

NOTES / ACTIONS from 18th January 2017 NTF meeting

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>MH opening remarks</p> <p>Apologies received from Nick Brown, Pete Wilkinson and Alan Pilbeam (represented by Matthew Stacey).</p> <p>MH welcomed Jon Shaw (NR Chief Engineer) and Rob Warnes (Arriva) as new NTF members, and John Halsall (SE) and Paul McMahon (F&NO) as the NR RMD reps.</p>		
	<p>DPI Reduction Plan Update</p> <p>KS provided an overview of the process by which NR Routes were developing and tracking plans to deliver target reductions in delay per incident (DPI). He noted that there was generally good engagement with TOCs and FOCs and BTP, and that they had visited LUL to look at their processes. He showed how activity was being developed under the themes of ‘predict and prevent’ and ‘recovery’, and the supporting metrics that had been identified. KS confirmed to MH that TOCs would be able to see these Route plans.</p> <p>MS noted the variation in performance between service groups and asked how well improvement plans were linked to local issues, and whether there was useful learning from where performance was better. TS questioned whether there was sufficient understanding of the root causes of the increase in DPI to focus activity in the right areas. For example, changes in staff behaviours would not show up in analysis of TRUST DA. He was still struggling to understand why performance had declined.</p> <p>JH responded that while there were a number of generic issues, and Routes were discussing and sharing their improvement plans, each Route was focused on its local priorities to give the best bang for the buck. PH added that this was why there was a focus on tackling the top 5 initiatives in each Route.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1701_01	The synergy with elements of the developing Better Operations theme activities was noted. It was agreed that DJ and KS would meet to review to avoid duplication of effort and encourage sharing of best practice.	DJ/KS	By 31 January
1701_02	DJ to speak to Andy Rivoire about including tracking performance trends by service group in the standard NTF period performance pack.	DJ	15 Feb NTF
1701_03	DM to consider how progress in DPI reduction is most effectively reported to NTF.	DM	15 Mar NTF
1701_04	<p>Paper A – Performance Report</p> <p>DM gave headlines from period 9 and 10. P9 had been awful with Autumn having a severe impact. GTR and Southeastern performance was particularly poor and the best day in the period had only reached 84.3% PPM.</p> <p>P10 had benefited from more benign weather and, while national PPM was still behind plan, the gap was smaller than it has been for most of this year. The Long Distance sector met the PPM target and most NR Routes had beaten their delay minute targets, some by a considerable margin.</p> <p>PH reported that he had met the Chair of the Delay Attribution Board (DAB) and supported the need for improvements in training.</p> <p>MH noted the decline in GN performance and asked that the reasons for this were addressed by NB at the February NTF meeting.</p>	NB	15 Feb NTF
1701_05	RW highlighted experience of a number of points failures the day after Boxing Day and questioned whether there was a wider issue with reliability of assets after spells with no services. It was noted that it was normal practice to swing points at these times. JS (NS) to investigate and advise – in correspondence - whether the post-Boxing Day failures were significant and any actions being taken.	JS	By 15 Feb NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	Paper B – IIA input for CP6		
<p data-bbox="190 879 304 911">1701_06</p> <p data-bbox="190 986 304 1018">1701_07</p>	<p data-bbox="342 355 1644 496">IF introduced the latest draft paper and sought views on key issues that needed to be removed or added. RW said it needed to be clearer that substantial change was required – the discussion of the NTF themes and work in progress did -not mean that everything was under control. GC added that the core message was the need for full funding of base OM&R plans for Railway Undertakings and NR.</p> <p data-bbox="342 520 1644 730">TS said it was important to make clear that the desired extra spend on performance would generate a payback to funders in increased industry revenue. The key was to find ways of funding schemes with an industry, but not individual, business case. RW noted that new franchise arrangements were giving TOCs significantly stronger incentives for performance investment. GC reported that DfT supported the inclusion of the performance fund in concept and for spending on base resourcing for resilience and performance.</p> <p data-bbox="342 754 1644 823">Members agreed that the table was helpful but that first column should refer to “current” rather than “business as usual”.</p> <p data-bbox="342 863 1644 932">IF to review draft of the NR Plan section of the IIA, and to circulate updated performance draft by close Thursday 19 Jan.</p> <p data-bbox="342 971 1644 1040">Phone conference to be held on Friday 20 January to sign off final version – with MH, GC, IF, DB, DJ, GR.</p>	<p data-bbox="1742 879 1787 911">IF</p> <p data-bbox="1742 986 1787 1018">DJ</p>	<p data-bbox="1899 879 2047 911">Completed</p> <p data-bbox="1899 986 2047 1018">Completed</p>
	<p data-bbox="342 1078 730 1110">Paper C – Route Scorecards</p> <p data-bbox="342 1150 1644 1291">DW presented an update on Route scorecards, noting the feedback received from customers, including views expressed at NTF, and described the changes made as a result, including change in the national / local balance of measures and the use of Level 2 scorecards for individual operators feeding the customer element of the overall scorecard.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1701_08	<p>MH asked whether TOC staff could be included in the workforce safety section of the scorecard. PM said that this has been agreed in principle with Freight customers for their scorecard – they were now looking at how to capture the necessary data to enable inclusion in 2017/18.</p> <p>Members asked how the weighting of the operators share of the scorecard total was being calculated, noting the need for consistency with other multi-operator allocation processes. DW to confirm the current assumptions to GC who would bring a proposal to NTF.</p>	DW / GC	15 Feb NTF
