that the action was to provide a baseline measure by service group against which progress in driving improvement could be tracked.</p> <p>Provide a summary of right time starts from origin by service group in period 8 to form a baseline for tracking progress.</p>	DM	With notes
	<p>Better Operations Programme Board (BOPB) - Update</p> <p>DJ summarised the focus areas in the Better Operations Programme. On Crew and Stock, RDG has published Concept of Operations (ConOps) and Common System Capability documents, and has hosted a supplier showcase event. TS raised concern it was not well understood that Crew and Stock systems may not be able to do what the industry wants them to. While the supply chain has developed some Crew and Stock informational capability, the systems are not yet able to replan services, or to connect with Traffic Management (TM). TM systems were not yet delivering, while Crew and Stock system development had become detached from TM and was also at risk of not delivering.</p> <p>TS questioned whether it was appropriate for suppliers to continue innovating separately or whether there should be a coordinated specification. JH noted that the industry did not have a good record when producing a single specification. DH asked whether there was an assessment of the extent of compliance of emerging systems with the requirements in the ConOps. DJ said that some suppliers were reporting 60% compliance with plans to increase this to 80%.</p> <p>On CP6 metrics, DJ said that BOPB were looking the impact of the new metrics on clauses in the Railway Operational Code (ROC). TS added that while much work had been done on developing the metrics, the impact on train regulation had been underestimated. Citing the example of Anglia Route</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1811_06	<p>with several operators all having different key performance metrics, he stressed the importance of providing clear guidance to front-line staff.</p> <p>Justin Willett (JW) from RSSB presented an overview of the PERFORM research programme, highlighting T1135 on decision-making during disruption and T1154 on spreading best practice and tools for recovery plans.</p> <p>JW noted that the Emergency Special Working (ESW) process was now in the Rule Book to go live from 1 December, following extensive testing on SWR where it had been shown to reduce the time taken to restart services from two hours to 20 minutes. ST stressed that adopting ESW was an industry big win for performance and it was essential that it was applied.</p> <p>MH asked whether NR Routes and operators were all ready to adopt the new procedures, having trained all drivers and signallers and ensured the necessary resources were in place.</p> <p>NR to prepare a summary of industry readiness for implementation of ESW, considering training of Route and Operator people, and availability of equipment, to state readiness for 1 December or indicate alternative date.</p> <p>It was noted that a number of operational changes to enable performance improvement had been made but not always fully implemented (e.g GSM/R caution acknowledge), and that it was important to track the take-up of these enablers.</p>	AT/TS	19 December NTF
1811_07	List the operational enablers completed by industry and establish a process for testing readiness and monitoring the application of and/or compliance with the new processes.	TS/DJ	Next BOPB
	<p>Suicide Prevention Programme</p> <p>Ian Stevens (IS) reflected that there were still too many fatalities on the rail network. Good progress has been made by putting boots on the ground in key locations, but this absorbs a lot of resource. The challenge remains to make the railway less attractive as a place to end life.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1811_08	<p>IS stressed that it is an industry programme, not an NR one, and appealed for more TOC member support in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applying the 9-point plan; • providing committed representatives for the Duty Holders Group; and • subscribing to industry campaigns. <p>JH noted the huge increase in proactive interventions and suggested it might be better to ask members what actions they are taking, rather than trying to track application of the 9-point plan. JK pointed out the importance of Local Authority engagement in tackling the problems, and the challenge presented by their lack of available funds. SW highlighted two relevant events in December and suggested that members review their attendance.</p> <p>IS to follow-up with individual calls to members to encourage input to the programme and review attendance at the December events.</p>	IS	30 November
	<p>Trespass Improvement Programme (TIP)</p> <p>Steve Longden (SL) outlined the work of the TIP in developing in guidance and tools to be used in tackling local trespass issues and in leading the national public awareness “You vs Train” campaign. Some progress had been made in reducing incidents, but the level of disruption to performance remained too high. The You vs Train campaign is having an impact, with a large number of people having seen it, good quality media coverage, and evidence that it was having an impact on public understanding.</p> <p>SL noted that significant reduction in trespass had been achieved at targeted hotspots. The TIP programme has funding and resources for CP6 and the programme includes continuation of the You vs Train campaign, partnerships with football clubs and other groups, the LearnLive Schools programme to educate more children, and improved coordination of educational visits. SL asked for greater TOC support for the programme, including full engagement at local Route Crime meetings.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1811_09	<p>MH noted the focus on reducing incidents, and asked what was being done to address the management of, and recovery from, the incidents when they did occur. SL noted Operation Peel, a joint NR/BTP initiative looking at incident recovery. GC suggested that the programme had lost sight of the purpose of delivering better performance. MH agreed that a stronger focus on reducing delays due to trespass was required and asked that BOPB consider what more needs to be done on managing incidents.</p> <p>BOPB to consider the workstreams around trespass reduction and managing disruption and consider the alignment of activity and how any gaps could be addressed.</p> <p>Performance Impact of Timetable Change</p> <p>CR set out OPSG's view of the likely performance impact of the December 2018 timetable change, stressing that the changes will not solve all the issues with the May timetable. He said that work assessing the performance impact of the May '19 timetable was underway and would be reported at future meetings.