

NOTES / ACTIONS from 17 February 2016 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>MH opening remarks</p> <p>Mark Hopwood opened the meeting and gave apologies including those from the normal meeting Chair, Chris Burchell.</p> <p>MH reminded members of the need to accept or decline future meeting invites to assist DJ in the management of the meetings, including security information.</p>		
<p>16 1702/01</p>	<p><u>NTF Performance Report</u></p> <p>A1 Performance Report GC highlighted that since mid-2012 performance has been in decline and that LSE / the 4 big TOCs and TSRs are major contributors to the current poor performance versus plan / decline in performance. However, is the current funded performance level out of reach? Looked at another way, out of 22 000 trains a day only 700 of those late have to run 1 ½ minutes earlier for the national performance plan target to be met. This doesn't mean that it is good enough, but NTF had said at its January meeting this is achievable and we should commit to doing that. We know from prior discussions and detailed NR analysis that industry reporting systems significantly under-estimate the delay impact of TSRs and given the current numbers of speed restrictions on the network NTF is right to continue to press NR to reduce the number and to prioritise those having highest impact on passengers.</p> <p>A number of long-term HR issues were discussed at the meeting. GC explained to NTF the existence of the recently reconstituted Rail HR Directors Group and said that it has already been asked (by him) to provide RDG with an activity / priority plan for 'early 2016'. He asked that NTF members also speak to their HR Group members so that they get the message from them as well.</p> <p>A2 NTF Work-stream Update GC drew attention to the variations in quality of the workstream updates submitted to DJ, stating that some were unsatisfactory. DJ asked that NTF members impress on any workstream lead they manage the importance of milestone reporting to NTF and that in future, as agreed NTF practice, inadequate</p>	<p>NTF member businesses</p> <p>NTF TOC and NR members</p> <p>Work-stream managers</p>	<p>Now</p> <p>Now</p> <p>Now</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>reports will be brought to the attention of the NTF.</p> <p>GC impressed the need to re-establish the Workstream summaries for future NTF comfort. *Post meeting note: DJ to reinstate Workstream check lists for each programme, similar to that for NRPP initiatives in the past. DJ to review and update the check lists accordingly and pass on to Workstream leads to be populated.</p> <p>A3 CP6 Trial Metrics</p> <p>This item was covered in the Paper B slot.</p>	<p>DJ</p>	<p>March NTF</p>
<p>16 1702/02</p>	<p>Paper B - CP6 Performance input into IIP - Phase 1 and Phase 2 update</p> <p>GC reminded NTF members of the 3 phases of this work and that for phase 1 members have been able to influence through a practitioner steering group and operations and communications practitioners working groups. SD gave an overview of the paper, drawing attention to the proposed metrics used within paper A3. He reaffirmed the intent to sign-off the metrics at the March NTF and he, GC and the chair stressed the need for any comments to be given well before the meeting given the level of engagement since last May.</p> <p>MF raised if void days are suitable recognised, and whether the impact of a scheme such as HS2 has an impact on these metrics in the future.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Agree definition and treatment of void days b) Quantify the impact of HS2 in phase 2 <p>PW again requested that customer friendly (as opposed to statically accurate) names be given to the metrics.</p>	<p>MF / SD MF/SD/RW</p> <p>JF</p>	<p>March NTF March NTF</p> <p>March NTF</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16 1702/03	<p>Paper C - TSR monthly national & route report</p> <p>PH talked to the dashboard report, on the basis that members will have read the paper. He explained that he has introduced the practice that TSRs are only imposed when it is know how they will be removed (secretary note this has been NR stated practice, if not reality since CP3).</p> <p>In discussion given NTF concern that the number of TSRs continues to ‘go the wrong way’ MF explained that TSR vis-boards, maps, a taskforce and a specific cyclic top PM have all been put in place.</p> <p>NL stated that the Standards primarily drives the decision. In further NTF discussion initiated by TS NR was asked again to challenge its own standards organisation given the better data, tools and techniques that exist now, compared to when Railtrack reacted to Hatfield. GC suggested this could form an item for the April NTF better operations workshop.</p> <p>MH made a point on the longer standing TSRs, suggesting that we use cause célèbre crossings that have a detrimental impact on railway performance and the economy for a small number of users. PW agreed the NTF would lead on this.</p> <p>Following these discussions the following actions were recorded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Review of Standards changes since Hatfield b) March paper to include information on ‘Vamos’, updated scorecards and route by route comparisons. NL also stated that the next report will also have historical data. c) PW - DfT to Champion the removal of TSRs related to Level Crossings, specifically looking at the performance (rail) and economic (UK PLC) impact 	<p>NL</p> <p>NL / RA</p> <p>PW</p>	<p>April workshop</p> <p>March NTF</p> <p>May NTF</p>
