

NOTES / ACTIONS from 23rd November 2016 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>MH opening remarks</p> <p>Apologies received from Rick Davey and Oliver Bratton.</p> <p>MH thanked Phil Bearpark for his support of NTF and welcomed Peter Broadley as his replacement.</p> <p>MH welcomed Martin Frobisher (LNW) and Andy Thomas (Wales) as the NR RMD rep. He also noted that Fiona Dolman (Capacity Planning Director) and Jon Shaw (Chief Engineer) from NTR would join NTF in 2017.</p> <p>GC advised he had formally thanked Chris Burchell on behalf of NTF.</p>		
	<p>NTF-OG – DJ reported that he was working with stakeholders to develop a proposal for revising the scope of OG. This would be presented to NTF in January. A new Timetable Planning Strategy Group is being created to take a longer-term view of timetable planning processes and systems.</p>		
	<p>Gibb Report – PW said that Gibb report had been drafted but was not yet signed off by Chris Grayling. It contains some quite far reaching recommendations as well as addressing more basic operational issues. He noted that there were continuing problems with the introduction of the new rolling stock and that the infrastructure was not resilient to cope with the level of traffic. NB added that GTR had had a lot of input to the review. He felt that morale at GTR was very good in the circumstances and that collaborative relationships with NR were also very good. He was asked to share with NTF as soon as possible.</p>		
	<p>Route Scorecards – PH updated on the process for agreeing 2017/18 route scorecards, acknowledging that feedback was mixed and inviting operators to comment on their concerns. RC said that the engagement with his TOCs had started very late and it felt like a rush job with the TOC being presented with the answer and not having the opportunity to input. AP added that Greater Anglia had not yet had</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1611_01</p> <p>1611_02</p> <p>1611_03</p>	<p>a scorecard meeting with their route. PH responded that the plan was for scorecards to be completed by the end of March – and therefore that there was plenty of time for collaborative discussion.</p> <p>MH said there was some confusion about whether the scorecards were an HQ pro forma to be filled in or were meant to be determined by local discussion. PH replied that he did not recognise the term ‘HQ’. Routes were developing as autonomous businesses and the scorecards should be developed in close collaboration with operators. PW stressed that route scorecards are very important and that they must be branded as joint/industry scorecards not NR.</p> <p>MH proposed that a checklist of questions about the process and content of the scorecard was produced and agreed for Routes and Operators to complete.</p> <p>NTF required that a report on progress is produced for the January meeting.</p> <p>Members are aiming to sign off at the February meeting.</p>	<p>PH (DW)</p> <p>PH</p> <p>NR and TOCs</p>	<p>21 December</p> <p>18 January</p> <p>15 February</p>
<p>1611_04</p> <p>1611_05</p>	<p>Paper A – Performance Report</p> <p>DM noted that period 8 has been the best period 8 in CP5 but was still worse than in CP4 and PPM performance was still 1.4% points below the plan. He noted that the top incidents included management tins in Wessex and Sussex showing that the attribution process was not being completed, and that there had been a number of problems with fleet this period. Autumn leaf-fall was still a few days behind the recent average and after a bad week the autumn-related delay minutes was a little lower than recent years.</p> <p>An up to date statistics page on Autumn performance would be provided for the December PDG meeting pack.</p> <p>MH expressed concern about the extent to which industry best practices were being applied – citing the limited application of multiple formation sanding which had been proven effective but was not being used by all TOCs. He asked that TOCs review their decisions for next year and report through</p>	<p>DM</p> <p>MH/DM</p>	<p>30 November</p> <p>In time for review action 7</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1611_06</p> <p>1611_07</p>	<p>AWG. AWG to review TOC positions on sanding in time for inclusion in the formal Autumn review (action 7).</p> <p>TS added that vegetation management was similarly inconsistent - very good on WCML but trains could not move on Ascot line – and plans needed to be developed quickly so that work was carried out before the nesting season.</p> <p>In advance of the formal review of Autumn performance, a paper on key emerging lessons learned from this autumn would be produced for the NTF December correspondence pack - in order that members had time to take action that would be effective next year.</p> <p>The full Autumn review would be completed during January, collating responses from all Routes and TOCs and shared with NTF in February. GC asked that this report should explicitly address the 2013 Curley Report recommendations and the extent to which these were being complied with (if still applicable).</p>	<p>DM</p> <p>DM</p>	<p>21 December NTF</p> <p>15 February NTF</p>
