

## ACTIONS FROM 13 May 2015 NTF MEETING

| ACTION     | WHAT  | WHO             | WHEN       |
|------------|---|-----------------|------------|
| 15 1305/01 | <p><b>Industrial Action – unscheduled discussion Mark Langman</b></p>   |                 |            |
|            | <p>Mark explained that he will be leading the NR Strategic Management Centre to handle the response he agreed to add NTF members to the all industry e-mail distribution list that he / Phil Hufton are using.</p>  |                 |            |
|            | <p>He was invited to provide an update on Network Rail’s understanding and preparation for the anticipated RMT industrial action (post meeting note - strike has now called for 25 May, national conference calls for RDG and for TOC communications / commercial teams are in place).</p>  |                 |            |
|            | <p>Operators were asked to suggest a TOC representative to join the NR response team. This is to be picked up in the RDG conference call.</p>   | MR*             | First Call |
|            | <p>The driver diagrams scrutiny process was highlighted as Operators’ key time concern should short notice changes to timetables be required.</p>   |                 |            |
|            | <p>i) Mark requested that where Operators are considering strengthening their Control function for the duration of any strike action, please can he be informed of the plans.</p>   | TOC NTF members | When known |
|            | <p>ii) Mark was asked to include freight representation for the Strategic Management Centre.</p>  | ML*             | Now        |
| 15 1305/02 | <p><b>Customers priorities for train performance Mike Hewitson (Transport Focus) and John Connaughton (Illuminas)</b></p>   |                 |            |
|            | <p>John presented the conclusions of the research jointly commissioned by the ORR and Transport Focus</p>   |                 |            |
|            | <p>Key findings were that customers do not: trust the industry, identify with their local TOC, understand the current performance measures, read data / information that the industry provides.</p>   |                 |            |
|            | <p>Regarding a performance ‘target’ passengers believe the current CP5 punctuality target is unambitious and should be 95%+ - as high as 98%. Although, revealing the lack of understanding of PPM, they talked about cancellation levels of 2.5% on the basis that a significantly late train is, in effect, a cancellation.</p> |                 |            |
|            | <p>The lack of trust is such that passengers expressed views that a TOC would stop trying in order to ‘save money’ once a target for the day / period etc., had been met.</p>   |                 |            |

| ACTION            | WHAT  | WHO                          | WHEN  |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
|                   | <p>There was strong support in the study for right-time to be the measure of performance except for frequent (5 trains an hour or more) metro services.</p> <p>The DfT was asked to do more to create a level playing field on performance across rail, road and airlines.</p> <p>In response to a question from the chair regarding ‘next steps’, Gary Cooper reminded NTF that this is the start point for a process agreed at the 11 March NTF for agreeing performance measures for CP6.</p>  | <b>AM</b>                    | <b>Report back to a future NTF</b>                |
| <b>15 1305/03</b> | <p><b>IAP Update – Gary Walsh and Jo Connaughton</b></p> <p>Gary Cooper reminded members that IAP is being managed through APSCM and members should contact their reps on that group should they have specific concerns or queries. The programme is at NTF for members’ information only and any significant points should be raised through their RDG APSCM member.</p> <p>Phase 1 - Aiming for £28m benefit from costs and revenue from less disruptive possessions, primarily calculated through schedule 4 savings in CP5, through better process and management of possessions. Further work required to understand how this work ties in with the existing EAS process.</p> <p>Phase 2 – Jo Connaughton explained that phase 2 is looking to reduce the amount of planning errors and re-planning of possessions by defining the access slots that are required for engineering works and building it into the timetable, identifying and timetabling engineering trains earlier in the process, establishing a 12 month rolling timetable which will eventually become a baseline timetable.</p> <p>Gary Walsh to provide a paper to note clarifying the outcomes Phase 1 will deliver.</p> | <b>GW*</b>                   | <b>10 June NTF</b>                                |
| <b>15 1305/04</b> | <p><b>Managing Suicides – Mark Smith and Ian Stevens</b></p> <p>Members supported the proposal for a new group to drive the industry strategy on suicide but expressed a desire for the three groups to become two as soon as possible.</p> <p>i) Three new posts are proposed to deal with suicide prevention Ian Stevens to arrange for one of these to be an NR funded TOC representative within the ATOC Operations team.</p> <p>ii) Ian Stevens was asked to explore more radical approaches and develop a strategy along the lines of the cable theft approach.</p>   | <b>IS*</b><br><br><b>IS*</b> | <b>September 2015</b><br><br><b>September NTF</b> |

| ACTION     | WHAT  | WHO                                 | WHEN  |
|------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 15 1305/05 | <p><b>Transport Resilience Review – Chris Perkins and Richard Geldart</b><br/>Chris Perkins explained he would be handing over to Richard Geldart and that the majority of recommendations are now delivered. The DfT have agreed to extend the deadlines on the three recommendations which are currently behind target and Richard will return in September to provide a further update.<br/>NTF thanked Chris for his excellent work.</p>  |                                     |   |
| 15 1305/06 | <p><b>NTF Lead Indicators</b><br/>There was insufficient time to discuss this paper. Members were asked to review the proposed indicators and provide feedback to <a href="#">Dominic Medway</a></p>  | NTF Members                         | By 29 May                                       |
| 15 1305/07 | <p><b>Q4 Performance Reviews – Rob Freeman</b><br/>Rob explained that the Q4 reviews were improved from Q3 with TOC and Route MD input for each review.</p> <p>i) Members asked that the good practices identified and shared with TOCs after each round of reviews be shared with NTF members.</p> <p>ii) TOC members rejected the assertion that they are not putting forward improvement schemes, raising concerns over access to funding and the complexity of NR’s governance, with some stating that the new status of NR making it even harder. Rob Freeman is to produce a guidance note and asked for specific examples where ideas have been rejected. DfT (Andy Murray) agreed to work with relevant people in DfT to unblock any specifics.</p> <p>iii) Gary Cooper and Andy Murray offered to work with RDG Policy Director and NR nominees from Paul Plummer’s team if necessary to review the generic process, pending what comes out of the specifics raised in June.</p> | <p>RF</p> <p>RF/AM</p> <p>GC/AM</p> | <p>June NTF</p> <p>June NTF</p> <p>July NTF</p> |

\*Key to non NTF members: GW = Gary Walsh, IS = Ian Stevens, ML = Mark Langman, MR = Michael Roberts