

**NOTES / ACTIONS from 6<sup>th</sup> July 2016 NTF meeting**

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>CB opening remarks</b></p> <p>CB welcomed Steven Hughes (Area Director, NR LNE Route) attending on behalf of Rob McIntosh, RMD, and noted apologies from Phil Bearpark.</p> <p>RDG – CB noted key points from the RDG meeting in June:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NTF quarterly report – RDG members noted the messages around the importance of managing major industry change and the need to learn lessons, and supported the need for more challenge from all parties in the Route performance strategy review process. RDG members also expressed their anxiety about current performance trends and were advised, as previously, that delivery is through Routes and TOCs and this is where attention is and should be focussed;</li> <li>• There was positive feedback on the Customer Journey approach and the MyTrainJourney website.</li> </ul> <p>Action tracking – DB noted that most actions were on track, the two areas of concern being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the DfT-led work on the Performance impact of the Hendy review was originally planned for March and had now been deferred again to the September meeting; and</li> <li>• the action on DJ/DB to ensure improvements in the workstream reporting will be picked up within the biennial review process.</li> </ul> <p>CB noted that this was Neal Lawson’s last NTF meeting and thanked him for his commitment to NTF over a number of years and his contribution to the good progress made under the ‘better assets’ theme.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> A new sponsor will be required for the Better Assets theme. This will be progressed through the biennial review.</p>		
	<p><b>Paper A – Performance Report</b></p> <p>PH and JT outlined the key trends in the period performance pack. Asset reliability – infrastructure and fleet - continues to improve but there is plenty more room for improvement and in particular</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1607_01	<p>around reducing the effects of failure (reactionary delay). The last period had been a difficult one, with severe weather causing widespread flooding and train crew issues affecting GTR. Even if the impact of these events is excluded then the overall trend is not favourable – only three operators were ahead of the period plan when the storms hit. The weather and train crew issues had a particular impact on the number of cancellations rather than delays to services. However, there were some encouraging signs of improvement in the right-time measure.</p> <p>Members discussed why there was a dip in performance and what else could be done to tackle it. A number of issues were raised including whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the planning process is good enough given that so many operators were already behind plan this early in the year;</li> <li>• the focus of performance strategies was too much on asset interventions and not enough on operational issues and incident management;</li> <li>• a skills gap was part of the problem; and</li> <li>• there was too much focus on treating symptoms rather than getting at root causes – citing the approach to TSRs as an example.</li> </ul> <p>PH said that NR do not do enough preventative maintenance, partly associated with not having enough engineering access, and that there is a need for more intelligent asset measurement to inform ‘predict and prevent’ maintenance regimes. CB noted the importance of the established Industry Access Planning programme which is intended to help NR address this, and PH noted the importance of embedding the work already done.</p> <p>CB asked how to create a greater sense of urgency in meeting the challenge. It was agreed that each theme sponsor would identify the one challenge that would make the biggest difference to performance if it could be unlocked. Responses would be shared by e-mail and would be consolidated for circulation by the end of August as part of the biennial review report back.</p>	NL, TN, PH	31 Aug