<p>1611_08</p>	<p>Delay per incident: TB presented some headline delay per incident ratios. GC expressed the group’s deep frustration that the analysis did not build on previous 3 analyses for NTF that had demonstrated that looking at national ratios was unhelpful – local and asset specific issues needed to be understood and addressed in improvement plans. DM said that Karl Smith was in the process of gathering individual Route performance plans for reducing DPI and that these were more varied and locally-focused.</p> <p>It was agreed that a note would be developed for the Jan NTF meeting, setting out what good looks like in the definition of the improvement plans, and the linkage to the industry route scorecards.</p> <p>PB and AP noted that delay per incident ratio was not a meaningful measure and all agreed that it was necessary to break it down to components and metrics that were meaningful and could be directly addressed. AP stressed the importance of continuing to reduce the number of incidents as well as improving response times, as Abellio were being affected by incidents that were easily avoidable.</p>	<p>DM / Karl Smith</p>	<p>18 January NTF</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1611_09	<p>PH said he wanted a focus on better incident management, saying that dedicated response teams were crucial and should not be diverted to routine work that affected their ability to respond quickly.</p> <p>TS supported the focus on response teams and proposed the development of a protocol to capture operational commitments from Routes and Operators aimed at ensuring improved performance (e.g. levels of resource). MF cited work with Chiltern setting out commitments on, for example, reducing TSRs and avoiding train crew shortages, that were literally being captured on tablets of stone. MH added that GWR/Western had agreed a recovery target of being on time within one out and back journey cycle. Post-meeting note: TS and DJ to discuss how to take this idea forward in w/b 28 November</p>	TS/DJ	2 December
1611_10	<p>Paper B – IIA input for CP6</p> <p>IF picked out key points from the paper and illustrated the BAU/ambitious/radical scenarios.</p> <p>GC said it was important that NTF said to the rest of the industry that operational performance was the top priority for CP6. NTF had done this in the past, but not during CP4 and CP5 planning. PW strongly agreed – enhancements are not the whole answer and the industry is starting to see revenue falling because of poor performance. DfT will strongly support the emphasis on performance and want the industry to spell out the priorities for funding and ensure that this is built into plans from the start.</p> <p>MH said there was a need for greater challenge to issues that adversely affected performance and asked that the IIA narrative challenged the industry becoming too risk averse. TS noted that the new delay repay arrangements will have significant impact on the financial consequences of poor performance and will drive different behaviour. AP strongly supported a focus on getting the basics right to drive better punctuality.</p> <p>It was agreed that the December 21 meeting slot would be used for a workshop focused on the IIA performance narrative. IF to organise a meeting for NTF team to plan this workshop and the preparatory activity.</p>	IF	Completed

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1611_11</p> <p>1611_12</p>	<p>Paper C – PIDD Update</p> <p>KD summarised the paper and asked for a sponsor for the people element of the programme. The requirement would be for someone to attend a Programme Board for half a day every month. No nominations were made so GC will follow up with potential candidates. <i>Post meeting note:</i> DJ and GC have discussed and DJ is to contact the proposed ‘volunteer’.</p> <p>PIDD update to be included in the December PDG meeting pack.</p>	<p>DJ</p> <p>KD</p>	<p>21 December NTF</p> <p>30 November</p>
