

**ACTIONS / POINTS TO NOTE FROM 25 NOVEMBER 2015 NTF MEETING**

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
15 2511/01	<p><b>Current Performance</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper A1 - Performance Report NTF 1608 - JT</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper A2 - NTF 1608 Workstreams Update - DJ</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper A3 - NTF 1608 CP6 Trial Metrics - JC</a></p> <p>CB remarked on TSRs as part of Paper A1 that TSRs for period 8 are at the 2<sup>nd</sup> worst rate for 6 years, and drew attention to TOC on-self delays. Also mentioned the revised NR target for TSRs being 250.</p> <p>a) CB drew attention to Paper A2, specifically the issue of getting Fleet lead indicators. GC asked TOC / Owing Groups to support this information gathering. NTF members to direct the TOCs they represent to engage with Bryan Donnelly.</p> <p>b) Similarly the continuing absence of lead indicators for TSRs was also flagged and it was confirmed that the 20 January NTF paper will provide these.</p> <p>c) CB asked, and GC confirmed, that all paper A reports will be discussed at the January meeting in an item led by Dean Johnson as a fresh pair of eyes.</p>	<p><b>TOC NTF members</b></p> <p><b>PH</b></p> <p><b>DJ</b></p>	<p><b>Now</b></p> <p><b>January NTF</b></p> <p><b>January NTF</b></p>
15 2511/02	<p><b>Autumn to date – Iain Flynn</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper B1 - Autumn update - IF BH</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper B2 - Autumn 2015 – interim overview NTF 251115 - IF</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper B3 - Autumn 2015 NOADR 241115 - IF</a></p> <p>IF opening statement was that P7 was a plain ride and that 3% leaf fall was left within period 8 and that NR are expecting average leaf fall now, and Autumn is back on track. DC stating that GTR has low PPM and that NR plans for rail head treatment were okay, and during the season they took out Gatwick and Brighton services in achieving 85% PPM. IF drew attention to the positives of implementing Autumn timetables, with additional headways being key although the meeting noted that the GTR trial went beyond retiming's and into removal of services.</p> <p>TS expressed concern on an emerging trend of wheel flats, specifically for East Coast and EMT, drawing attention to the recent Anglia route issues too. TS stated the need to understand the pattern for damage, including why, given that the level and pattern of wheel flats appeared unusual compared to other autumns?</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>a) ATOC was asked to work with relevant TOCs to better understand the issue in time for the review sessions in early 2016</p> <p>b) TS stated that the number of station over-runs were better than previous years but given all the work done probably not as good as they could be. To be picked up in time for the end of year reviews*.</p> <p>c)*In the meeting IF agreed that the autumn review would report to the February NTF. Immediately at the end of the meeting MH and GC agreed that the remit for the 2015 review would be set by AWG and shared in correspondence with NTF before Christmas. This to cover issues raised in discussion such as rolling stock condition, signaller and driver briefing, infrastructure capability after renewals.</p> <p>d) NTF Delivery manager to schedule review for February NTF if it has been shared prior with NTF-OG.</p> <p>NTF members concerned that safety KPIs formed no part of the presentation – they had been requested and were provided on the day.</p>	<p><b>GC</b></p> <p><b>IF</b></p> <p><b>MH</b></p> <p><b>DJ</b></p>	<p><b>31/01/16</b></p> <p><b>31/01/16</b></p> <p><b>Before 24/12/16</b></p> <p><b>February NTF</b></p>
15 2511/03	<p><b>Remote Condition Monitoring – John Smith</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper C1 - RCM Programme Update – Infrastructure - JS</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper C2 - RCM Programme Update – Infrastructure - Appendix B - JS</a></p> <p>Members <b>again restated that</b> they expect a joint paper from ATOC and NR on asset RSC not separate papers – in order to ensure that interface opportunities between track and train RCM could be understood and delivered</p> <p>JS drew attention to three key areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. People – Flight Engineers in with controllers with strong structures in place in the Routes. Looking at having more RCM response teams in place in the future.</li> <li>ii. Process – Data analytic support was made available to NR through Birmingham University. Enhanced asset monitoring giving teams more time, information on failure types and reducing times to resolve the issues. In the longer term NR is looking at national strategic views at trend levels.</li> <li>iii. Support (Programme) – Out in the Routes now, but centrally a business improvement specialist is in place. More training to be setup, but a focus on more practical training at centres. Looking to up-skill the workforce. JS also reiterated that it is vital to understand local issues, and raised concerns that RCM is a distraction.</li> </ol> <p>MH raised issues with assets failing, not being spotted and queried of the total number of failures how many</p>	<p><b>NL/GC</b></p>	<p><b>Next Quarter</b></p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>were dealt with. JS stated that issues vary by route, but there has been a 15% improvement in the area of Track Circuits. DC stated that it is critical that staff members are passionate about RCM and a culture change is needed. JS remarked that the South East team were good and could demonstrate best practice and that the Wales Flight Engineer moved into HQ.