

**NOTES / ACTIONS from 26th October 2016 NTF meeting**

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><b>MH opening remarks</b></p> <p>Apologies received from Chris Burchell, Pete Wilkinson, Rick Davey and Oliver Bratton. MH deputising as Chair.</p> <p>CB welcomed John Halsall (South East) as the NR RMD rep, Dominic Medway (NR) for Paper A and Denise Wetton (NR) for Paper D.</p>		
1610_01	<p><b>PDG</b> – GC reported that the PDG meeting had gone well. The notes and the comprehensive introduction for the new minister had been circulated to NTF members with the papers for this meeting. It was confirmed that NTF would see the SoS initiated Gibb Report on GTR, and noted that the performance impact of timetable change (see paper C) was raised. The Rail Minister was very keen to understand what is changing and to know how the DfT can help whilst being challenging about the architecture we have in place, <i>i.e.</i> NTF / PDG etc., since performance is not on plan and has not been for a long time.</p> <p><b>Action tracking</b> – DB reported that the main outstanding action was completing the transfer of accountability for oversight of PIDD to Customer Experience Board, which had been held up by changes in RDG Customer Experience team organisation and personnel. MH sought assurance that the actions that NTF had been tracking were still being pursued and DJ confirmed that they are.</p> <p>DJ to bring a paper to the next meeting with an update on the PIDD actions, including a report on how the outputs from the 2015 seminar with Claire Perry are being taken forward.</p>	DJ	23 November NTF
	<p><b>Paper A – Performance Report</b></p> <p>DM noted that period 7 had not been as bad as period 6, but was still well short of plan.</p> <p>As requested he concentrated on one main issue – in this period delay per incident (DPI). He outlined the range of factors underlying the overall DPI and some of the previous initiatives aimed at improving</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>it. He noted previous analysis (2011 Draper report) and noted that NR and ORR were jointly undertaking a deep dive analysis of DPI. GC commented that there is more analysis than the Draper report and that NTF-OG has studied the matter twice in joint NR/TOC/ATOC activity, so work must build on the past where relevant. An outcome of the OG prior work was that there are no ‘national answers’ – tackling DPI needs local in depth understanding of geography (for infrastructure capability and train service characteristics) and asset class.</p> <p>TS said that DPI trend showed that something has changed – understanding this could inform how to get back to where we were. Rule changes (e.g. impact GSM-R ‘red button’) and change in mix of incidents were noted as possible factors. AP asked whether underlying indicators affecting DPI (e.g. time to fix) were being tracked. DM said that some were but that there was a need to consolidate this.</p>		
1610_02	DM to present deeper analysis of issues underlying the rise in DPI at the next meeting – showing where the problems are, what issues are Route-specific and what are network wide, and looking at how to improve the monitoring of indicators.	DM	23 November NTF
1610_03	DM summarised Autumn safety and reliability performance to date, noting that delay minutes were below the 6-year mean so far, although leaf fall was also a few days behind mean. Members suggested there was value in capturing what has gone right so far so that it can be replicated. Some service groups were performing particularly well. DM noted that RHTT delivery was currently at 100% and that other aspects of Autumn preparation were better than last year. DM to address these comments when providing the final Autumn review.	DM	17 January NTF
	<p><b>Update - Train Location Services</b></p> <p>DM reported that the TLS programme has been ‘paused’ with a 4-8 week delay in the programme expected.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> GC, DJ, DB met with DM and Roberta Lowes to discuss. Key challenges are that the supplier raised their price substantially very shortly after NR had secured investment authority. In addition, there is concern that a number of key individuals who have been engaged in the project to date are likely not to be available for the next stages. NR is therefore looking at a number of options</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1609_04	<p>for engaging different suppliers or using its own resources to reduce the risks to delivery. RL has engaged with David Waboso to take on the executive sponsor role. In the meeting NTF support for the work was restated and Roberta was encouraged to ask for any help she needed if industry needs to help NR</p> <p>DM to provide a programme update paper to NTF for December (papers only).</p>	DM	18 December NTF (papers)
	<p><b>Update - RDG Governance</b></p> <p>GC presented an overview of the governance changes that had been agreed by RDG Board members, noting the creation of the Planning and Production Board and the proposal to add NR Route MDs to the TOC MD group.</p>		
1610_05	<p><b>Paper B – NTF Biennial Review</b></p> <p>Chair: It was agreed that GC would write to Chris Burchell to express members’ appreciation of his contribution to NTF.</p> <p>GC said that Mark Hopwood (nominated by GC, seconded by TS and CB) was the nominee for the Chair. MH left the room while members discussed this. MH’s appointment for a two-year term as Chair was agreed.</p>	GC	By 11 November
