

NOTES / ACTIONS from 15th March 2017 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>MH opening remarks</p> <p>MH thanked Nigel Jones for his contribution to NTF over several years and welcomed Richard Clarke as the new DB Cargo rep.</p> <p>MH welcomed Paul MacMahon (FNPO) and Richard Schofield (Anglia) as the NR RMD reps, Jake Kelly (for Tim Shoveller), Alex Foulds (for Nick Brown), Gus Dunster (for Peter Broadley) and John Thompson (for Kevin Frazer).</p> <p>Apologies received from Rick Davey.</p>		
	<p>RDG Board feedback</p> <p>GC reported that a paper on the NTF Performance Plan (a high-level version of Paper C to this meeting) had been presented to RDG Board, and offered to share it with any member if they wanted it. There was strong Board support for reaffirming and strengthening the role of NTF in tackling performance improvement, with NTF’s role in performance dialogue with the Government being highlighted. There was a steer from NR that the plan should not be described as a “national” plan - some other term should be used.</p> <p>The Board asked that GC return to the RDG Board in June with specific proposals, and asked PP and GC to review whether NTF should report directly to the Board rather than chart to Planning and Production Board.</p> <p>PH queried how an enhanced NTF role would fit with the new Route Supervisory Boards. GC said this would need to be considered in the development of the NTF Plan. MH added that he was attending the pilot Route Board in Western Route.</p>		
	<p>Planning & Production Board Meeting 21 February</p> <p>GC noted that P&PB had been briefed on the performance input to the IIA.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1703_01</p> <p>1703_02</p> <p>1703_03</p>	<p>Paper A – Period 12 report</p> <p>DM summarised P12 performance noting that PPM was 1.4 PPM points behind plan, with the year-end forecast PPM MAA at 87.7%. The number of TSRs had risen after a few periods of reduction – JS clarified that the number of unplanned TSRs had fallen, but there had been an increase in planned TSRs following renewal / enhancement works that was typical for this time of year.</p> <p>Storm Doris had a very severe impact on performance. The weather forecasts had been fairly accurate; several blanket speed restrictions had been applied and some contingency timetables put in place. Performance had been very poor – did the industry try to run too many trains? AP felt that TOCs and NR had been too cautious in implementing the right contingency plans. MH responded that the principal issue had been lines blocked by fallen trees that could not be planned for, and noted that the industry would have been criticised for any perceived over-reaction to the weather forecasts. PH added that LNW Route had held off imposing a blanket speed for as long as possible.</p> <p>Reviews of Storm Doris performance had been carried out by each Route. DM to bring a paper to the May NTF meeting collating the output from these reviews and drawing out key lessons learned.</p> <p>DM showed a breakdown of PPM by service group showing those that had improved or declined over the last 5 years, and the NR Exec report on the DPI action plans. The DPI programme report (part of the NTF Better Operations Theme) will be shared with NTF members from April.</p> <p>MH noted that there was already an action for SWT to be invited to NTF under “Three Reds”, and proposed that Scotrail should be invited for “Three Greens”.</p>	<p>DM</p> <p>DM</p> <p>DB/DJ</p>	<p>10 May NTF</p> <p>12 April NTF (papers)</p> <p>10 May NTF</p>
	<p>Paper B - Route Scorecards 2017/18</p> <p>DW introduced the paper noting that the NR Board had signed off the scorecards. AP repeated that he felt the weighting of performance measures in the scorecards was too low but accepted that the process was now complete for 2017/18. PW noted the variation in measures between Routes and said that the DfT wanted to see more consistency in the metrics in CP6. NTF endorsed the scorecards noting that</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<p>1703_04</p> <p>1703_05</p> <p>1703_06</p>	<p>there were caveats from several members. <i>Post-meeting note:</i> All TOC/FOC members have been asked to advise DB by 22 March whether they are content to sign-off the scorecards.</p> <p>MH queried how the national PPM figure would come together and how ORR would review performance outputs. GR said that the PPM figures agreed in the Performance Strategies were the regulated outputs, if these were not met then ORR would view Route scorecards as a source of evidence about whether NR had done everything reasonably practical to meet customer requirements.