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1607_02	<p><b>Paper B – GTR report</b></p> <p>DC summarised the paper on the independent review of GTR, noting the main themes and summarising the GTR response to the 14 review recommendations, of which 8 were accepted. A number of these are already being addressed in the GTR/NR recovery plans, although many come to fruition with the 2018 timetable. The three recommendations in the paper were agreed by members.</p> <p>Members queried how the risks of the introduction of the 2018 Thameslink timetable were being managed – with particular emphasis on the phased build up of the quantum/frequency of services to 24tph, given the national importance of this and recognising the sensitivity around contracts and business cases. DC responded that this should be addressed through the normal industry timetable processes.</p> <p>Post meeting note: GC to seek discussion with DC, PW, John Halsall to see if what options for industry assurance / visibility are open that are acceptable to all.</p>	GC	By 28 September NTF meeting
	<p><b>Paper C – Adhesion Working group report and Paper D - Autumn step change</b></p> <p>These papers were discussed together. Paper D highlighted research showing that the cost to the wider UK economy of the dip in performance during Autumn was of the order of £250m. In response to the challenge from Claire Perry on how a step change improvement in autumn performance could be achieved if funds were available, it was concluded that the only identified initiative for which additional funding was required was an enhanced vegetation management programme that led to ongoing enhanced maintenance of the lineside environment.</p> <p>MH reported that representatives of the Adhesion Working Group had attended a number of Route seasonal preparation meetings to identify progress against the industry recommendations for autumn preparations. The main risk area emerging from the reviews so far was that some Routes did not have funded plans to address vegetation clearance at key sites. An initial assessment indicated that there was a good economic and railway business case for these vegetation management works, although it was noted that this did not mean that it was the best overall use of scarce funds.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1607_03	<p>PH was asked to explain NR's overall approach to vegetation management for this autumn in the light of this analysis and opportunity.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> This should clarify NR's position regarding its previous commitment to implementing the 2013 Curley Report recommendations, what direction is being given to Routes, whether plans for targeted vegetation management of super sites are constrained by funding and whether any mitigation is planned. This should be addressed in email correspondence by 31<sup>st</sup> Aug, with a verbal update at the 3<sup>rd</sup> August NTF meeting.</p>	PH	3 August NTF
1607_04	<p>NL noted that recent Autumn periods had seen severe storms and suggested that the seasonal reviews for autumn and winter needed to address this as well, as preparation to manage the impact of leaf-fall. Adhesion Working Group to test this during the Autumn reviews.</p>	MH	28 September NTF
1607_05	<p>CB asked for visibility of the AWG Task Force report when completed with clarity on the amber and red items - if risks remained, in advance of the season.</p>	MH	28 September NTF
1607_06	<p><b>Paper E – TSRs</b></p> <p>PH confirmed that John Halsall, who has moved from RMD Wessex to RMD South East, remained accountable for the TSR action plan. NL summarised progress, noting that John Halsall would present the TSR action plan in detail at the 3<sup>rd</sup> August meeting. In response to previous questions NL stated that the impact on performance was not considered when the standard of cyclic top was changed – this was a gap in NR's standards change process that would be changed by December.</p> <p>Members asked that the August paper addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NR's approach to long standing TSRs (beyond 6 months) including specific actions plans and why they were not converted to PSRs;</li> <li>• an update on TOC engagement in reviewing TSR removal plans; and</li> <li>• NR's approach to planned TSRs and how they are accommodated in the timetable (review of engineering allowances approach)</li> <li>• how the steps taken to predict and improve cyclic top TSRs, as well as other actions, impact on the overall TSR forecast for the next year.</li> </ul>	JH	3 August NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p><b>1607_07</b></p>	<p><b>Paper G – Performance metrics</b></p> <p>SD outlined the proposal for the Metro metric, noting that the working group had not found any way of separating metro service measurement – so the measure would be an overlay for selected metro-style flows - with all services on the network being counted in the right-time measure. While this raised a question about how useful the measure was and how widely it could be applied, it was considered appropriate to have it available to use in appropriate circumstances (e.g. when Crossrail services launched). SD was asked to set out the criteria for when it would be appropriate for the metro metric to be used (turn up and go services) so that this could be shared and discussed with service specifiers / clients.</p> <p>SD also noted the decision that the right-time measure should be applied to the timetable at 22:00 the night before. Transport Focus had accepted this provided further information to record the extent of late changes to the timetable before 22:00 was provided.</p>	<p><b>SD</b></p>	<p><b>3 August NTF</b></p>
<p><b>1607_08</b></p>	<p>Members endorsed the proposal for the Performance Measurement Steering Group and asked SD to identify suitable industry representatives and highlight if help was needed.</p> <p>SD to develop change process and programme for introducing the performance metrics, to include key stage gates where “go/no-go” decisions needed to be made, informed by discussion with RD to identify useful learning from Keolis’ experience of similar changes.</p>	<p><b>SD</b></p>	<p><b>3 August NTF</b></p>
<p><b>1607_09</b></p>	<p><b>Paper H – Comms plan for performance metrics</b></p> <p>SG summarised the comms plan for the roll-out of the new performance metrics. The paper included a mock-up of how information would be presented and invited comments.</p> <p>It was agreed that the caveats on the completeness of the right-time data should be stated clearly. Members asked SG (with industry comms colleagues) to consider likely external reactions when the right-time data was published and to prepare appropriate lines to take.</p> <p>Members agreed that a consistent approach to the presentation of ‘external’ causes in cancellations was important – either both NR/TOC external causes shown or neither should be split out.</p>	<p><b>SG</b></p>	<p><b>3 August NTF</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1607_10	<p>TS asked SG to consider whether a phased roll-out of the metrics, by TOC, was feasible and whether this approach would have advantages.</p> <p>Post meeting note: It is feasible, but had not been planned in this way. The data is already available to all. If NTF wishes to have a phased approach a decision needs to be made quickly and the MyTrainJourney Project Manager and SG advised urgently.</p>	To be picked up when notes shared	15 July
	<p><b>Paper I – Performance messaging</b></p> <p>SG asked whether members found the performance messaging useful and whether they used it. PW said that it was - but that it needed to be clear on the performance trajectory – plans, actuals and what happened to cause a gap.</p> <p>He felt that the industry, through the narrative, should tell a more positive story, getting on the front foot with the message that there was a lot of change with new infrastructure, new trains and changes to working practices that, while inevitably causing a short-term dip in performance, would deliver major benefits in future. It should also describe the size of the passenger rail business in GB.</p> <p>SG to revise paper for future.</p>	SG	3 August NTF
	<p><b>Paper J - Process for NTF engagement in PR 18</b></p> <p>DJ explained that the proposed response to ORR’s initial PR18 consultation would go to the August NTF and RDG meetings for endorsement. The ORR Working Paper on outputs had been delayed and responses were now due by mid-September. DJ had agreed with ORR that a draft paper would be submitted, subject to revision following review at the NTF and RDG meetings in late September.</p> <p>Members were asked to nominate representatives for the outputs working group, with the aim for one TOC representative from each main market sector.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> nominations have been received to complete the working group and they are Nick Gibbons (DB Schenker), Darren Horley (Virgin West Coast), Richard Dean (Go Ahead), Stuart Cheshire (Go Ahead) and Peter Lensink (Abellio).</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>Paper K – ORR Monitor</b></p> <p>GR summarised the main issues in the ORR monitor which had just been published.</p> <p>TS expressed concern about the deferral of signalling renewal projects from CP5 to the same year in CP6, and whether this was deliverable in the supply chain. GR agreed the importance of assessing deliverability more robustly in PR18 than in previous reviews.</p>		

Other attendees: Claire Volding, Muriel Tsikirayi, Brian Haddock for Paper C. Neil Ovenden for Paper D.