1610_06	<p>DB noted that TS had agreed to take on the role of Theme Champion for Better Operations, and that GC would become the Champion for Better Information. Discussion was ongoing for the Better Assets and Timetables themes and DB would be making contact.</p>	DB	By 23 November
1610_07	<p>DB summarised the review implementation plan and asked members to put forward items for the strategic risk register. It was agreed that the first step should be a ‘brain dump’ of risks – with all members to advise DB of their view of key risks to performance over the next few years.</p>	All	11 November
1610_08	<p>DB to develop a first draft of the risk register, reviewing previous formats and incorporating members’ ideas, for consideration at the next meeting.</p>	DB	23 November NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1610_09	<p>GC said that Jon Shaw, NR's new Chief Engineer, is proposed by Graham Hopkins, to join NTF as a full member. If Jon does join it is proposed that he lead the Better Assets theme.</p> <p>PH said that his preference is for Route MDs to continue to attend in rotation as it was useful for them all to have some exposure to NTF debate. This was challenged by DC as going against what NTF agreed in September on continuity in attendance. PH said that RMDs were reviewing their attendance at cross industry and national forums on 2nd November and that he could then confirm RMD representation at NTF for 2017.</p>	PH	23 November NTF
1610_10	<p>DC stressed the need for the System Operator role to be represented. GC and PH to discuss the appropriate system operator representation in light of other industry governance changes.</p>	PH/GC	11 November
	<p><b>Paper C – Impact of Timetable Changes</b></p> <p>FD summarised the paper, acknowledging that NTF had raised with NR before her time but emphasising that NR still does not currently have the capability to evaluate the net impact of lots of small changes to the timetable in a short period of time. There are predictive models but these are very complex and slow and are principally used for evaluating major enhancement schemes. The December 2016 timetable change involves a large number of performance fixes and changes to TPRs. This is expected to lead to a reduction in delays directly attributed to timetable errors. There is potentially a bigger overall performance impact but there is no basis for estimating this.</p> <p>FD stressed that she was not happy with the existing capability. Previous attempts to engage suppliers in developing solutions have not succeeded. NR's plan is to encourage innovation by posing questions to the market – supported by open source data – rather than a detailed specification. A period of about 6 months to develop prototypes / proofs of concept was envisaged.</p> <p>TS asked whether there was scope for some before and after review of the Dec '16 timetable changes.</p> <p>MH asked whether enough was done to review modelling work in the light of experience, given the high profile projects where the forecast performance impact had not been accurate. FD said there was a tendency to undertake the modelling work early, based on current assumptions, but not to update the work when key assumptions changed that would affect the output. AP asked whether models were</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1610_11	<p>rerun after the event with updated assumptions – FD responded that this was too big and time consuming a job.</p> <p>FD agreed to summarise the available modelling options – indicating what tools are used for what tasks and how they are applied.</p> <p>The recommendations were endorsed, subject to review of the TRIP programme update paper due at the November meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that (see note above) that the minister will seek a report on modelling capability at the 5 December PDG meeting.</p>	FD	23 Nov NTF
1610_12	<p><b>Paper D – Route scorecards</b></p> <p>DW summarised the process for 17/18 scorecards – noting phased approach to agreeing the measures to use and then the target levels, and asked for feedback from operators on how it was working. Members reported varying levels of engagement and progress but no significant problems were reported.</p> <p>MH commented that the process had been understood eventually but that the initial comms had not been clear. It was important that all parties got the same information and that relying on a cascade was not the best way to achieve this. <i>Post meeting note:</i> GC to distribute the scorecard guidance slides to all TOC MDs via the RDG comms team weekly update.</p> <p>TS queried what the process would be if operators and NR failed to agree on the scorecard content. GR said that ORR might be the arbitrator in CP6, but not in CP5. DW said that Route Boards were the key forum for reaching agreement.</p>	GC	4 November
1610_13	<p>PH said that NR wanted to arrange an event for NR Route MDs to meet with TOC MDs to explain and discuss the changes being made through devolution at NR – including Route Boards and scorecards. PH/GC to discuss how and when to set this up.</p>	PH/GC	11 November

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1610_14	<p>TS expressed concern that it will become harder to match franchise obligations with the capability and funding to deliver performance improvement, and that it will get more difficult to agree values for scorecards. DC noted that as part of the Gibb review of GTR performance, LEK were looking at the (mis)alignment of contractual incentives. AM encouraged all members to engage early with DfT if and when conflicts between franchise targets and scorecards emerged.</p> <p>GR questioned whether the new performance metrics for CP6 should be used in scorecards now. It was agreed that this was appropriate and consistent with the desire to implement the new measures now.</p>	All	Ongoing
