

**NOTES - ACTIONS from 20 January 2016 NTF meeting**

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16 2001/01	<p><b>CB opening remarks</b>            CB gave an outline of the meeting with Claire Perry on 12/01/2016. In a good meeting she pressed for the industry to report Right Time performance and the importance of transparency. CB set out how the railway does manage to Right Time and reports it. CB also explained the current development work NTF has in hand around improved metrics for customers and transparency through ‘my journey’ data. She remains supportive of and interested in the work on CP6 metrics and may attend the March NTF at which final discussion is scheduled.            CB continued to give an overview of the meeting agenda.</p> <p>Paper B1 has been withdrawn after a conversation Calvin Lloyd and Alan Price.</p> <p>GC flagged the risk of unintended consequence of NR / industry reaction to the Hendy EDP position and consultation. Risks for NTF to be brought to the February meeting by ATOC and NR.</p>	GC/IF	17/02/2016
16 2001/02	<p><b>NTF Paper B2 - DfT year-end quick spend process</b>            AM summarised the paper. GC reiterated this process was not meant for this financial year, but the aim was to have a process in place for next year (2016/17), if funds were available for ‘quick spend’. CB and AM raised points on criteria, assessment, cost benefit and the best VfM.</p> <p>a. GC to work with the DfT and ORR setting out criteria for the March NTF. CB made reference to the CP4 process, which could prove a good starting point.</p> <p>b. GC suggested bringing an established ‘quick spend criteria’ back to the September NTF, and for members to identify scheme’s if funds where available throughout April-August in time for the September NTF.</p>	GC Members	March NTF September NTF
	<p><b>NTF Paper C - PIDD programme update – shifting the paradigm</b>            JS gave an overview of the paper which provided an update on the status on the PIDD Programme and set out a new, customer centric focus. In conclusion JS asked the NTF to agree to the following actions:</p> <p>1) NTF agreed the change in reporting approach (enabling vs. customer facing).</p> <p>2) NTF agreed to the accelerated delivery of the “customer-facing” PIDD actions, although further clarity is needed as to how and who will do this.</p>		



ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p><b>16 2001/04</b></p>	<p>Members were dissatisfied asking what is different. Despite action plans being in place, the industry is going backwards concerning the numbers of TSRs, and in practice it's the worst it has been for six years. Some of the comments made captured below.</p> <p>RA said that good practice is on Western Route – GC reminded NTF this has been flagged for years and asked RA if NR, as asked since Chris Gibb was on NTF, has rolled this out to all Routes, RA said it hadn't been but will be.</p> <p>A number of members commented that the focus on the TSRs that have the biggest performance impact has been lost and must return. Members were also concerned to learn that the standards change that has caused COT TSRs to remain on for longer was not discussed prior to the change and not treated as a system change.</p> <p>PW asked for information on the average age of TSRs, specifically by route and stated that the volume of TSRs are damaging the railway in terms performance and therefore its commercial ability to compete with other modes.</p> <p>DC and GC commented that the presumption to return track at line speed has also been lost with DC stating that it is the TOC that has to press for this because the Route isn't. JL concerns about loss of competence.</p> <p>NTF agreed that until it can be satisfied it wants NR to report on TSR every period and to do so by Route not just nationally.</p> <p>a. NR to report each period by Route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• those TSRs still in place due to cyclic top</li> <li>• those in place due to the changes to standards</li> <li>• the percentage of renewals planned to be handed back at line speed</li> <li>• the average age &amp; performance impacts of TSR</li> </ul>	<p><b>PH</b></p>	<p><b>17/02/2016</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• future forecast of TSR numbers</li> <li>• leading indicators to better predict TSRs coming and enable avoiding action</li> </ul> <p>b. TOCs and Routes to prioritise removal by impact on performance</p>	<b>TOCs and NR</b>	<b>From Now</b>
	<p><b>NTF Papers E1 / E3- Christmas 2015 Engineering review</b>  JG gave an overview of the paper, highlighting that since Christmas 2014 a great deal has been done to apply the lessons learned from the overruns at Paddington and Kings Cross and to embed these lessons in the business. JG gave a sample of some of the lessons which were learned and the actions which were applied to the recent period of engineering work.</p> <p>CB congratulated NR on a job well done over the Christmas and New Year period, requesting that the progress made in process terms and lessons learned need to be embedded for future major holiday periods. CB asked whether NR looked at the balance between delivery, efficiency and ensuring the right customer outcomes (cost vs risk) and how we ensure we optimise the price of having no over-runs. JG replied that most jobs were delivered over the period.</p> <p>GC noted that Francis Paonessa, although declining to provide a paper to January NTF (because of the need to discuss outcomes internally first) has written to ORR and that this letter (in the NTF pack) provided the information that had been requested.</p>		
<b>16 2001/05</b>	<p><b>NTF Paper E2 - Customer Experience during Christmas-New Year Engineering Works</b>  JS presented a paper providing the NTF with an update on feedback received from customers about their experiences using the railway over the Christmas and New Year period.</p> <p>JS will develop and share a customer focussed checklist for Easter works with TOCs. GC post-meeting note – suggests this form the basis of an ATOC ACoP on preparing for, and consideration of customer impact during bank holiday Engineering works.</p>	<b>JS</b>	<b>25/02/2016</b>
	<p><b>NTF Paper G - Non-track Assets Quarterly report</b>  NS provided slides on the day, these are available via the following link: <a href="#">NTF Paper G2 - Non-Track Assets Quarterly Update NTF - NS</a>  NS gave an overview of the presentation, and there were demonstrative improvements on points failures, signal failures, track circuits, level crossings, signalling system &amp; power supply, traction</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>power and telecoms (before resolution of disputed incidents), however axle counter train detection was worse.</p> <p>NTF commended NR activity and progress.</p>		
<p><b>16 2001/06</b></p>	<p><b>NTF Paper H - Meeting the CP5 challenge</b>  AP gave an overview of the paper sighting the emerging narrative he perceived in the industry that CP5 performance targets are already unachievable. The paper also sets out to quantify the gap to be closed by analysing the actual number of trains that would need to arrive within their PPM threshold and hence provide a more tangible quantification of the size of the challenge as opposed to a small percentage number of PPM. AP emphasised the need to get to a position where we get RT from origin reminding NTF that all members had supported the work by Vince Lucas in 2013. It was agreed that this is central to the Better Operations workstream and that NTF-OG should continue to prioritise this developing measures and tracking delivery.</p> <p>NTF confirmed that as industry lead body it has not given up on delivery the Regulated CP5 outputs.</p> <p>Summarising CB said that much of this work sits within the next item that PH leads for NTF Better Operations.</p>	<p><b>DJ / GC / IF</b></p>	<p><b>By next OG</b></p>
<p><b>16 2001/07</b></p>	<p><b>NTF Paper F - Better Operations Management Theme</b>  NL and PB gave overviews of their respective papers. Concerning PBs element of the Better Operations Management and National Joint Disruption Programme update GC stated that the paper is planned for the March NTF to enable PB to have time to engage with the TOC community. PB confirmed that the proposal is to engage with TOC MDs and security contacts over the coming weeks. GC asked him to work with Andy Odell from ATOC.</p> <p>NTF comments on NL's paper included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. CB a need for NL to develop lead indicators for the Better Operations Management work-stream.</li> <li>ii. CB secondary delays and sub-threshold delays to be part of theme and to consider these as part of the Y2 Q3 performance strategies</li> <li>iii. MH asked, given the number of comments that prior agreed NTF activities seem to be</li> </ul>	<p><b>NL</b> <b>IF</b> <b>IF</b></p>	<p><b>Ongoing Reporting</b> <b>17/02/2016</b></p> <p><b>February NTF</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>inconsistently applied, if there is a need have audit process to check NTF member compliance as part of this workstream.</p> <p>PW stated that roughly 20-25% of the network is already full to capacity and the priority is to focus on the LSE. He suggested that time be dedicated to the problem.</p> <p>a. Post meeting note – GC to discuss with CB, NL and AP development of a strawman of what the workshop should look like. GC suggested the vacant April NTF meeting as the proposed meeting date.</p> <p>b. DJ to provisionally book Wednesday 13 April 2016 and members to note.</p>	<p><b>GC/CB/NL/ AP</b></p> <p><b>DJ and members</b></p>	<p><b>By 05/02/2016</b></p> <p><b>13/04/2016</b></p>
<p><b>16 2001/08</b></p>	<p><b>NTF - Current Performance - Focus on South East</b></p> <p>DJ gave a presentation on the first part of three part approach on the subject of investigating TOC on-self delays, which will see two further agenda slots, covering this subject in more detail at next two NTF meetings.</p> <p>DC firmly stated that GTR delays are skewed by significant attribution issues confirming that she owns all the identified TOC issues she stressed the size of the attribution gap.</p> <p>a. Part 2 – at the February 2016 NTF, proposal for a ‘3 reds’ type approach focussing on TOCs that have had three successive periods of TOC on-self delays, where the target / plan was not achieved.</p> <p>b. Part 3 – will see a national TOC on-self paper from the ATOC Performance &amp; Planning Forum (P&amp;PF) at the March NTF highlighting more in-depth analysis and activities.</p>	<p><b>DJ / JT</b></p> <p><b>RW</b></p>	<p><b>17/02/2016</b></p> <p><b>16/03/2016</b></p>
<p><b>16 2001/09</b></p>	<p><b>Papers for Noting and AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CB emphasised the need for NTF members to review Paper A3 - Additional Slides for New Metrics, as this will be brought to the NTF in March for endorsement or rejection, hopefully for former and that the Minister may be present.</li> <li>• NTF Paper K - IAP Phase 2 update note as an excellent paper.</li> <li>• NTF Paper L - Fleet Challenge update. CB remarked that fleet reliability is improving, but raised a question on reactionary delays, that needs further oversight and also to look into funding for</li> </ul>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>schemes. GC said he had cancelled a meeting on the latter at short notice – diary pressure and is to reconvene.</p> <p>a. NTF biennial review. GC stated that the review proposal will be made to February meeting, stating that at the December RDG meeting he had RDG reconfirmation that NTF is the recognised cross-industry body for performance matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NTF Paper N - Suicide prevention work-stream report. GC made reference to a Trades Union meeting on 21/01/2016 to discuss union concerns on the proposals. Post meeting note, TSSA and ASLE&amp;F attended and were far more positive post meeting.</li> </ul> <p>b. NTF Meeting Forward Plan. DJ to update post January meeting and distribute asap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AOB – PW raised two points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. PW asked for the industry to try and start working better together, and to look at behaviours and cultures, specifically between now and potential changes over the last 20 years.</li> <li>ii. PW remarked that the NTF has a body of expertise around the table, specifically on operating the railway, and this should be noted, and has indeed been noted within government. PW suggested the NTF (collectively) submit views into the Shaw review. GC to discuss offline.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>DJ</b></p> <p><b>PW-CB-GC</b></p>	<p><b>17/02/2016</b></p> <p><b>01/02/2016</b></p> <p><b>w/c 25/01</b></p>

Non NTF member identification

IF Iain Flynn, NS, Nigel Salmon, RA Robert Ampomah, PB Paul Brogden