	<p>Paper D - Review of Autumn 2015</p> <p>IF gave an overview of slides not previously shared on the day (available here).</p> <p>MH noted that some views, received in email correspondence from ATOC for TOCs on the paper</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16 1702/04	<p>needed consideration and summarised that research areas needed further consideration and a greater push to share best practice (citing MerseyRail as an example) is required. IF drew attention to the forthcoming Autumn conference being held by Network Rail. GC asked for confirmation as to who is the Programme Manager.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) IF to close out points raised in correspondence by ATOC to both NR and ATOC satisfaction and confirm in next report. b) IF to take output of February 2016 Autumn Westwood to NTF-OG and build any comment from its members into NTF paper for March meeting. c) IF to confirm in the paper the industry Programme Manager. 	<p>IF</p> <p>IF</p> <p>IF</p>	<p>March NTF</p> <p>March NTF</p> <p>March NTF</p>
16 1702/05	<p><u>3 Reds TOC - focus on TOC on-self delays</u></p> <p>SWT Paper E2</p> <p>CR gave an overview of the paper, drawing attention to the increase in train mileage and passengers numbers. CR also stated that fleet delays have played a part in the increase in TOC self PPM failures, noting that the modifications to 458s have seen this class of train go from approximately 200k miles per failure, down to 3k miles per failure, although this has now been improved to 40k miles per failure.</p> <p>PW asked about the contract and whether any penalties could be obtained from the suppliers. CR responded that the suppliers (Porterbrook and Alstom) had agreed to supply Wi-Fi fitment as compensation for the 458 modification problems.</p> <p>GC reminded NTF that in the past PDG had seen RoSCos, OEMs and other suppliers at NTF's recommendation, and queried if Alstom should be invited? CR / TS to form a view and advise GC if they think it would be useful.</p> <p>The chair highlighted that Traincrew information was missing from the report. TS agreed that it was an oversight and stated that there were a small number of events, with no underlying issues.</p>	<p>CR/TS</p>	<p>In time for next PDG (16/05)</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>GTR Paper E3</p> <p>DS ran through the slides, highlighting that as a comparison today's normal running PPM is the equivalent to running during Autumn two years ago. Southern TOC on-self has nearly doubled in this timeframe.</p> <p>MH remarked that it is a huge challenge for GTR currently, but did raise the fact that GTR impact heavily on the national TOC on-self performance, and the overall PPM (approximately 25%) failures. PW concurred and suggested that an NTF review be undertaken to form an independent view. The output of the review would be required to give government some comfort that the NTF (responsible for railway performance) is taking some action to address the decline in railway performance. TS also supported the idea of an NTF review. GC countered that any review would need to be appropriately targeted given the amount of reviews, analyses and reporting already in hand. DS confirmed that GTR is already under tremendous scrutiny, including weekly calls with ministers and further reviews would not be helpful at this moment in time. PW reiterated the need for NTF comfort, but highlighted that the NTF report could help GTR, sighting a point on the continued growth in railway passengers / journeys, and whether the industry can continually keep accommodating this growth. DS quoted the recent 'Draper Review' and whether that was sufficient for NTF?</p> <p>Following these discussions the following action was recorded:</p> <p>PW requested an NTF review take place of GTR performance. <i>Post meeting note: PW spoke with Charles Horton, and agreed that GC should undertake the NTF review. GC to report back with a plan including timeframe, following an initial meeting to be held on 26/02/2016.</i></p>	<p>GC</p>	<p>March NTF</p>
	<p>Paper F - Impact of Hendy Review as currently known</p> <p>GC gave an overview of the paper, highlighting that TOCs and Routes should be on the case with section 3.1 – i.e. known issues but that for 3.2 there are unknown unknowns, with the highest profile for NTF probably being whether the impact on the GPS train location programme has been considered. NL queried whether NR wasn't 'conflicted' given the report was from its chair, GC, MH and PW</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16 1702/06	<p>responded jointly that NR's obligation at NTF is to NTF and it isn't conflicted.</p> <p>a) AM to generate email correspondence to clarify TLS / GPS funding, to include IF, NL, GC, JF b) DfT to co-ordinate a letter to the Secretary of State on the impact of the Hendy review on railway performance. Input required from GC, PH, CB</p>	AM PW	Now Now
16 1702/07	<p>Paper G - Better Operations Management workshop 'strawman'</p> <p>GC reminded members of the workshop date (13April) and that GC PH TS MH and PW and the IRO will develop a workshop strawman in time for March NTF.</p>	GC/PW/PH /TS/MH	March NTF
	<p>Papers for Noting & AOB</p> <p>MH drew attention to the PfN. There were no specific points on the PfN made from members. GC remarked that PDG is on 23 February and that the following was on the agenda: Agenda item 1: Current Performance Agenda Item 2: Seasons/weather: autumn, winter floods etc Agenda Item 3: Christmas engineering works readout and plans for Easter Agenda Item 4: Customer needs gap analysis (Heartbeat) and PIDD update Agenda item 5: NTF forward look ahead</p>		

Non NTF member identification

Stephen Draper (SD), Iain Flynn (IF), Christian Roth (CR), David Scorey (DS) Martin Frobisher (MF) Rob Warnes (RW) Janine Fountain (JF)