</p> <p>PH stated that intervention is the key, getting the right intelligence and that standards do not always drive the best behaviours. There is a need to understand RCM on an asset level, using the intelligence of the train to monitor assets, and to interface over the two. JS stated it was complex and asked how do we bring it all together? GC confirmed that this has been raised repeatedly by NTF members and that it is for John and Bryan (Donnelly) to work on a joint paper to NTF, this was supported by the Chair. NL stated data coming from multiple sources is a challenge and GC reminded the NTF that NL is its Asset Champion and suggested to NTF agreement an action on JS and Bryan Donnelly to work with NL on bringing back to the NTF in March'16 a paper covering the use of intelligent trains, sharing good practice and forward plans.</p>	<p>NL/BD/JS</p>	<p>March NTF</p>
<p>15 2511/04</p>	<p><b>Initial Industry Plan – Stephen Draper</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper D - Performance Planning for CP6 Initial Industry Plan - SD</a></p> <p>SD outlined the timeline for the work, confirming that NTF is the industry lead for this activity which will input to the Initial Industry Plan for discussion with Government through the process led by Planning Oversight Group (POG). Responding to a query from CB, SD confirmed that the intent would be to use the new metrics trialled as part 1 of this work and reminded NTF that the issue of how schedule 4 and 8 are impacted is part 3 of the work and led by RDG Policy.</p> <p>TS suggested that a gap in our thinking is the consideration of revenue, and the link to business cases to improve performance. GC suggested that a proposed working group on this be established. TS questioned due to revenue sensitivity and commercial colleagues whether there is a ‘will’ from NTF to take this forward by expanding it to include members from the ATOC Commercial Schemes. CB drew attention to research and that the value of performance is required if meaningful trade off conversations are to be had with funders and specifiers.</p> <p>a. GC took an action to establish x3 key NTF members by next Wednesday and to liaise with the ATOC Managing Director Customer Experience over members with demand forecasting competence.</p> <p>SD drew attention to the request in the paper for TOCs to share information and provide a contact point.</p> <p>b. Paper next to come to NTF in March preferably, failing that May,</p>	<p>GC</p> <p>TOC NTF members</p> <p>DJ</p>	<p>02/12/2015</p> <p>Now</p> <p>Mar / May</p>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
			<b>NTF</b>
15 2511/05	<p><b>Train Location – Janine Fountain</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper E - Train Location Services Programme Update - JF</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper E2 - Train Location Services Update 2015-11-25 JF</a>            JF talked around slides provided at the meeting (see above Paper E2 DropBox hyperlink), reiterating that iTED is <b>not</b> a real-time tool, iTED <b>will not</b> store all data and <b>will not</b> replace Trust and that there is a delay to the role out now scheduled for early 2017. iTED will use real time and historical data.</p> <p>JF asked for NTF help in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When will fleet fitment take place? Both ATOC and NR have struggled to get responses from London Midland, Chiltern, Crosscountry, Great Western Railway and Heathrow Connect (and GTR noted post meeting).</li> </ol>		
	<p>This information is needed to inform the industry business case. Relevant NTF TOC members representing these TOCs to get back to JF by next Friday.</p>	<b>AM/MH/DC</b>	<b>04/12/2015</b>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Consider what would stop you from moving away from your currently performance analysis systems? Make sure to send an appropriate rep when a request comes out post-Christmas to attend the Phase 2 ITED Requirements Elaboration workshops.</li> </ol>	<b>All TOC members</b>	<b>January</b>
	<p>MH drew attention to Bugle and Compass, stating different systems need the cost implications and funding looking at. Furthermore that TOCs are not funded for these changes.</p> <p>MH then asked JF for confirmation on the possibility of TOCs moving away from Bugle to ITED. JF stated that TOC performance managers had told her that this is what was needed. In a move from Bugle to ITED FGW (and others) have 100-1000s of reports automatically running out of Bugle and they don't want to have to pay someone to recreate all of these in ITED. JF referenced the move away from static reporting and a change in culture being part of the solution. MH still wanted assurance that NR don't add to TOC costs in this regard. JF took an action to look into plans for creating static reports in ITED as part of Phase 2 and whether there is space to accommodate individual TOC requirements.</p> <p>JF reaffirmed TLS not being the TRUST replacement but MH asked what was being done to replace TRUST given that is the bigger need. JF explained the small steps approach with proving GPS, doing some attribution in ITED etc. but MH wanted to know more about NR TRUST replacement plans and this view was shared. JF took an action to come back to a future NTF with more info on replacement of TRUST – noting that the</p>	<b>JF</b>	<b>February NTF</b>