<p>1611_13</p>	<p>Paper D – TRIP Update</p> <p>GS summarised progress on the timetable rules improvement programme, stressing the good collaboration that was continuing, with some very challenging issues being tackled constructively.</p> <p>MH questioned what happens when the analysis identifies proposed rule changes that would ‘break’ the timetable. GS referred to the agreed derogation process and confirmed to a GC query that all the proposed changes are recorded and the reasons for not making changes fully documented. MH asked that the next TRIP update to NTF focused on some of these contentious issues and how they were being addressed.</p>	<p>GS</p>	<p>15 February NTF</p>
<p>1611_14</p>	<p>Paper E – Weather resilience and climate change</p> <p>LC summarised key points from the paper. It was noted that the Weather Resilience Group (WRG) had not met for some time and was being re-energised. A new WR&CC strategy was being drafted for review by WRG in December and would be shared with NTF when ready.</p> <p>NB noted that some familiar locations were causing problems and questioned the balance of attention to low frequency high impact events versus high frequency low impact events. LC responded that the focus was on improving basic drainage and vegetation management to address the high frequency low impact events, while developing longer-term plans to tackle the high impact locations where solutions were potentially very expensive (e.g Dawlish, Cowley Bridge) and required detailed evaluation.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1611_15	<p>PH explained that the impact of Cowley Bridge flooding this week had been much lower than the last major incident (a day rather than a week), as a result of works that had been undertaken to protect the signalling.</p> <p>GC reiterated the NTF input at the start of CP5 that asset managers should have plans for their assets to perform as well on ‘adverse’ days as ‘normal’ days by the end of CP5, expressing concern that the performance gap remained significant and that the strategy only referred to a 20% improvement by the end of CP6. LC said she was not aware of the NTF position. Post-meeting note: DB/DM to review relevant NTF papers and submissions relating to weather resilience and ensure LC received all relevant material.</p>	DB/DM	9 December
1611_16	<p>It was agreed that tracking of the remaining TRR actions could be transferred to RDG (for PIDD) and DfT (for review of legislation affecting third party land use). The handover to Customer Experience at RDG would be confirmed with Jac Starr.</p>	DB/DJ	30 November
1611_17	<p>LC asked for an NTF volunteer to succeed Phil Bearpark. It was agreed that GC would follow up with potential candidates following the meeting. Post-meeting note: Nick Brown is hopeful he could champion in 2017, in the meantime Dan Boyde will cover.</p> <p>Paper F - Earthworks Risk Management</p> <p>MF summarised circumstances of the Watford tunnel landslip and derailment, noting that a much more serious accident had been avoided as a result of the gearbox limiting the extent of the derailment and a successful application of the GSMR emergency button slowing the speed of the oncoming train and minimising the impact. He explained that the existing drainage arrangements had not been effective as changes in land use above the tunnel had changed water flows in a way that had not been understood.</p> <p>MF added that all locations with cuttings by tunnel portals were being reviewed and risk-assessed and that a key challenge was to systematically improve knowledge of third party land use changes and how these could affect water flows near the railway.</p> <p>Paper G – Good to Great</p>	GC	Complete

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>MF and PB described the work undertaken by Virgin and LNW Route to improve performance – the key messages being attention to detail and a focus on continuous improvement – striving for perfect performance rather than accepting ‘good enough’. A PPM daily record figure of 99.34% had been achieved with just two trains affected by one incident.</p> <p>A key source of improvement had been the focus on removing TSRs, getting a benefit of around 3 mins per train. This was criticality based, starting at the London end and working north so that long stretches of the main lines were currently TSR free. Another key activity was avoiding TSRs by identifying potential problem sites and taking action before defects were manifested as bump reports.</p> <p>PW said that sharing good practice around performance improvement was vital and that such ‘good news’ sessions should be part of every meeting. NTF should tackle resistance to adopting best practice.</p>		
	<p>Next meeting: 21 December – special meeting focused in input to IIA – 200 Aldersgate Street.</p> <p>Timing TBC to maximise attendance.</p>		

Other attendees: Dominic Medway (DM), Tom Blann (TB), Kathryn Daniels (KD), Greg Sugden (GS), Lisa Constable (LC).