

**NOTES / ACTIONS from 11 May 2016 NTF meeting**

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16 1105/01	<p><b>CB opening remarks</b></p> <p>CB welcomed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Halsall NR RMD</li> <li>• Oliver Bratton for Jeremy Long (MTR)</li> <li>• Richard Dean for Dyan Crowther (GTR)</li> <li>• Dan Boyde, NTF Programme Manager</li> </ul> <p>CB invited GC to comment on recent concerns being expressed by TOC members on TOC-on-self delay trends. GC said that, although the ATOC paper to the March NTF and recent TOC invites to NTF had majored on TOC self-delay and had showed differing causes for differing TOCs, some members had, on a TOC telephone conference, asked for a deeper investigation into traincrew caused delay to get beyond immediate causes. An initial paper will be brought to the June NTF. In discussion NTF members asked that the Rail Directors HR Group provide input as to whether any IR issues are impacting performance.</p>	GC	8 June NTF
16 1105/02	<p><b>Paper B - TSR monthly national &amp; route report</b></p> <p>JH summarised the paper, explaining that he was now accountable for tackling TSRs across NR. The key cause of the overall rise is unplanned TSRs related to cyclic top, after derailments led to a change in the standard, he stressed that had the standard not changed and been complied to, further derailments would have happened. The underlying challenge (noting that there is industry comment that visible inspection must give warning, of pre-conditions) is that NR does not yet have a means of predicting sites at risk of cyclic top and this is now the key focus.</p> <p>Members questioned whether NR had a process for evaluating the impact of standards changes, prior to implementation, which took proper account of impacts on passengers. JH said he was not aware of such a process but would check and confirm or take action.</p>	JH	8 June NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>MH challenged the rationale that the railway is considered safe until the NMT runs and detects a fault and then has a TSR imposed immediately. JH reiterated that working out how to predict risk sites was key and that NR needed to develop proactive approach – so that NMT is used to confirm that track is safe, not to find faults.</p> <p>Members asked whether data captured by service trains, and information about deterioration in track from train drivers could be useful to support NR in early identification of TSR risk sites and/ or in the confirmation that corrective work had been successful without the need for the NMT to confirm. It was noted that work had been done with SWT drivers a few years ago. JH/AJ to consider how intelligence from train systems and drivers might support NR.</p> <p>MH noted that the plan showed some high impact TSRs remaining until 2017 and CB asked JH what more NTF members could do to help NR tackle TSR removal and whether TOCs were content with the proposed removal dates of the top 20 TSRs, noting that 35% had dates beyond 2016? JH asked that members encourage their operators to challenge NR in TSR reviews on TSR removal dates if they feel more could be done - and to continue to encourage them to be collaborative in providing access for necessary works – TOC members reconfirmed that they are always ready to discuss access.</p> <p>RD noted that Southeastern have already changed the timetable to accommodate the TSR at Orpington but have not received the Network Change. JH/RD to discuss outside NTF.</p>	<p><b>JH/AJ</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>JH/RD</b></p>	<p><b>8 June NTF</b></p> <p><b>Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>By 13 May</b></p>
<p><b>16 1105/03</b></p>	<p><b>Paper C – PIDD</b></p> <p>JW presented the paper and the recommendations in the paper for challenging supplier costs and for Customer Experience Board to be the single cross-industry body accountable for PIDD were endorsed with the caveat that NTF still needs to be engaged and sighted. JW to agree Terms of Reference for Customer Experience Board governance of PIDD with GC to ensure they meet NTF needs.</p>	<p><b>JW</b></p>	<p><b>8 June NTF</b></p>
<p><b>16 1105/04</b></p>	<p><b>Paper D – Operation London Bridge</b></p> <p>JG and CG presented an overview, highlighting areas for industry engagement. It was noted that the Olympic Delivery process was a suitable model for engagement, with principal, directly affected</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>operators involved and others represented by a cross section of operators.</p> <p>GC to identify Director to be lead contact for RDG/ATOC and advise John Gill and Christopher Garnett. Post meeting note, ATOC/RDG Executive have agreed to GC's proposal that the lead is Jacqueline Starr - Director Customer Experience.</p>	GC	Completed