</p> <p>DM said his team were in the process of collating the performance strategy figures and calculating the resulting national PPM figure and comparing with the Route Scorecard numbers. A note summarising the final figures will be circulated as soon as possible.</p> <p>This information will form part of the PDG briefing to Paul Maynard on 27 March.</p> <p>GC said that the key question was whether NTF members were content with the planned PPM figures and the scale of the shortfall against the PR13 PPM output. Any members who are not happy with the figures when circulated should contact MH/GC. A conference call to discuss would be set up if necessary.</p>	<p>DM</p> <p>GC/PH</p> <p>All</p>	<p>By 12 April NTF (papers)</p> <p>27 March PDG</p> <p>tbc</p>
	<p>Paper C – Reasserting role of NTF and proposal for a National Performance Plan</p> <p>IF introduced the paper – highlighting the challenge, existing components of the plan and possible enhancements. FD challenged the suggestion that “more governance” was required - it was agreed that clear – rather than more - governance was the intent. JK stressed that any NTF activity should be deliver tangible improvement and physical changes in activity.</p> <p>PH objected to the inclusion in Appendix B of the suggestion that sponsorship of the DPI improvement programme could switch from NR to NTF – as there had been no discussion with NR. <i>Post-meeting note:</i> This was an error in Appendix B – it had not been intended to propose any change in sponsorship of the DPI improvement plan.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1703_07	<p>MH sought views on whether NTF should undertake more intrusive reviews. AP said it was important for NTF monitor whether people did what they said they were going to do. IF said that the formal Peer Review process followed for projects by NR's Investment Projects team was valuable and might be a model for review of performance strategies. GC highlighted the past success of the Three Reds challenge process in stimulating improvement activity. JK suggested that the NTF emphasis should be on challenging non-delivery of outcomes rather than challenging the detail of plan inputs.</p> <p>Detail of the proposed performance plan and the role of NTF will be worked up for review at the May NTF meeting, informed by meetings with members and review of drafts. A note on the process will be circulated with these notes.</p>	DB	22 March and following
1703_08	<p>Paper D - Autumn 2016 Review</p> <p>John Edgley was introduced as the new Chair of the Adhesion Working Group. BH introduced the review spelling out the help needed from NTF in supporting the continuation of the AWG Task Force to review Autumn preparation and the delivery of the 2107 Autumn review recommendations – particularly TOC attendance at SeaJITS all year round (not just late Summer) and in reporting sub-optimal traction.</p> <p>RW highlighted severe problems with wheel flats due to the Routes stopping RHTT circuits too early while leaves were still falling. JK also reported serious issues with wheel flats – the TOC had only just managed to avoid a much more serious performance impact.</p> <p>MH said that the AWG was looking at fitment of WSP to old DMU fleets and reviewing the business case and would involve the DfT as appropriate. It was necessary to challenge ROSCOs about realistic assumptions for how long these fleets will remain in service.</p> <p>BH highlighted the 98% delivery of RHTT treatment against plan. AP requested a breakdown of this figure by Route as it did not tally with his TOCs' experience.</p>	BH	22 March

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1703_09	The recommendations in the paper were all endorsed. Any operators who have objections with adopting multiple sanding or providing full information on sub-optimal traction should explain their reasons to NTF.	TOC/FOC members	By 12 April
1703_10	PW asked that BH meet with the DfT to share the Autumn review work in more detail.	AM/BH	By 30 April
1703_11	BH to bring paper to July NTF with update from AWG task Force on Autumn 2017 preparation.	BH	5 July NTF