	<p><b>Paper E – TSR recovery plan</b></p> <p>JH summarised progress, reiterating that the main driver of the increase was unplanned cyclic top related TSRs. MH noted that cyclic top TSRs only directly affect freight services and questioned whether cyclic top was the priority area affecting performance. JH said that all TSRs were bad and the plan was aimed at removing them – focusing on the cyclic top issue first – before moving on to other factors - while also seeking to ensure that removal of existing TSRs was prioritised according to the performance impact.</p> <p>JH noted that the rise in the last period was due to earthwork shrinkage – this is a regular seasonal issue on routes built on London clay but the soil moisture deficit has been relatively high this year due to a dry summer. GC said that a previous NR executive, when questioned at NTF, had said the only answer to the problem is rain - JH confirmed that this is still the case. AJ explained that there was no cost effective solution to the problem and that the response was to apply a TSR until the earthwork movement had stopped and then tamp to restore the geometry. There was scope to remove some of these TSRs more quickly if the necessary access for tamping could be agreed.</p> <p>AJ explained that a key theme of the new guidance documents for track engineers was specifying timely intervention to prevent issues developing rather than waiting for failures. There was a lot to do to get people understanding and applying the new processes as they represented a significant culture change.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p><b>1610_15</b></p>	<p>JH concluded by noting that the governance focus remained strong with most DRAMs engaged in conference calls and that in 3 months he expected to be reporting a reduction in total TSRs and the development of the recovery programme beyond cyclic top.</p> <p>MH wondered what value the NTF reviews were adding. JH responded that NTF had added significant value in getting focus on the issue and developing a common understanding of the underlying problems.</p> <p>DC expressed disappointment with annex 3 to the paper – it was not clear about engineering allowances and showed that NR was still not taking account of the actual impact of TSRs. She questioned whether the impact of planned TSRs – which could be mitigated through delivering higher handback speeds - was a bigger performance issue than cyclic top.</p> <p>MH noted that WCML and GWML were both largely free of TSRs and asked where the main performance impacts were. TS agreed that other main lines were generally OK, but that Wessex and South East routes were suffering, partly because they were not classed in the top Route Criticality band by NR. A lot of TSRs lasting fewer than 7 days - that are not in the headline totals - were having a big impact. PB said that the focus on clearing TSRs from the WCML has been a major factor in the performance improvement and suggested there were lessons that could be learnt.</p> <p>JH agreed that the next TSR report to the January NTF would address analysis of best practice on Routes where TSR issues had been reduced, and show a clear focus on tackling TSRs causing the largest performance impacts. AP asked to see evidence that the priorities for TSR removal – as agreed by TOCs / FOCs with NR based on performance impact - were being dealt with.</p>	<p><b>JH</b></p>	<p><b>18 January NTF</b></p>
<p><b>1610_16</b></p>	<p>It was noted that the NR work in 2013 showed how the impact of TSRs is understated and that this paper would be circulated with the NTF notes.</p>	<p><b>DB</b></p>	<p><b>Now</b></p>
	<p><b>Paper F – IIA</b></p> <p>IF summarised the themes emerging from an ongoing series of interviews with Route and TOC performance managers. Key points were that there was no driver of significant performance</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	improvement identified in CP6, and that the lack of the right investment framework was frequently cited as a blocker to worthwhile performance improvement schemes. TS noted that the changes to the principles (and awareness of) delay repay would drive a big change in the incentives to improve performance.		
<b>1610_17</b>	The recommendations in the paper were endorsed, subject to IF being asked to identify the issues that could be tackled in advance of the IIA / CP6 plans, and propose how and where these are best taken forward quickly.	<b>IF</b>	<b>23 November NTF</b>
<b>1610_18</b>	<b>Paper H – Vegetation management in CP6</b> MH stated that operators were unhappy with the paper as it seemed to be saying – two years before the start of CP6 – that not all Routes would be compliant with the vegetation management policy. He asked that NR facilitate a meeting with DfT and ORR to address this and to report back to NTF.	<b>PH</b>	<b>18 January NTF</b>
<b>1610_19</b>	All slides used on the day will be circulated with the meeting notes.	<b>DJ</b>	<b>4 November</b>
	<b>Next meeting:</b> PH said that Priestman Goode, a design consultancy who have developed alternative seating configurations that could improve capacity, had offered to host the next NTF meeting at their offices in Great Portland St. They would make a short presentation.		

Other attendees: Dominic Medway (DM), Denise Wetton (DW), Fiona Dolman (FD), Andy Jones (AJ), Louise Carvey (LC), James Mackay (JM).