

NOTES / ACTIONS from 28th September 2016 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1609_01	<p>CB opening remarks</p> <p>Apologies received from Phil Hufton, Roger Cobbe, Paul McMahon and Nigel Jones.</p> <p>CB welcomed Mark Langman (Western) and John Halsall (South East) as the NR RMD reps, Oliver Bratton deputising for Jeremy Long (MTR), Julia Wraithmell for Roger Cobbe (Arriva), Peter Sharp (VTEC), Dominic Medway (NR) for item 2, Neil Bamford (LM) for paper E and Paul Brogden for Paper PN4.</p> <p>RDG: GC explained that there was an RDG Board awayday the following day that would be reviewing proposed changes the overall governance framework, including NTF. GC/CB would brief members on the outcome of this discussion at the October NTF meeting.</p> <p>Action tracking – DB reported that action on transfer of accountability for PIDD actions from NTF to Customer Experience Board was outstanding from June. DJ is working with Crispin Humm in Customer Experience to resolve this.</p>	GC/CB	26 October NTF
1609_02	<p>Verbal Updates</p> <p><i>PRPP process:</i> GC reported feedback from NTF-OG members that they wanted more visible leadership from NTF members to ensure that sufficient priority was given to the quality, delivery and review of the performance strategies. All members to ensure they engage fully with the PPRP process and make clear its importance within their organisations.</p>	All	Ongoing
1609_03	<p><i>Dec '16 timetable:</i> GC reported that in the December 2016 timetable over 900 TPR changes and 1,200 performance 'fixes' are being implemented – but that NR at NTF-OG reported it was unable to quantify the expected performance impact of these changes. CB said this was unacceptable. GC reminded members that there was a longstanding NTF action on NR to develop the toolkit to answer this question.</p>	JH	26 October NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1609_04	<p>JH acknowledged the challenge and agreed to review with Fiona Dolman, who would be invited to the October meeting to explain NR's current capability and plans for measuring the performance impact of timetable change in advance of implementation.</p> <p>Route scorecards: Main item postponed until October to allow Phil Hufton to lead the item. ML outlined the planned process and timetable for agreement of Route Scorecards for 2017/18 – noting that engagement between NR Routes and Operators was required in October. All members were asked to report back to the October NTF meeting on how effective this process has been.</p> <p>Watford landslip: ML gave an overview of the Watford landslip incident. The immediate cause was exceptionally heavy rainfall round the tunnel portal washing soil from the cutting onto the line causing a derailment, with the derailed train subsequently being struck a glancing blow by a train in the opposite direction. No failure of existing processes had been identified to date. The impact of changes in land use by the landowner above the tunnel on the flow of water was being investigated. The GSM-R emergency call had been received by the other train which had significantly reduced its speed before impact with the derailed train. NB noted that the gearbox on the derailed train had prevented a more serious derailment. PB noted that there had not been previous problems at the site and there was no history of flooding. Martin Frobisher (RMD LNW) will present to the November meeting on NR's management of earthworks safety.</p>	All	26 October NTF
	<p>Paper A – Performance Report</p> <p>DM provided an overview of period 6 performance – highlighting the continuing trend of performance running at the lowest level for 10 years and the very high level of cancellations (1 in 40). He also noted that on average 40% of trains are running out of path at any time. Asset and fleet reliability was fairly flat, but the rising trend of DPI since 2010 was continuing.</p> <p>PW questioned whether poor performance was hitting farebox revenue. TS and others confirmed that it was having an impact.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1609_05	<p>MH noted that a lot of work on understanding DPI had already been done. GC reiterated that this work had shown the need for very local understanding by asset class and location meaning that specific local problems have to be tackled rather than a national solution.</p> <p>CB asked that more detailed analysis of key performance issues was presented at future meetings to provide useful insight for NTF action. A deeper review of DPI will be produced for the October meeting. DM will review prior work and report back on current issues.</p>	DM	26 October NTF
1609_06	<p>PW asked what could be done to normalise performance for traffic growth, and the length of the operating day, and to better demonstrate the trade-off between performance and capacity. CB said that this could be tracked, but that understanding the impact of the growing saturation of capacity was more difficult and the relationship was unlikely to be linear. DM to consider how this can be addressed in a future performance report slot.</p>	DM	23 November NTF
1609_07	<p>CB stated that consideration of the performance impact of changes often seemed to be neglected in recent times (e.g. Hendy Review, TSR standards changes, timetable change) and was not treated as a key industry output. CB underlined the need for all members to ensure that the drive to improve performance is taken much more seriously. All members agreed that as NTF members they have a responsibility <u>always</u> to ask the question about performance.</p>	All	Ongoing
1609_08	<p>DJ noted that one of the workstreams in the Better Operations theme was assessing options for rule book /standards changes that could enhance performance without compromising safety. This would be covered during the Better Operations theme update to the October meeting.</p>	DJ	26 October NTF
1609_09	<p>Paper B – GTR /NR recovery plan update</p> <p>DC and JH presented an update on GTR/SE performance and recovery planning. Following a very poor period 3 (66.8% PPM) there has been some improvement over the last three periods but big challenges remain with the IR situation, the reliability of the new Class 700 fleet, and declining performance on the GN route.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>JH summarised the ‘galaxy map’ approach to consolidation of improvement initiatives and getting at root causes – disaggregating each delay cause category, doing Pareto analysis to prioritise issues within each category, and then asking ‘5 whys’ to get to root cause and potential solutions. He highlighted the large amount of unattributed delay and the need to break down the ‘Network management’ delay category in order to identify potential improvement actions. He explained that Arcadis had been given a contract to analyse the unattributed and unexplained delay, and agreed to share the outcomes of this review with NTF when it was available.</p>	JH	23 November NTF