1703_12	<p>Paper E – Q3 Performance Strategy Reviews</p> <p>DM introduced the paper, noting the link to the earlier discussion on the role of NTF. He suggested that TOCs should chair alternate quarterly reviews as there was a perception that the meetings were an NR process and not an NTF one. There was support for a full review of the content of the strategies at the start of the year.</p> <p>The low attendance of TOC and Route MDS was noted. RS responded that the key to success was the quality of the ongoing discussion rather than who was in the room at the review – noting that there was no correlation between MD attendance and good performance outcomes. MH concluded that NTF encouraged MDs to participate in the review process but was not going to enforce attendance.</p> <p>FD noted that the PPRP process had been established at the start of CP4 since when the industry had changed with the move to devolution and the start of Route Boards. It would be appropriate to consider whether the PPRP process was working effectively. MH added that he was not sure the PPRP tools were widely understood and applied. Post meeting note NTF secretariat will discuss issue with National Performance Team and report back.</p>	DJ/DM	10 May NTF
	<p>Paper F – Schedule 8 TOC-on-TOC proposed change</p> <p>JM introduced the paper setting out that the key issue was whether the change in responsibility for TOC-on-TOC would have an adverse impact on incentives to recover service after an incident. The RDG response to ORR’s consultation proposed that the decisions on making a change should only be made in the light of a proper impact assessment endorsed by NTF.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1703_13	<p>OB said that the consultation and the response both lacked any reference to the actual wording of Schedule 8 and the Network Code which make clear that NR is responsible for managing the recovery – if the TOC is not in control it should not bear the cost. PS clarified NR’s position as supporting the detailed impact assessment but supporting the change in principle as they want TOCs exposed to the actual delay that they cause, and that the change would make the regime more accurate.</p> <p>GR said that ORR was consulting on the proposed change and would not make a final decision until late 2018 – and will need to see evidence of the adverse consequences that people have asserted will follow. NJ challenged the claim that the change in the FOC regime was seen as “successful” – the Freight operators did not agree.</p> <p>AP said he preferred option 1 in the paper – no change – unless the impact assessment proved that option 2 would be beneficial to performance. MH questioned what problem ORR were trying to solve in proposing the change – he had not seen any evidence that TOCs were not behaving appropriately.</p> <p>OB said that ORR had lost sight of the original purpose of Schedule 8. GR replied that ORR had already consulted on the purpose and NJ responded that RDG’s consultation response had said Schedule 8 should be left alone.</p> <p>It was agreed to go ahead with option 2 – setting up a task and finish group (T&FG) to carry out the impact assessment (IA) and report back to NTF. <i>Post-meeting note:</i> DJ/JM/SP to identify suitable people for the T&FG and for the IA to be presented to NTF in May.</p>	DJ/JM/SP	10 May NTF
	<p>Paper G – Better Operations</p> <p>DJ summarised the position in development of the workstreams and governance since the April 2016 NTF workshop.</p> <p>MH noted that a key element of service recovery and reducing DPI was empowering staff on the front-line to make decisions rather than referring to senior managers. PB added that this was a key principle in the joint disruption programme activity (next item).</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Paper H – Joint Disruption Programme</p> <p>PB provided an overview of the programme as it closes at the end of this month - setting out what had been achieved and how activity was transitioning to business as usual.</p> <p>MH thanked PB and the BTP for their work on the Programme and PW highlighted the value of BTP input into Gold Command.</p>		
1703_14	<p>Papers for Noting / AOB</p> <p>Paper J – Performance Messaging</p> <p>PW reiterated the need for DfT and RDG Comms teams to link up on the performance narrative to be more positive about the good work being carried out and the areas of improvement.</p>	DJ/SG	10 May NTF
	<p>Paper K – WR&CC</p> <p>MH noted the publication of the new NR Strategy and the note in the paper on how NTF wished to engage. It was noted that this would be addressed in a paper to the June meeting.</p>		
	<p>AOB - CP6 Metrics</p> <p>MH noted the decision not to show the breakdown of cancellations by cause in the RDG reporting of the new performance metrics. <i>Post-meeting note:</i> The updated RDG website with the CP6 metrics is scheduled to go live w/c 10th April.</p>		
	<p>Next meeting: 10 May 2017. Papers for review by correspondence will be circulated on 12 April.</p>		

Other attendees: Dominic Medway (DM), Denise Wetton (DW), Iain Flynn (IF), John Edgley (JE), Brian Haddock (BH), Peter Swatridge (PS), James Mackay (JM), Steve Price (SP), Paul Brogden (PB)