

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>i) Members noted the delayed work to produce an ACOP on implementing timetable change and requested that it reference the tendency to overestimate the performance benefit and also the good practice from some of the positive timetable changes. Dominic to pass this feedback to Fiona Dolman and Chris Nutton.</p> <p>ii) Members requested assurance ahead of the December timetable change at the next NTF and it was suggested that a checklist of activity would be a good addition to the process. Dominic to raise with Fiona Dolman.</p>	<p>DM</p> <p>DM</p>	<p>Complete</p> <p>October NTF</p>
<p>15 3009/03</p>	<p>Managing Disruption – Paul Brogden</p> <p>NTF members supported the work and noted that Paul is developing a balanced scorecard of metrics to inform discussion. He added that trespass remains the biggest challenge but delay minute improvements are being seen on policing measures.</p> <p>Members focused on the spending review and proposed cuts of between 25 and 40% of the budget for the British Transport Police. Pete Wilkinson outlined his view that the BTP are essential for the smooth running of the railway and that his department are opposed to Treasury proposals.</p> <p>i) Gary Cooper advised that ATOC Board had discussed the concerns around BTP and BTPA and asked for a position statement and options for minimising the impact of cuts which is being led by Andy Odell for the RDG for the policing and Security Group (Chaired by Patrick Butcher), he is happy to share with the NTF.</p> <p>ii) Mark Hopwood asked for clarity of whether the night Tube will affect policing levels for the National Railway. Paul Brogden to respond.</p> <p>iii) Paul Brogden and Dominic Medway to discuss membership of the disruption board.</p>	<p>GC</p> <p>PB</p> <p>PB / DM</p>	<p>When Ready</p> <p>Before October NTF</p> <p>Before October NTF</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
15 3009/04	<p>Managing the Impact of Suicides – Ian Stevens</p> <p>Ian advised that the Duty Holders Group has now been set up and has just held its second meeting. Seamus Scallon of First Group has agreed to a request from Gary Cooper to Chair the group, providing a link to the System Safety Risk Group.</p> <p>Gary explained that he has had to deal with RSSB challenge into the Duty Holders Group and has had robust conversations with the Chief Executive, reminding him that they are there to serve the industry.</p> <p>Dyan Crowther observed that the language in the paper could do with being more positive and definite to drive the appropriate level of energy and engagement.</p> <p>Responding to a challenge on the effectiveness of our current mitigations Ian explained that we currently only have anecdotal evidence but Nottingham University has been engaged to provide a more robust understanding.</p> <p>i) Tim Shoveller explained that Jeremy Hunt, the Secretary of State for Health, is willing to get involved and has offered to make people available for a summit to discuss the issues. Mark Hopwood made a similar offer of support arising from the Slough local authority. Ian Stevens to follow up.</p> <p>ii) Neal Lawson requested Ian produce an industry script or shopping list with key facts and figures, to coordinate a consistent message to stakeholders.</p> <p>iii) Pete Wilkinson has asked his team to engage with Edward Welsh to develop a media strategy to shape public opinion and the DfT may be prepared to fund work.</p> <p>iv) Dyan offered to peer review the work and direction of the programme so far with Ian and Seamus, bringing her experience of tackling cable theft to bear.</p> <p>Members agreed the recommendations and approved the appointment of Seamus as lead for the Duty Holders Group.</p>	<p>IS</p> <p>IS</p> <p>PW</p> <p>DC / IS</p>	<p>January NTF</p> <p>January NTF</p> <p>January NTF</p> <p>Before January NTF</p>
15 3009/05	<p>TSRs – Neal Lawson</p> <p>Neal explained that TSR numbers have risen because of a change in the way cyclic top is managed which keeps restrictions on for 2 weeks rather than one and a change to the standards around level crossing sighting.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Members expressed frustration at the continued lack of progress on TSRs, which catalysed a discussion on the salient points. Key to this was a concern that NR is not undertaking a systems wide impact assessment when considering changes to standards.</p> <p>Responding to a query from Pete Wilkinson, Tim Shoveller explained that TSRs have increased partly because we were not complying with our own standards on level crossings. He raised a specific concern about the ORR stance on the issue of not blowing the horn between the hours of 22.00 and 07.00 which has led to a blanket TSR for all trains through the crossing.