

## ACTIONS FROM 14 January 2015 NTF MEETING

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
<b>15 1401/01</b>	<p><b>FGW / Western – Three Reds: Mark Hopwood and Patrick Hallgate</b></p> <p>Highlighted that the Christmas engineering programme was the largest ever undertaken on the Route but Easter and Christmas 2015 will be larger still so there is a real need to get the discipline and contingency arrangements right. An immediate improvement in PPM MAA is expected as the effects of last year’s flooding is lost from the data. Overall Network Rail is worse than plan, TOC on TOC is worse than plan, TOC on self is on plan. NR asset reliability is improving, the biggest risk is incidents in the Thames Valley. Fleet performance is not good enough nor meeting plan for class 165 – issues with the RoSCo (Angel - C6 overhaul) and the class 166 fleet being at the edge of their performance capability. Discussion brought out member concern / prior experience where heavy maintenance periodicity can be / is extended without increasing safety risk by virtue of the analysis undertaken and mitigations applied but the same consideration isn’t perhaps given with respect to the reliability risk this may import.</p> <p>Suicides and the Investment Programme are the major causes of external imposed delay on the Route and TOC. Reactionary delay and specification loss are an issue to be addressed through PPRP and timetable change. A paper to NTF regarding understanding the impact of investment projects as a two part piece of work was agreed at NTF in November, part 1 (analysis) is in hand, part 2 (industry interviews) is not funded NR (Iain Flynn) reports will review this when part 1 reports to NTF.</p> <p>A learning point brought out in discussion is to ensure Route assets that are rarely used but will be needed during engineering work are thoroughly tested before they are needed and those that become critical during the work are, if necessary, supported with additional human resource and condition monitoring for the duration of their use.</p> <p>Mark and Patrick expressed confidence that they will be on plan at the end of year 2.</p> <p><b>AGA / Anglia – Three Reds – Jamie Burles and Richard Schofield</b></p> <p>Jamie Burles and Richard Schofield presented their plan to recover performance in Anglia: The three areas needing attention are Track Faults, Fatalities and Fleet. They described work to improve awareness of key performance metrics through visualisation tools, driving a refresh of right time principles at Liverpool Street, and advised that TSRs, managing vegetation and Fleet are all improving off the back of a good autumn performance.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Alstom’s ability to supply 321 traction motors remains a concern, but Fleet more widely has over 125 improvement plans in place.</p> <p>They forecast being 1PPM point behind plan at the end of year 1 and on plan, or better, by the end of year 2.</p> <p>Arising from the two reports the meeting discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the performance risks that the Thameslink and Crossrail programmes will bring with respect to transferring delay more widely across the network;</li> <li>• the impact of suicides on performance and staff (note – a paper from the National suicide Prevention Group will be scheduled for a future NTF to address this);</li> <li>• the need for metrics in CP6 that better reflect the job that railway is trying to do including identification of key locations (nodes) where performance should be measured and specifically managed; (Note from Gary Cooper – NR initial thinking (Stephen Draper) on types of measure is scheduled to come to NTF this side of Easter 2015)</li> <li>• the recurring concern that the railway repeatedly falls into the trap of under-maintaining ‘key’ track assets which have the greatest potential to disrupt when failed, because of difficulty with securing access, and then suffering the consequential reliability problems and the need for premature replacement (this is part of the RDG APSCM workstream);</li> <li>• the repeated re-learning / rebranding of condition monitoring initiatives and critical asset drives.</li> </ul> <p>Actions arising from the discussions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. NR to bring proposals to NTF to develop the key node proposal and how NR will manage delay carried from one part of the network to another, noting particularly the significant increase in risk of this from the Crossrail and Thameslink programmes.</li> <li>b. Fleet Challenge to be asked to specifically develop a workstream / activity within its programme to assess the risk of future diesel national fleet reliability – given age, and probably the need to operate longer than planned.</li> <li>c. Neal Lawson to bring a paper to NTF to note as part of the better assets NTF theme showing how NR is learning lessons from the Fleet community and improving maintenance practices.</li> </ol>	<p><b>RF</b></p> <p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>NL</b></p>	<p><b>RF to confirm to DM</b></p> <p><b>Fleet challenge advised</b></p> <p><b>11 March NTF</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>d. Neal Lawson to bring a paper to NTF to note regarding the work of the National Suicide Strategy in reducing delay to trains and trauma to staff</p> <p>Invited to comment, attending his first NTF meeting, Pete Wilkinson confirmed that the Department is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• open to discuss whatever is required to enable sensible business decisions regarding performance to be made between TOCs and NR;</li> <li>• wanting a discussion on how we measure performance and where we measure it;</li> <li>• seeking realism from the NTF in its aspirations for performance.</li> </ul> <p>Adding that he personally wants Routes and TOCs to be focussed on running a Safe and Punctual Railway – do the day job.</p>	<p><b>NL</b></p>	<p><b>11 March NTF</b></p>