</p> <p>Key areas of change include GTR, where the planned increase in off-peak services is expected to have an adverse impact on PPM. MH queried the potential size of this impact. SW responded that it was estimated to be around 1% point off PPM, but stressed that it would be very hard to identify the incremental impact due to the level of day to day variability in the base. New service recovery plans were being put in place to mitigate the impact.</p> <p>CR said that TPE performance should improve as a result of some specific changes to service operation that the TOC has proposed. He noted that the issues experienced in May with Leeds station working had been improved but not completely resolved and some risks remain. GC questioned whether there was a significant risk of very poor performance around Leeds in December. RW responded that the plan for Leeds was much improved and that the details were still being worked on to mitigate risks, as, in contrast to the May change, there was still time to do this.</p>	TS/DJ	Next BOPB

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>December 2018 Timetable Readiness</p> <p>PMcM summarised the readiness assessment for the imminent December timetable change, including the output of a more detailed assessment of operational readiness of Routes and TOCs requested at the last NTF meeting. The only ‘red’ risk related to the availability of Class 442 stock on SWR.</p> <p>PMcM said that the Timetable Readiness PMO continued to track readiness for May ’19 and had started to review December ’19 with the aim of addressing issues and making recommendations much earlier in the process than had been possible previously. Some major challenges were already apparent.</p> <p>AH warned against complacency for December as there is still a lot of work to do to be ready, e.g. Waterloo International platforms, SDA electrification.</p>		
	<p>Performance Strategies</p> <p>AH introduced this section of the meeting, covering the Donovan Review and Performance Management System proposals, noting that a number of consistent themes had emerged from recent independent performance reviews of operators with services amounting to a third of the network. He said that a strategic approach to performance management was needed, as current tactical approaches were clearly not working.</p> <p>Common learning from Performance Reviews</p> <p>Nick Donovan (ND) presented the key themes and recommendations from his ‘review of reviews’. He set out the scope of the review in the context of a performance crisis, with the industry failing to meet its performance improvement plan trajectory for the ninth consecutive year. He presented an overview of PPM attrition over those years, highlighting that ‘good days’ have been getting worse with increased specification / plan delay and a big increase in reactionary delay, outweighing a reduction in primary delay.</p> <p>ND set out a simple model of performance as a system, noting a theme of changes being made without consideration of the wide system impacts. He challenged the exclusive focus on lagging indicators of performance, and the nature of delay attribution in identifying a single source of blame, when the</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>overall outcomes are influenced by other parties in the system. ND also highlighted the distinction between execution losses (gap between plan and actual) and planned losses (gap between plan and capability).</p> <p>He concluded that the industry has failed to focus on a common vision for performance management and set out three key recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a collective focus on a system approach within refreshed performance strategies; • refreshed industry leadership of a common performance improvement agenda; and • a programme of ‘go-look-see’ for senior leaders to visit the front-line with a focus on tackling the blockers to delivery. <p>Performance Management System</p> <p>MG outlined NR’s proposal for a Performance Management System, to address the issues from the Steer and Donovan reviews. The proposal reflects key principles that performance is an outcome and that performance is a system. He described the component frameworks and the plan to establish a dedicated team by the end of January to develop the detail with Phase 1 completed by the end of March.</p> <p>AH said that the proposal was consistent with further devolution to NR Routes, but that it was essential to have a clear framework and assurance process around performance.</p> <p>MH noted that there were detailed assurance processes for the safety management system and other parts of the industry, but no equivalent for performance and supported the direction of the proposal. AP emphasised the importance of the line of sight from strategy to front-line in engaging people, and said the objective was to reach a state where everyone cared about performance. RG agreed the need for consistency in the management of performance.</p> <p>DH suggested that the proposed approach sounded like ‘more of the same’ and urged against developing a complex process, suggesting that the PPRP was too complicated to be used. AH replied that a fundamental difference was the focus on leading, rather than lagging, indicators. RW noted that</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	the Planning & Performance Forum had done some work on leading indicators and was a forum that could support development of the new framework.		
1811_10	<p>NTF Biennial Review</p> <p>DB summarised the key points in the paper, noting that this aligned with the further development of the performance management system framework and a stronger focus on application of agreed industry good practice, and that the paper covered the rationale for ‘decoupling’ some activities from NTF. DB highlighted the importance of behaviours at NTF and invited comments on the proposed NTF membership for 2019 and the current NTF Charter.</p> <p>Members to provide any comments on the existing NTF Charter to DJ. Updated version of the Charter to be circulated for endorsement and signature at the 19 December meeting.</p>	All/DJ	19 December NTF
	<p>Impact of changes in train operation on performance</p> <p>This paper was deferred to the next meeting.</p> <p>PfN: Ill Passengers on Trains</p> <p>MH encouraged all members to ensure that TOC policies were updated in line with the RDG guidance note as the performance benefits were significant.</p>		
1811_11	<p>AOB</p> <p>It was agreed that, in view of the scale of the current performance challenge, a meeting should be held in December rather than papers in correspondence.</p> <p>DJ to arrange meeting on 19 December and develop draft agenda, to include deferred paper.</p>	DJ	28 November

Next meeting: Wednesday 19th December