1701_09	<p>MH highlighted the objective of signing off scorecards at the next meeting and asked that all members ensure their organisations worked closely together to reach agreement on the scorecards and came to the 15 February NTF meeting prepared to confirm sign-off or explain outstanding issues.</p>	All	15 Feb NTF
1701_10	<p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> DW to provide briefing notes to GC who would issue to TOC MDs through the regular TOC MD update comms channel (rather than generate separate email).</p> <p>GR questioned how the scorecards were developed when franchise change was imminent. GC confirmed the principle that the incumbent operator leads any discussion and the DfT approves.</p>	DW	By 23 Jan
1701_11	<p>Paper D – Q2 Performance Strategy Reviews</p> <p>DM summarised the reviews, noting that it was still challenging to secure senior attendance. The added value from the review was partly a function of how good the regular dialogue was.</p> <p>Members reiterated that it is a requirement for all TOC and Route MDs to be attend these reviews. All members would remind their MDs of this in time for the Q3 reviews which are about to get underway.</p>	All	By 25 Jan
1701_12	<p>The Q3 review report should explicitly record MD attendance at the reviews. GC also stressed the importance of the report in capturing and sharing good practices.</p>	DM	Mar 15 NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1701_13	<p>There was some discussion on the value of reverting to using independent reviewers to lead the process reviews. OB noted that TfL were already doing this. It was agreed that GC and OB should review and develop a proposal for NTF in time to affect the Q4 reviews.</p>	GC/OB	5 July NTF
1701_14	<p>Paper E – TSR Reduction plan</p> <p>JH summarised progress with the plan, noting that a number of the key actions had been completed and were now being rolled out. The reduction in the total over the last two periods, partly due to addressing the recent increase due to embankment shrinkage due to the very dry summer, was encouraging but the real benefit of the workstreams was still to come. He confirmed that best practice from LNW and Western routes had been reviewed and shared through the programme.</p> <p>Members discussed the understanding of the performance impact, MH reiterating that campaigns to tackle local TSRs has always generated larger than anticipated performance benefits. JH said the key focus remained on driving down the number of TSRs rather than the detail of the performance impact. OB noted that the right time metric will be more directly affected by TSRs than PPM.</p> <p>TS questioned whether the deferral of renewals from CP5 was creating a further risk for TSRs. JH responded that the progressive move to ‘predict and prevent’ for TSRs would ensure the right work was done and would control this risk.</p> <p>MH asked for visibility of the TSRs having the greatest impact on each Route. JH agreed to provide some analysis of this – including plans for removal of the highest impact TSRs – for the next NTF update.</p> <p>Paper F – Fleet Challenge</p> <p>NB summarised fleet performance noting that the reliability improvement trend had flattened, but that Fleet Challenge remained confident that the end CP5 target would be met. PB asked whether there was challenge from TOCs to the supply chain to deliver improvements. NB confirmed that there was and noted that there was supply chain representation at Fleet Challenge. He added that cross industry</p>	JH	10 May NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
1701_15	<p>collaboration was improving, for example he had jointly presented to Fleet Challenge with LNW Route's Director of Asset Management on work to improve knowledge of the NR/train interface.</p> <p>RW said that the impact of Autumn had been prolonged, with the TOC still experiencing a lot of wheel flats into January and asked that this was considered in the formal Autumn review.</p> <p>The risks associated with the need to extend the life of existing diesel fleets because of the delays in electrification projects (affecting the introduction of new and cascade of existing fleets) was noted. This could require DfT support in ensuring that necessary work to life extend fleets was properly funded. NB was asked to review the potential funding requirements and ensure that any problems securing funding are escalated.</p>	NB	10 May NTF
1701_16	<p>It was also agreed that this risk should be flagged in the IIA document.</p> <p>Paper G – Non-track asset reliability</p> <p>JS summarised key asset reliability trends, noting that a continued reduction in incidents was still being outweighed by rising delay per incident. He outlined key ongoing improvement workstreams including a new 'design for reliability' standard, smarter use of intelligent infrastructure to optimise intervention regimes, a major overhaul of LED light engines, further improvements to new points installations, and OLE resilience improvements on LNE and LNW Routes.</p>	IF	By 31 Jan
1701_17	<p>MH asked for the data to be normalised for asset volumes, with reference to the increasing replacement of track circuits with axle counters</p>	NS	10 May NTF
1701_18	<p>TS asked whether there was an issue with the design of new S&C units as there appeared to have been a number of early life failures. JS agreed to check the data and advise.</p> <p>MH highlighted a recent project where 12 points failures had been experienced within 24 hours of a project handback and questioned whether best practice was being followed. RW noted recent good</p>	JS	By 18 Feb NTF

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>practice in completion of works at Neville Hill with follow-up work planned 24 hours later. PH also stressed the importance of follow-up works to ‘settle’ newly installed assets.</p> <p>Paper H – NTF-OG and NTF Better Operations Programme Board</p> <p>The proposals to suspend NTF-OG - with a review in September, to set up a Better Operations Programme Board, and for this Board to act as the client for Customer Experience During Disruption (CXDD) workstreams 2 and 3 were endorsed.</p>		
	<p>Next meeting: 15 February.</p>		

Other attendees: Dominic Medway (DM), Karl Smith (KS), Iain Flynn (IF), Denise Wetton (DW), Nigel Salmon (NS), Andy Jones (AJ).