16 1105/05	<p><b>Paper E – My Train Journey</b></p> <p>KD demonstrated the My Train Journey webpage (not an app) which will be ready by the end of May. There was some discussion on the default parameters and it was agreed that these should be right time, 15 mins and 60 mins to align with performance metrics work.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the specification of a 28 day delay in data provision was not appropriate and recommended that it should be removed. KD to seek Customer Experience Board endorsement of this change. <i>Post meeting note</i> – this has been agreed by Customer Experience Board.</p> <p>KD to confirm that a robust communications plan, developed with RDG communications, is in place for the public launch.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note:</i> Claire Perry has offered to be part of the launch.</p>	KD  KD	Completed  8 June NTF
16 1105/06	<p><b>Paper G – CP6 Performance input to IIA</b></p> <p>JT summarised progress, noting further work required to complete the Metro metrics and that there will a considerable amount of work to be done to implement the new metrics. DJ noted that a meeting with NR was being arranged to start to develop the implementation plan.</p> <p>JT to bring strawman implementation plan for performance metrics to NTF.</p>	JT	6 July NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16 1105/07	<p><b>Paper H – Route scorecards</b></p> <p>GR explained that ORR proposed to use Route scorecards in the regulatory process as a piece of evidence in their assessment of whether NR had done all that could be reasonably required of it to meet customers’ reasonable requirements. The scorecards would not replace regulatory targets and would be used as an indicator, not for a pass/fail test. After some discussion, GR summarised the key points of members’ feedback as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a strong emphasis on scorecards encouraging collaborative behaviour between NR and operators - and that regulation should not undermine this;</li> <li>• the need to keep it simple; and</li> <li>• the need for clarity on the relationship between scorecards, performance strategies and regulated outputs.</li> </ul> <p>GR agreed to share proposed text on this discussion for the ORR Board paper with GC for comment.</p> <p>It was noted that NTF is leading for RDG on the evolution of the development and use of the route scorecards. PH will meet with CB and GC and bring a paper on the proposed process to NTF. This will include consideration of how national operators are included.</p>	<p><b>GR/GC</b></p> <p><b>PH</b></p>	<p><b>Completed</b></p> <p><b>3 Aug NTF</b></p>
16 1105/08	<p><b>Papers for Noting</b></p> <p>Paper J – Non-track assets: CB noted that positive performance trend was good news. GC commented that the focus on setting up back-drives on points was not a new issue – and has been advised to NTF at least 3 times – so is there corporate memory?</p> <p>Paper K – WRCC update: GC reminded members that the industry agreed CP5 asset policy, set by NTF and agreed through IIP process is that, by the end of CP5, assets should be as reliable in “adverse” weather just as in normal weather and that NR had proposed and industry had agreed with industry definitions of normal, adverse and extreme weather. PB confirmed that the Weather Resilience Group recognised this.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	Paper L – Year end quick spend process: DJ to review the proposal in the paper for an NTF sub-group to assess schemes and prioritise for detailed evaluation. To liaise with Elizabeth de Jong at RDG and identify participants and terms of reference.	<b>DJ</b>	<b>6 July NTF</b>
	Paper M – Suicide prevention update: it was suggested that the positive impact of the increase in life-saving interventions should be communicated more widely and Ian Stevens should engage with Paul Prentice from RDG communications.	<b>PH (IS)</b>	<b>By end May</b>
	Paper O – Train location services: GC stated that the key gap in the paper was clarity on exactly what would be delivered and when. NR advised that this is to be addressed in a paper to NTF-OG for discussion on 27 May and the outcome will be reported to the June NTF. The NTF paper must identify whether any outputs are at risk and what choices there are in the next phase.	<b>RL</b>	<b>8 June NTF</b>
	Paper P – Performance Strategies: the process for the quarterly reviews is being considered by an NTF-OG task and finish group which will bring a proposal to NTF in August.	<b>JT</b>	<b>3 Aug NTF</b>

Non NTF member identification

John Halsall (JH), Andy Jones (AJ), Jason Webb (JW), John Gill (JG), Christopher Garnett (CG), Kathryn Daniels (KD), John Thompson (JT), Roberta Lowes (RL), Ian Stevens (IS).