

NOTES / ACTIONS from 15th February 2017 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>MH opening remarks</p> <p>Apologies received from Oliver Bratton and Rick Davey.</p> <p>MH welcomed Rob McIntosh (LNE) and Richard Schofield (Anglia) as the NR RMD reps and Andrew Monk representing Kevin Frazer.</p>		
	<p>PDG Feedback</p> <p>GC and PW reported on the PDG meeting. The Minister had challenged them on what had changed since he took office and how improvement was going to be delivered. GC replied that NTF was more purposeful and had agreed the narrative in the IIA that punctuality is the top priority for CP6. NTF needed to be more assertive in driving improvement and requires support from DfT and ORR around the IIA priorities. The Minister was supportive of the NTF IIA position and wants NTF to produce a National Performance Plan / Framework to demonstrate how performance improvement will be delivered and to track progress. GC had agreed to bring proposals - via NTF - to 20 March PDG, stressing that performance is delivered locally by TOCs and Routes.</p> <p>PW emphasised that Ministers see NTF as the only place for a joined-up industry discussion about performance.</p> <p>There was some discussion about a national plan / framework in the context of increasing devolution. TS said the performance picture across the network was more varied than it had been in the past when there had been common problems across the network. There are now very different issues in different areas and it is important that these are tackled locally. A Framework with Routes/TOCs pursuing their own top 5 issues was more appropriate than a single national plan. Others agreed that everyone had to deliver their own local performance plans and that NTF had a role in providing help and support, sharing best practice, and tackling blockers and structural issues as well as holding members to account for delivering their plans. [See also final item – paper E]</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1702_01	<p>Paper A – People impact on performance</p> <p>SR summarised the paper, highlighting the example of Southeastern PPM declining substantially during the morning peak despite there being no significant incident, and asking whether the industry is doing enough to manage customers.</p> <p>PW welcomed the paper saying that DfT recognised the need to stop increasing the pressure on limited resources by squeezing more people and more trains in without addressing the performance impacts. There is a need to consider taking trains out and to address recovery time and the sufficiency of access to undertake engineering works (e.g. shorter operating days on Mon-Wed). FD reminded members of the work done by the Industry Access Programme to facilitate evaluation of alternative access options. [<i>Post-meeting note</i> - this included successful trials of increased Mon-Wed night access on Southeastern].</p> <p>TS stressed that it was important not to appear to be blaming customers for performance, and said the behaviour and sufficiency of platform staff were critical factors, with a need to improve operational discipline.</p> <p>MH cited MTR in Hong Kong and LUL as successfully maintaining or improving operational performance at the same time as accommodating substantial growth. NB agreed that the industry has much to learn from LUL in managing passenger dispersal, for example, through excellent wayfinding, and said the industry needs to be more agile in tackling this.</p> <p>PB said he found that DfT tended to be resistant to any proposed changes to service level commitments that could improve performance. PW asked that anyone having such issues with DfT should raise them directly with him.</p> <p>SR to take forward looking at best practice elsewhere (LUL, MTR on TfL Rail and in Hong Kong) and to identify part(s) of the network where ideas could be tested – bringing a further paper to the May meeting.</p>	SR/DM	May NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1702_02	RW said that Northern had done some detailed work on customer movements at Manchester Victoria which had produced some useful insight into behaviour and how it might be influenced. He agreed to bring a paper to the May NTF on the learning from this study.	RW	May NTF
1702_03	<p>P11 Performance Report</p> <p>DM noted that P11 performance had been better than recent periods, helped by benign weather. 11 TOCs had met their PPM targets and Virgin West Coast had beaten theirs by a substantial margin. The Lewisham derailment had a severe impact on Southeastern.</p> <p>It was agreed that GWR and SWT should be called in under “Three Reds” for the next meeting and that Merseyrail be lined up for “Three Greens” at a subsequent meeting.</p> <p>A conversation later in the meeting reminded NTF members that the questions TOCs and Routes are asked to answer in a “Three Reds” session are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are you not on plan? 2. What are you doing to get back to plan? 3. What help do you need from NTF or from organisations represented at NTF? 4. When will you be on plan? <p>And the NTF to consider - Should the TOC and Route be asked to attend PDG?</p>	DB/DJ	15 March NTF
	<p>Gibb Review</p> <p>It was noted that the report was not yet ready for publication and the item was deferred to a future meeting.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1702_04	<p>Paper B – ‘Three Reds’ – LNE/Great Northern</p> <p>RMcI summarised the key points from the paper. GN performance has been in decline for some time although the last two periods have been encouraging. Issues include the impact of suicides, evacuation of the Kings Cross PSB (exacerbated by the Fire Brigade being sent to the wrong location), rough rides on some routes, poor VTEC fleet performance, the ageing GN fleet, shortage of drivers, and poor management of critical assets by NR.</p> <p>Improvement actions include suicide prevention works at stations, improved positioning of response staff based on data analysis, a focus on managing single points of failure of assets, and driver recruitment and training. The new COO and SIO roles are having a positive impact on operations, and the route had learned from LNW/VWC collaboration and now had track engineers taking cab rides on the Hertford loop to address track quality issues and rough ride reports.</p> <p>It is anticipated that GN performance will be back on plan by the summer.</p> <p>TS acknowledged the VTEC fleet issues and explained that they were now using some additional Class 90s, enabling acceleration of works to the Class 91 fleet.</p> <p>RMcI also noted that clear service recovery principles had been agreed with operators and were now in use. MH said he had seen these and asked that they be circulated in order that other members could learn from them.</p>	RMcI	By 22 Feb