<p><b>15 1401/02</b></p>	<p><b>PIDD – Michael Roberts, Jason Durk, Chris Scoggins</b></p> <p>Michael Roberts and Jason Durk explained the updated position on the wording of the recommendations following discussions with Passenger Focus (PF) which had also raised a general concern around some of the implementation timescales for recommendations, stating that it had been explained to ORR that the agreed timescales are for whole industry alignment and that individual TOCs would be looking to progress actions at differing speeds. Michael Roberts said that the intent is for RDG sign off at its 27 January meeting based on NTF members’ agreement.</p> <p>Jason explained that the conversation with PF had led to further amendments to 7 of the recommendations since the NTF paper was published and these were to be examined by the RDG PIDD subgroup – Burchell, Barker, Chivers – and would then be shared with NTF – next week after the input from these three.</p> <p>Chris Burchell strongly stressed the need for TOCs to ensure the national plan is reflected in their local plans and reminded members that these plans are to be published – in a way each business sees fit – and that the ORR will be monitoring local compliance and progress. He asked NTF members to close out the discussion and get on with delivering.</p> <p>Michael Roberts, responding to a question raised by Peter Wilkinson, explained that TFL are now receiving a feed from Darwin to allow for a more coordinated response.</p> <p>Actions agreed:</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>a. Amendments to the wording following the Passenger Focus meeting are to be shared in correspondence w/c 19/01.</p> <p>b. Mark Hopwood highlighted the need for members to take responsibility for the leadership of a customer need / passenger information culture within their businesses. There is a need to cascade the actions and principles throughout the industry.</p>	<p><b>JD</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p>	<p><b>By 21/01</b></p> <p><b>Ongoing</b></p>
<p><b>15 1401/03</b></p>	<p><b>PPRP Phase 2 – Greg Sugden and Fiona Dolman</b></p> <p>Greg outlined the three key parts of the programme, which is an NTF National Performance Workstream under the Better Timetables Theme, they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gathering and analysing data;</li> <li>• consulting and agreeing the changes to TPRs;</li> <li>• future system capability.</li> </ul> <p>He clarified the proposed PPM benefit from the PPRP work shown in the paper was based on a contribution towards national PPM rather than each Operator’s individual PPM improvement.</p> <p>Jan Chaudhry noted the need to implement non-controversial changes identified without delay and that there may be several types of controversial changes, some requiring infrastructure changes or franchise changes or DfT approval for existing franchise implementation. Pete Wilkinson confirmed the DfT will welcome sensible proposals for change within franchise.</p> <p>It was highlighted that, where the review identifies the need for TPR changes the industry agrees not to adopt, then the reason for not so doing should be recorded as a conscious decision.</p> <p>Members supported the work and agreed to engage their train planning teams to help them to see this is not a threat and something they should support. Dyan Crowther and Fiona cited that they had both found the need to personally lead their teams to the right behaviours.</p> <p>a. Greg asked members to support the continued feed of OTMR data to the programme, recognising the need to automate, as much as possible, the data gathering and analysis activities. He also asked for support from members in ensuring their organisations engage with the process and the methodology without simply defending their parochial interests.</p>	<p><b>GS</b></p> <p><b>TOCs</b></p>	<p><b>Part of process</b></p> <p><b>Now</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>b. Members were invited to provide Greg with the names of anyone they wanted to engage with this work or be on the advisory panel.</p> <p>c. Roger Cobbe requested the proposed method for determining TPRs be shared ASAP to allow members to form a view.</p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>GS</b></p>	<p><b>Now</b></p> <p><b>11 February NTF</b></p>
<b>15 1401/04</b>	<p><b>GPS Train Location Chris Docker and Rob Freeman</b></p> <p>The NTF reaffirmed support for this important enabling workstream that will support better timetables, better passenger information and better operations.</p> <p>a. Robin Gisby asked Chris Docker to recommend a way through the contractual issues relating to obligations for maintaining the equipment and ownership of the data.</p> <p>b. Rob Freeman outlined the plans to develop the system solution to store, process and analyse the collected GPS data. He will be holding a series of workshops through the NTFOG members during the 14 week feasibility process. He requested that NTF members ensure their Chief Information Officers were aware of the need for, and priority of, this work in order to line them up in support of the programme.</p> <p>c. Chris Burchell requested a high level delivery plan be shared with the NTF – this will be part of the workstream description.</p> <p>d. Rob was asked to consider accelerating the roll out as part of this workstream and to ensure that a communication plan brings the benefits of this proposal to the attention of other stakeholders and the Digital Railway directorate within NR.</p>	<p><b>CD</b></p> <p><b>TOCs</b></p> <p><b>RF</b></p> <p><b>RF</b></p>	<p><b>11 March NTF</b></p> <p><b>Now</b></p> <p><b>11 February NTF</b></p> <p><b>6 May NTF</b></p>
<b>15 1401/05</b>	<p>Papers B1 and B2 on the NTF Workstreams and administration were carried over to the February NTF and will be updated for that meeting. An important step forward is that there is no gap between the Mark Carne RDG performance priorities and the NTF workstreams and Themes a position endorsed by Mark and Chris in e-mail correspondence.</p>	<p><b>DM</b></p>	<p><b>11 February NTF</b></p>

Key to non NTF members: RF = Rob Freeman, JD = Jason Durk, GS = Greg Sugden, CD = Chris Docker