		<b>JF</b>	<b>February NTF</b>

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>greatest challenge is likely to be commercial.</p> <p>c. Get onto the new national GPS Gateway. This will be ready summer 2016 and the more Operators prepared to interface with the Gateway by then the earlier they will realise the benefits of GPS (contact via ATOC Customer Info Strategy Work steam – lead Kathryn Daniels).</p> <p>MH sought clarity on the potential for two systems running side by side. JF replied that official reporting will still be through TRUST, but including GPS data. JF also stated that the programme is engaging with the Delay Attribution Board to resolve any immediate problems. JF took an action to come back to the NTF with more on the route to using GPS in delay attribution.</p>	<p><b>JF</b></p>	<p><b>February NTF</b></p>
<p>15 2511/06</p>	<p><b>Analysing performance of TfL Rail – John Thompson and Oliver Bratton</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper F - Analysis of good performance of TfL Rail - JT OB</a></p> <p>GC explained that this item was initiated by Mark Carne.</p> <p>JT and OB noting the origin of the item stated that currently there is insufficient data to draw meaningful information as to the causes of the changes in performance since the franchise change. It was also noted that AGA had achieved similar levels of performance to TfL Rail in the not too distant past.</p> <p>Good work has been done on station dispatch – which has helped keep pace with the growth in customers and having only a small number (14) of stations to give management attention is helpful to improved performance. One of the key factors in improved PPM was resolving the issue of isolated traction motors, with 21 of the 44 inherited fleet having this issue and now none. Further positives were seen with staff training around suicide and larger crowd management. OB highlighted the issues of Ilford depot, being a two track railway and for further improved performance that working with NR on testing contingency plans in the simulator.</p> <p>CB reiterated that the evidence was inconclusive at this point. TS asked about any real material changes to trains and driver diagrams etc. OB replied the operator has 44 sets with 20+ diagrams, but reaffirmed the point of TfL Rails policy of having platform staff at every station from start to end of service. OB also recognised that with AGA there would have been different interactions and control decisions around metro and mainline service priorities.</p> <p>DC observed that TfL was very good as selling its positive points, and that the perception seemed to be positive within NR and National Rail should do more.</p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	DJ took a post meeting action to keep a watching brief on the ongoing analysis of good performance of TfL Rail, with a view to bringing it back to NTF when more data and evidence becomes available.	<b>DJ</b>	<b>May NTF</b>
15 2511/07	<p><b>Brighton Mainline Performance – Dyan Crowther and Alasdair Coates</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper G1 - Brighton Mainline Recovery Plan - DC_AC</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper G2 - BML presentation - DC_AC</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper G3 - Service Recovery - Draper Review - DC_AC</a></p> <p>DC opened by stating that the papers supplied to the meeting were replaced by a joint NR / GTR presentation (NR/GTR Service Recovery Deep Dive – NTF: Additional information: BML Recovery Plan). The presentation came about from an Alliance Board meeting on Friday 20<sup>th</sup> November.</p> <p>DC stated that GTR have had to thin out BML services, with Victoria being a particular pressure point, with GTR seeing a 6 or 7 fold increase in reactionary delays. NL made reference to platform congestion and the need to work together to get passengers off the platforms and stations. DC stressed the need for honesty about future schemes such as HS2 (particularly Euston) and that NTF must require an honest assessment to be made by the relevant members.</p> <p>AC remarked that there has been 6% passenger growth in six months DC stating that the PPM attrition analysis for specification loss from 2013 was 3-4%, it is now 11%, therefore even on a near perfect day the best GTR could achieve would be 89% PPM.</p> <p>MH raised that there are similar issues elsewhere on the network, making reference to Reading and particularly the signaller / signalling system capability. CB stressed the point that GTR is not unique, albeit at the vanguard of the challenge, and that stressed networks are getting even tighter, and sought support from all NTF members to learn the lessons regarding passenger growth.</p> <p>NL highlighted the issue of getting people off the platforms as a significant performance constraint that isn't being effectively addressed in the industry planning systems.</p> <p>It was agreed that the recovery plan is to be brought to NTF each quarter.</p> <p>Dean and Gary also to consider how NTF can address, or be sure that someone is addressing the wider issues raised.</p>	<b>DC/AC/DJ</b>	<b>February NTF</b>
15 2511/08	<p><b>Performance Strategy Y2Q2 Reviews – Iain Flynn</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper H1 - Performance Strategy Reviews Q2 2015-16 - IF_JT</a></p>		

ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p><a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper H2 - Summary table Q2 2015 16 for NTF - IF JT</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper H3 - Year Two Quarter Two Performance delivery - IF JT</a></p> <p>Members noted the paper and the issues identified in the reviews and restated that it is Route and TOC Performance Strategies that are the basis of improving national performance and that the challenge raised in Q2 reviews needs more attention. This being that TOCs and Routes answer the question: What have you not done / not proposed because of a belief that the proposal is too expensive or complex or requires expenditure from a party (parties) that won't see the benefits.</p> <p>a. CB emphasized for Q3 reviews that the industry needed to think more adventurously at potential ways to improve performance across interfaces and not to be constrained by traditional boundaries. MH and TS both remarked that simplicity (ie simple train service patterns) was important.</p> <p>b. NL observed that a measure of infrastructure availability needs to be part of the process in future. CB stated that a challenge should come to following due process but not achieving outcomes.</p> <p>c. TS asked for management challenge and scrutiny, with further comments from IF and CB on that current plan does not go far enough and that Q3 reviews need yet more rigour.</p> <p>d. TS asked for clarity (following SWT comments) on the process from getting from amber to green. The criteria for red, amber and green will be included within the Q3 review.</p>	<p><b>IF</b></p> <p><b>IF</b></p> <p><b>IF</b></p> <p><b>IF</b></p>	<p><b>Q3 Reviews</b></p> <p><b>Q3 Reviews</b></p> <p><b>Q3 Reviews</b></p> <p><b>Q3 Reviews</b></p>
15 2511/09	<p><b>Christmas and New Year Readiness – PDG Preliminary – John Gill</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper I1 - Christmas &amp; New Year 2015 preparation - PC</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper I2 - Xmas 2015 stakeholder presentation - PC</a></p> <p>JG said that there is close work with the Minister's office and good engagement from TOCs and Routes at the RDG conference, with ORR and BTP participation. GC noted 6 big projects and that 4 were in a satisfactory state of readiness. CB asked for confirmation that the customer focus element had been embedded, and JG confirmed it was.</p> <p>a. GC raised that by the 3rd December (for PDG) that the NTF has to have 'ducks in a row' and requested JG distributes the final presentation / information for PDG by Monday (30th November). GC also asked JG on the status and location of the Stakeholder pack.</p> <p>NL raised the scenario testing and feedback from it. JG stated that live testing was taking place over the</p>	<p><b>JG</b></p>	<p><b>30/11/2015</b></p>



ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>weekend (e.g. top 6 jobs as if they were going to happen), with stress situations inserted into the test, to examine the contingency arrangements including forced over-runs and mock media interviews. CB asked for assurance of codifying all of this, JG confirmed that it will be documented in the information provided above for 30 November.</p> <p>PH said that this was all built up over time, not just based on last year's events, and that accountability is to be clear via the weekend testing.</p> <p>JG raised the impact of Boxing day being on a Saturday this year and PH stated that TfL's management of communication over Boxing day was a concern.</p> <p>JG remarked that there has been good engagement throughout, but NYE was a little unknown and discussions have been taking place with particular focus on Victoria. TS raised a concern of passengers interchanging at Clapham over the period, and the need to consider joined up communication, as potentially passengers may not be able to get connections from trains out of Waterloo.</p> <p>The BTP remarked that the 'A-teams' have been in place for the trials, and members must ensure they are in place for the real time events. The BTP also stated that it has been clarified that extra transport ambassadors have been put in place for the Xmas and New Year period.</p> <p>CB stated that local issues need assigning. GC remarked that Seb Gordon from the RDG comms team has been pulling together the arrangements for this but was asked to repeat the need for a detail of who is on call for which organisation at a national level (assuming local arrangements apply for each programme) MH asked if the arrangements have been stress tested as the media will be looking for bad stories.</p> <p>b. Finally CB clarified the list of key contacts for the period, but GC sought a lower level of detail (as in who is available for each day from the key parties). Post meeting DJ took an action to establish this information and collate into a grid form for the NTF.</p> <p>c. Alasdair noted that Claire Perry was doing a walk-around the morning of PDG and was asked to provide any quick headlines to NL CB GC if possible before PDG at 14:30.</p>	<p><b>DJ (SG)</b></p> <p><b>AC</b></p>	<p><b>21/12/15</b></p> <p><b>03/12/15</b></p>
15 2511/10	<p><b>Performance Messaging (Paper to note from RDG comms)</b>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper N - Performance Messaging - SB - PfN</a>  <a href="#">15 2511 NTF Paper N - Industry Performance Messaging - SB - PfN (v2) update</a></p>		



ACTION	WHAT	WHO	WHEN
	<p>Item noted by the NTF. CB stated that the data could have been more up to date GC said already being dealt with.</p> <p>DJ to make updated paper available (see above v2 update DropBox hyperlink).</p>	<p><b>DJ</b></p>	<p><b>02/12/2015</b></p>