</p> <p>Neal Lawson explained that speed restrictions are an immediate response to changes in the risk profile while longer term mitigations are developed and implemented.</p> <p>Ruud Haket pointed out that the outcome of the Chief Engineer’s decision could have been predicted but the forecast for TSRs did not take that into account and was concerned that the impact assessment of the decision wasn’t discussed with the industry. Impact assessments should be carried out for all standard changes as a matter of course.</p> <p>i) Network Rail to develop an understanding of the number of TSRs a route section can tolerate before performance is negatively impacted.</p> <p>Members discussed level crossing TSRs and focused on examples where the rights of a handful of level crossing users are having a large impact on hundreds of passengers. Mount Sorrel was cited as a good example of how the industry has dealt with this issue. Pete Wilkinson declared that he was up for the battle of closing these level crossings and dealing with the fallout.</p> <p>ii) Moving from TSRs, members raised a concern about the number of unwarranted permanent speed restrictions on the network. Settle – Carlisle was referenced as an example. The Chair requested a paper to a future NTF identifying locations where the maximum permitted speed is less than the infrastructure capability and what effect this may be having on performance.</p> <p>Dyan raised a concern with recommendation 3 in the paper asking for TOC support for access proposals, highlighting that on occasion there is an Operator cost to facilitating the access with no framework in NR to cover it. – This links to action 15 3009/1 iv).</p> <p>Members welcomed the recognition from NR that for sighting TSRs the commencement and termination board should be co-terminus.</p>	<p>NL</p> <p>NL</p>	<p>January NTF</p> <p>January NTF</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
15 3009/06	<p>Performance Metrics – Stephen Draper</p> <p>Stephen Draper highlighted the measures, explained the work and invited member comment.</p> <p>There was general continued support for the thrust of the work but concern on whether we are overcomplicating measures, concern over the level of transparency and concern that the industry could be accused of hiding key detail.</p> <p>Gary Cooper reminded members that the metrics in the paper are to inform funders and specifiers so that they can determine whether they are getting what they have bought. Passengers’ information on railway performance is covered by Paper Q to this NTF on the development of a My Journey App. All of the work completed to date on metrics has been on the basis of the transparency agenda and the recognition that journalists will seek to rank the performance of different operators.</p> <p>Pete Wilkinson suggested that PPM as a measure isn’t bad if it could measure arrivals along the route. He suggested sharing all of the data and allowing the market to decide how to measure the industry. Asked to clarify the DfT position Pete explained that Ministers want right time at every station but he is happy to be pragmatic. Gary Cooper advised that for every location there will be a distribution of arrivals.</p>		
15 3009/07	<p>LOROL Performance – Three Reds – Peter Austin</p> <p>Peter explained that LOROL performance has been significantly impacted by London Bridge and issues on the East London Line. The performance impact of the move to Three Bridges ROC and the impact of the changes on signallers was underestimated. The takeover of West Anglia was affected by fleet problems which could have been prevented by a better shakedown.</p> <p>Peter received support for the regulation policy and confirmation that the BML recovery plan will be tracked through the NTF. It is also tracked through the joint GTR and NR Alliance Board.</p> <p>Dyan Crowther expressed disappointment that the infrastructure capability around London Bridge and operational challenges to GTR caused by the network capability reductions since September 2014 were not recognised in the paper. The paper inferred that GTR was at fault in many areas and this was not accurate. The interactions between LOROL and GTR services are largely driven by NR policy and GTR’s autumn performance will be similarly affected by NR decisions. Members noted this clarification.</p> <p>i) The preparations and remaining risks for the Dec 15 timetable change will be coming to the October NTF.</p> <p>ii) Further information required on how the leaf fall timetables affect the regulation policy. Dominic Medway to follow up with LOROL.</p>		

*Key to non NTF members: PB = Paul Brogden, IS = Ian Stevens,