

NOTES / ACTIONS from 8th June 2016 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16/06/01	<p>CB opening remarks</p> <p>CB welcomed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alasdair Coates NR RMD • Will Rogers for Roger Cobbe (Arriva) • Charlotte Twyning for Tom Norris (Abellio) • Neil Bamford (London Midland) attending meeting and leading Fleet Challenge and Three Greens items; <p>and noted apologies from Jeremy Long and Oliver Bratton from MTR.</p> <p>PDG – CB noted key points from the PDG meeting with Claire Perry in May:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interest in how to weight output metrics and route scorecard measures to reflect the impact on passengers and in measuring the passenger impact of TSRs • positive feedback on the Customer Journey approach and the My TrainJourney website <p>Action tracking – DB noted that formal tracking of NTF actions is being reinstated and will be a standing agenda item to review outstanding actions.</p>	DB	6 July NTF
	<p>Paper B – GTR / NR Joint Performance Board</p> <p>DC and AC presented an update on GTR performance trends and the content of the performance recovery plans. Following a serious dip in the Autumn there has been a steady recovery up to period 1 - but the ongoing IR issues has resulted in a sharp decline in period 2. Other big challenges remained with restricted infrastructure and shortage of drivers. Declining performance on GN and Gatwick Express were key concerns, though there was some improvement on Metro services. The December timetable changes had delivered some benefits and the imminent arrival of Class 700 fleet is key to further improvement.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>16/06/02</p> <p>16/06/03</p> <p>16/06/04</p>	<p>The very high level of unexplained delay – 60% of the total - was highlighted. This has increased following agreement not to spend management time on the attribution of every minute of delay but to focus on recovery. There is now a need to better understand the causes of the unexplained delays – which will include understanding impact of TSRs – to enable identification of improvement actions.</p> <p>CB said that support from the industry for GTR was important – and that it was also necessary to get the overall messaging right to prevent the rest of the industry being dragged down when performance in other areas was much better. DfT have drafted in additional resources to support this activity and will produce a narrative for the industry on current and future GTR performance.</p> <p>CB questioned, to NTF agreement, whether and how a review of engineering allowances on capacity & performance stressed routes is being addressed in the TRIP programme – particularly given the accepted understatement of performance impact in TSRs. DB to follow up – to see what is done and report back if more should be done.</p> <p>It was agreed that it was important to be able to separate ‘one-off’ events, such as extreme flooding, from underlying delivery when analysing performance to ensure that emerging issues are not masked by non-routine events. Network Rail performance team to review how this could be tackled in the NTF regular performance reporting pack.</p> <p>NTF thanked DC for the honest assessment and reiterated the industry’s support.</p>	<p>AM</p> <p>DB</p> <p>PH</p>	<p>6 July NTF</p> <p>6 July NTF</p> <p>3 August NTF</p>
	<p>Paper C – Fleet challenge</p> <p>NB as new Chair for the Fleet Challenge Steering Group summarised key themes for ongoing work highlighting a desire to involve Network Rail much more in fleet activity and highlighted that a trial of the proposed leading performance indicator was getting underway but that one TOC, Northern, is not. PH supported NR involvement, stressing the importance of a whole system approach to asset management.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>16/0605</p>	<p>Members asked NB to take the following into account in further developing the work programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • covering the reaction to fleet incidents as well as the prevention of incidents (to target secondary delay) • assessment of the impact of duty cycles and human operating factors (example of varying performance of Class 180 fleets) • managing the need to extend life of existing fleet to cope with late delivery of new trains and associated cascades • the potential role for fleet in monitoring the condition of infrastructure assets • maintaining a fleet forward risk register • the interface with the Digital Railway programme and the risks and opportunities for fleet activity <p>NL reminded NTF that ATOC Engineering and NR have been working together since last summer on fleet monitoring of infrastructure.</p> <p>TS asked how the industry could establish a mechanism to fund fleet refurbishments or upgrades where there was an industry business case – noting that a fund had been available in CP4 but this had been removed in CP5. GC to speak with RDG policy and bring note to August NTF as part of NTF’s contribution to the IIA.</p>	<p>NB</p>	<p>Next quarterly update</p>
<p>16/06/06</p>		<p>GC</p>	<p>3 August NTF</p>