1609_10	<p>GC asked that JH share the planning tool for DM to build into PPRP.</p>	JH/DM	Next revision
	<p>DC noted that the very high DPI associated with fleet incidents was due to breakdowns occurring in the Thameslink core and that any under-powered trains were now being removed before they reached the area, one cancellation being preferred to the risk of major delays to all services.</p>		
1609_11	<p>DC highlighted the continuing IR risk and that the growing reluctance of drivers to work on their rest days meant that establishing Sunday as part of the working week was vital. TS said that EMT had implemented Sunday working in their driver’s contracts. PW stressed his prior offer to NTF that DfT would fully support TOCs in addressing this - and encouraged TOCs to engage with DfT.</p>	TOC NTF members	Now
	<p>OB asked whether the extent of ‘signaller error’ was a direct cause or a symptom of other issues – do signallers have sufficient support and supervision. JH noted the intent to apply some of the measures introduced for the Olympics with additional people to support decision-making in signal boxes. TS stressed that people will always be critically important to performance, even with technological change.</p>		
1609_12	<p>DC outlined the Gibb review which will report to the Secretary of State. To date the review had not identified major gaps in the plans or suggested new initiatives – but it would include some analysis of alignment of incentives. PW to report back to NTF on the report when it is completed for potential lessons learned for the rest of the industry.</p>	PW	23 November NTF
	<p>Paper C – NTF Biennial review</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1609_13	<p>DB introduced key discussion points from the Biennial Review paper. Members unanimously agreed the need for the NTF continue. There was strong support for taking a more strategic and forward-looking view, and the proposal to re-introduce the strategic performance risk register that would focus NTF activity was endorsed.</p> <p>The proposal for a ‘Route spotlight’ at each meeting was not supported, with DC and ML both expressing the view that there was sufficient oversight of performance through Route Boards and the interfaces with DfT and ORR.</p> <p>PW said that he was very keen for NTF to engage with DfT in guiding better specification of future franchises.</p> <p>CB stressed the importance of paper sponsors taking accountability for ensuring that all NTF papers are of suitable quality and that they answer the exam question, noting that the NTF support team are often spending much time going back to authors and sponsors.</p>	All sponsors	Ongoing
1609_14	<p>DB noted the need to choose a new Chair as CB’s final two-year term is up, and to find replacement Theme Champions following the departures of Neal Lawson and Tom Norris. Members were asked to volunteer or provide nominations for the roles of Chair, Better Assets champion, Better Timetables champion and Better Operations champion (to allow Phil Hufton to stand down if he wishes).</p>	All	7 October
1609_15	<p>DB will develop an implementation plan reflecting the views expressed on the recommendations in the paper.</p>	DB	26 October NTF
	<p>Paper D – Performance Impact of Hendy Review</p> <p>AM summarised the paper, emphasising the difficulty of quantifying the performance impacts – during the review as well as now. He noted that there were some benefits from reduced disruption during works, as well as deferral of the benefits that schemes could deliver. He also noted that significant uncertainty remained about the consequences for OM&R and about other elements of the review including asset sales. PW said that much of the decision-making had been political and not driven by</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1609_16	<p>customer input or performance impact – and that it was important that any future revisions to the enhancements plan were reviewed by NTF.</p> <p>It was agreed that further analysis of the impact of the Hendy review would not be productive.</p> <p>CB asked that all NTF members ensure that performance is always taken into account in ALL decision-making - whether this relates to enhancements, access rights, timetabling, safety and standards or any other issue – particularly if further workplan changes may be discussed for O,M&R or enhancements.</p>	All	Ongoing
1609_17	<p>Paper E – Fleet Challenge Update</p> <p>NB summarised key elements of the paper, noting that continued steady improvement in reducing incidents (MTIn) was not matched by any reduction in delay minutes.</p> <p>CB asked that all NTF members challenge the fleet improvement components of their performance strategies at the next quarterly reviews - are the plans sufficient and are they delivering expected outcomes – particularly in areas where impact of fleet delays could be reduced?</p>	All	Q2 PPRP reviews
1609_18	<p>Noting the earlier discussion of DPI in general and for fleet on GTR – CB asked that FCSG place a stronger focus on improving the management of DPI. NB to report on this aspect of the FCSG portfolio work at the next quarterly review with NTF in January.</p>	NB	18 January NTF
1609_19	<p>The issues affecting the introduction of the Class 700 fleet were briefly discussed. It was agreed that Gerry McFadden be asked to present to NTF on the key issues - and the lessons to be learned by the industry in respect of the introduction of new trains and software development.</p>	GMcF	23 November or 18 January NTF
1609_20	<p>CB expressed surprise at the NR view around the value of capturing information from trains about infrastructure assets and asked that this be challenged in the context of supporting asset management with data on degradation over time. DB and BD to review the engagement to date on this issue and consider appropriate next steps – providing an update paper to the January NTF meeting.</p>	DB/BD	18 January NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1609_21	NB was asked to give further thought to the normalisation of incident numbers for differences in the duty cycle, considering how this could be measured and how the information could then be used to drive improvement.	NB	18 January NTF
	<p>Paper F – PR18</p> <p>The proposed response to ORR’s PR18 Working Paper on Outputs was endorsed. The value of the cross industry Working Group in pulling together the response – and its continuing role through the PR18 process was acknowledged.</p>		
1609_22	<p>Paper G – Adhesion Working Group</p> <p>The AWG request for ATOC / NR funding of the work to update and reissue the AWG manual was endorsed.</p> <p>DB to re-circulate the final report from the AWG task force on reviewing Autumn preparedness with the Notes of the meeting.</p>	DB	3rd October

Other attendees: Dominic Medway (DM), Neil Bamford (NB), Paul Brogden (PB), Bryan Donnelly (BD).