	<p>Route Scorecards</p> <p>DW gave an update on scorecards for 2016/17 which had been reviewed by NR Exec on Monday 13th. All operators had engaged in the process and the Level 2 scorecards for individual customers were considered a success. The ‘must wins’ had been removed from scorecards – with the exception of DPI which all parties had agreed should be included. The ‘Your Voice’ measure had also been removed. DW has an action to explain to operators how the scorecards will cascade into individual objectives.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1702_05	<p>DW added that Routes had agreed their own approaches to the weighting of customers within the overall Route scorecard – rather than a consistent national approach being used as had been discussed at the previous NTF.</p> <p>MH invited members to comment on whether the scorecards were agreed. No issues were raised with the structure of the scorecards and definition of metrics, but some members noted that the specific performance targets had not yet been agreed.</p> <p>GR asked whether the scorecard approach was working. PB responded that the inclusion of a specific measure for Anglo-Scottish services in 2016/17 had been effective in driving improvement.</p> <p>It was noted that the scorecards contained a mixture of PPM and the new CP6 performance metrics. MH asked how this came together at corporate level. DW confirmed that the national scorecard would have an aggregate PPM figure. DW to share the NR national scorecard – including national PPM – at the March NTF as early as possible and not later than NTF paper deadline (16:00 08 March).</p>	DW	15 March NTF
1702_06	<p>MH asked that the Q4 performance strategy reviews look for evidence of supporting plans to deliver the scorecard performance outputs. RMCI questioned the value of the quarterly reviews in “marking my homework”. TS said that - through the review process - NTF needed to hear <u>why</u> performance strategies were not meeting their targets and what was being done to close the gap. No one is, or has ever sought, to mark homework.</p>	DB/DM	7 June NTF
1702_07	<p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> it is important that lessons learned from the process of agreeing the 2017/18 scorecards are fed into the consideration of CP6 scorecards through the PR18 working group.</p>	DW/DJ	tbc
1702_08	<p>Paper C – CP6 Metrics</p> <p>SG summarised the key questions in the paper reflecting feedback from industry comms stakeholders. Members agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “on time” should be used, not “within 59 seconds”; 		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1702_09</p> <p>1702_10</p> <p>1702_11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>average</i> passenger lateness should be published, rather than <i>total</i> passenger lateness; • the current cancellation causes split should be used – but the definitions rewritten in plain English. <p>Members also agreed to recommend that all TOCs should publish the metrics on their own websites – commencing as early as practicable. TOC members were asked to declare any objections to this by the end of the week.</p> <p>A quarterly report on what is published on TOC websites will be provided to NTF.</p> <p>GR agreed to share what ORR intend to publish, and when, with NTF for comment.</p>	<p>SG</p> <p>TOC members</p> <p>DJ</p> <p>GR</p>	<p>When ready</p> <p>17 Feb</p> <p>10 May NTF</p> <p>10 May NTF</p>
	<p>Paper D - TRIP Update</p> <p>FD presented the paper, highlighting that the project had arrived at a key milestone after two and a half years of activity reviewing the accuracy of the rules used to build the timetable (running times, dwell times, junction margins). More than 2 000 changes had been proposed and consulted with operators and Version 2 of the Timetable Planning Rules - reflecting NR’s decisions following consultation - had been published. Friday 17th February is the deadline for operators to accept or trigger formal dispute.</p> <p>FD said that there had been very good industry collaboration – but that some disputes were expected which could relate to adverse impacts on capacity, journey times, service level commitments or the underlying methodology for proposing changes. The agreed industry derogation process had already been triggered for South West Trains and London Midland (cross Birmingham services). The Access Disputes Committee had been lined up with a view to ensuring that disputes could be resolved before the new timetable is produced. PB asked whether there were sufficient resources to handle this activity and FD confirmed that there were.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	MH reiterated the need to capture information about disputed outcomes and agreed work-arounds. FD confirmed that the programme would record where and why they were unable to use accurate timetable rules, and when it would be possible to revisit these (e.g. franchise change).		
	AP noted that there were concerns in Scotland over the adequacy of the analysis of the overall performance impact and would follow-up with FD outside the meeting. PW observed that awareness of TRIP at DfT was limited and that he would invite FD to present to the DfT Rail Board and to brief his team in more detail.		
1701_12	<p>Paper E – National Performance Framework</p> <p>The paper was not reviewed in detail owing to limited time. It was agreed that a further paper should be produced for the March meeting, with a proposal for a National Framework, reflecting the discussion earlier in the meeting.</p> <p>PH said that he did not support the suggestion of NTF taking a Client role for some projects currently being led by NR. PH also noted that Mike Gurtenne was taking over leadership of the National Performance team and would get involved with NTF, including having some input to the Framework.</p>	IF/DB	15 March NTF
	Next meeting: 15 March 2017		

Other attendees: Dominic Medway (DM), Simon Reay (SR), John Halsall (JH), Denise Wetton (DW), Seb Gordon (SG), Stephen Draper (SD), Iain Flynn (IF), Jamie Thomas (JT).