	<p>Paper D – Three Greens – London Midland</p> <p>Steve Helfet (LM) and Martin Colmey (NR) presented an overview of how recent improvements in performance had been achieved. The key factors included highly collaborative working, a focus on continuous improvement, and an effective, layered governance structure involving the right people in decision-making. A willingness to make operating decisions based on the overall passenger benefits rather than individual company interests was also highlighted. The principal challenge was finding the time to focus on improvement actions and to review how effectively they were embedded. NTF members all gave appreciation of the good work and the helpful paper and presentation.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Paper E – AWG Oversight and assurance</p> <p>MH outlined the ongoing AWG task force reviews of the implementation of the 2015 National Industry Autumn Review recommendations in each route, leading to a report to the July meeting. He observed that there was already considerable evidence of non-compliance and asked for member support in responding, as there will be little time to react to the identified weaknesses before autumn. Members noted the issue, thanked him for the work to date and committed to giving the issue time at the July NTF.</p>		
<p>16/06/07</p>	<p>Paper F – Review of Train Crew performance</p> <p>GC summarised the analysis already undertaken of the adverse trends in train crew issues affecting performance, and the work already in progress and business as usual activities to address the causes. TS confirmed that the paper was helpful in providing evidence that actions were being taken.</p> <p>There was some discussion of factors affecting the resilience of staffing plans to changes in service specification, the impact of major infrastructure works, introduction of new fleets etc., and of the costs of building in levels of contingency. It was concluded that funders needed to establish what level of service resilience they wished to buy, and that some analysis was required to demonstrate the potential benefits of providing higher levels of cover. GC and DfT to review how to evaluate this as an input into the IIA and/or franchise specifications, where appropriate.</p>	<p>GC/AM/ PW</p>	<p>3 August NTF</p>
<p>16/06/08</p>	<p>Paper G - Process for NTF engagement in PR 18</p> <p>DJ summarised current thinking on NTF engagement, noting the intention to bring an update to the July meeting. GR & GC emphasised that PR18 was a lengthy process and that the plan needed to assess the whole period and not just the immediate response to the initial consultation paper and working papers. NJ volunteered to join the working group when it was established.</p>	<p>DJ</p>	<p>6 July NTF</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
16/06/09	<p>Paper H – Better Operations</p> <p>PH summarised the proposed activities following the April workshop which agreed a number of workstreams and leaders. Plans are being fleshed out, including resource requirements, and an update paper will be presented for endorsement at the August meeting.</p>	PH	3 August NTF
	<p>Paper I – Biennial review</p> <p>DB outlined proposed scope and process for the biennial review. WR questioned whether the process was sufficiently independent and whether a review by an external party should be carried out. GC proposed, to agreement, that the review should continue as proposed, but that an independent review of NTF’s own effectiveness against its reviewed remit should be undertaken within a year.</p>		
16/06/10	<p>Papers for Noting</p> <p>Paper J – TSRs</p> <p>In response to some concern over the delay minutes analysis in the paper, CB confirmed that John Halsall (NR lead) was very clear that the TSR problem was serious and that his focus was on driving down the number of TSRs with prioritisation at route level based on overall performance impact.</p> <p>NTF noted that previous analysis of West Coast performance in October 2013 demonstrated that the overall impact of TSRs was much larger than industry systems record. <i>Post meeting note:</i> The previous papers and subsequent actions are being reviewed to establish what was done at the time and to propose appropriate next steps. John Thompson will lead this work.</p>	JT	6 July NTF
16/06/11	<p>TS raised concern over the system safety risk of having so many TSRs on driver behaviour, having observed driver repeatedly cancelling AWS for TSRs over a short stretch of line. GC to consider how to take this forward with RSSB.</p>	GC	3 August NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>16/06/12</p>	<p>Paper L – Hendy Review It was noted that this paper had been deferred and that the planned scope had been reduced to cover the impact on fleet and service specification only as these were the aspects that DfT could address. NTF was clear that the whole scope of the action needs fulfilling via other parties if necessary with DfT remaining responsible for the overall action.</p> <p>Paper M - Route scorecards GR reported that ORR Board had considered NTF feedback on Route scorecards and concluded that they could be used as leading indicators for assessing whether Network Rail had met the ‘reasonable test’, while recognising the need for clarity over the relationship with performance strategy targets. ORR Board had also decided not to undertake a licence breach investigation over 2015/16 performance, on the basis that the issues were understood and that recovery plans were in place.</p>	<p>AM</p>	<p>6 July NTF</p>
<p>16/06/13</p>	<p>Paper P – Performance strategy review NTF members agreed to expedite the sign off of this year’s PSRs and noted and accepted the NTF-OG view that the process has become too comfortable. A proposal from NTF-OG is to come to the August NTF.</p>	<p>JN</p>	<p>3 August NTF</p>

Non NTF member identification

Will Rogers (WR), Neil Bamford (NB), Jason Nash (JN).