

XXXXXXXXXX

By e-mail: XXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXX

Rail Performance & Operations  
Department for Transport  
76 Marsham Street  
London  
SW1P 4DR

E-mail: XXXXXXXX@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Direct Line: XXXXXX

Web Site: [www.dft.gov.uk](http://www.dft.gov.uk)

Our Ref: F0007507

26 April 2011

Dear XXXXXXXX

## **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST P0007507**

I am writing to confirm that the Department for Transport has now completed its search for the information which you requested on 28 March 2011.

You asked for copies of all Rail National Task Force minutes of meetings over the last 12 months. A copy of minutes from NTF meetings held on 12 May, 9 June and 7 July 2010 are attached. These were the only minutes produced during the 12 month period covered by your request, as after the July meeting minutes have no longer been written. Names have been redacted at the request of the NTF Secretariat.

In keeping with the spirit and effect of the Freedom of Information Act, all information is assumed to be releasable to the public unless exempt. A copy of this response and the information provided may now be published on our website together with any related information that will provide a key to its wider context.

If you are unhappy with the way the Department has handled your request or with the decisions made in relation to your request you may complain within two calendar months of the date of this letter by writing to the Department's Information Rights Unit at:

Zone D/04  
Ashdown House  
Sedlescombe Road North  
Hastings  
East Sussex TN37 7GA  
E-mail: [FOI-Advice-Team-DFT@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:FOI-Advice-Team-DFT@dft.gsi.gov.uk)

Please see attached details of DfT's complaints procedure and your right to complain to the Information Commissioner.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact me. Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.

Yours sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

## **Your right to complain to DfT and the Information Commissioner**

You have the right to complain within 40 working days of the date of this letter about the way in which your request for information was handled and/or about the decision not to disclose all or part of the information requested. In addition a complaint can be made that DfT has not complied with its publication scheme.

Your complaint will be acknowledged and you will be advised of a target date by which to expect a response. Initially your complaint will be re-considered by the official who dealt with your request for information. If, after careful consideration, that official decides that his/her decision was correct, your complaint will automatically be referred to a senior independent official who will conduct a further review. You will be advised of the outcome of your complaint and if a decision is taken to disclose information originally withheld this will be done as soon as possible.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire  
SK9 5AF

## NOTES FROM A MEETING OF THE NATIONAL TASK FORCE

**Date:** 7 July 2010

**Venue:** Bridge Room – ATOC

<b><u>Members:</u></b>	XXXXXX <sup>1</sup>	XXXXXX
	XXXXXX	XXXXXX
	XXXXXX	XXXXXX
	XXXXXX	XXXXXX
	XXXXXX (Chair)	XXXXXX (secretary)
	XXXXXX	XXXXXX
	XXXXXX	XXXXXX

<b><u>Guests:</u></b>	XXXXXX (Virgin Trains)	XXXXXX (NR)
	XXXXXX (Freightliner)	XXXXXX (NX)
	XXXXXX (ATOC)	XXXXXX (First)

<b><u>Apologies:</u></b>	XXXXXX	XXXXXX
	XXXXXX	XXXXXX

*Note 1 from item 3*

### **1.0 Opening Remarks**

XXXXXX explained he was acting chair pending a permanent appointment and XXXXX's holiday; he welcomed NTF members and guests and gave the apologies received. He reported the last PDG meeting as "strange" in that it was later than usual after period end and with performance continuing to be at satisfactory levels Theresa Villiers is querying the need for, or the purpose of, the meeting; the need for it to add value is a concern shared by other PDG members and the matter should be picked up through the NTF review as well as in any Governmental thinking.

He explained that we page turned the Period 2 report, and had talked at length about cable theft and fatalities without new insight and agreed that the September PDG meeting will cover overcrowding and (TV's words) "timetable padding", concerning the latter she has said the phrase isn't a personal view but an accusation she hears.

XXXXXX explained that he will liaise with ATOC for the work on overcrowding and with NR for timetable planning and design.

### **2.0 Period 3 Performance – XXXXXX**

XXXXXX noted that NR missed its period 3 delay minute target but that it was met for TOC self delay, however both NR and TOC delay minutes were worse than last year so there is no room to relax; he drew attention to the fact that for the first time we have nearly met the NTF secondary goal of no TOC performing more than 5 points worse than the NPPMMAA mean, Virgin Trains PMMMAA is currently 5.2 points worse, over 5 points better than a year ago.

XXXXXX introduced a new chart for CaSL giving more detail for L&SE which missed target last year due to the January and February weather, he said that the NTF-OG has just set up a cross-industry group to look for

good practice to codify and share, the need is to get the level of front line staff understanding to the same degree that we now have for PPM.

**Table 1: Period 3 Performance**

	Delay Minutes	% Change on Previous Year	Delay Minutes Target	% Variance to Target	Period PPM	PPM MAA
<b>Network Rail</b>	<b>463k</b>	<b>3.6W</b>	<b>441k</b>	<b>5.0W</b>		
<b>TOC Self</b>	<b>234k</b>	<b>2.3W</b>	<b>241K</b>	<b>2.9B</b>		
<b>TOC on TOC</b>	<b>79k</b>	<b>14.1B</b>	<b>91k</b>	<b>13.1B</b>		
<b>This Year E&amp;W</b>					<b>92.8</b>	<b>91.6</b>
<b>Last Year E&amp;W</b>					<b>93.2</b>	<b>91.0</b>
<b>This Year All</b>					<b>93.0</b>	<b>91.5</b>
<b>Variance to Trajectory E&amp;W</b>					<b>0.4W</b>	<b>0.1B</b>
<b>Variance to Trajectory All</b>					<b>0.2W</b>	<b>0.1B</b>

Fleet, external and non track asset delays are all off target and need attention locally and possibly some national scrutiny, cable theft remains a significant problem and we should take evidence of its total impact to PDG to seek assistance in finding solutions. TSRs remain under control and the first three periods of the year are the best on record.

### **3.0 International Benchmarking – XXXXXX (NR)**

Introducing the material, XXXXXX explained that part of industry planning ahead for CP5 was a need to understand how other railways perform and how they measure performance in order to move away from anecdote and hearsay when developing thinking for the future and when responding to stakeholder observation on GB rail performance.

XXXXXX explained that what he will present is not a fully worked through detailed study although it may become that. A working party from TOC Owners, ATOC, the ORR and NR has done a desk-top exercise to try and establish how GB rail performs in comparison to other railways to understand how they measure performance and to consider how we may use this information. Much of the information is available through telephone / e-mail and through use of data on the internet. Some railways provided information only on the basis that would not be identifiable; hence the data provided is anonymised. Attempt was made to rebase the metric so that all countries performance was measured in a similar (*not identical*) way.

It was found that:

- GB performance is comparable to other railways and in mid-range;
- GB performance is improving, many other countries are static;
- Many countries use a measure based around “time to five”, although this ranges from 4:31 to 5:59;
- Most countries do not include cancelled trains;
- Forecast GB performance at the end of CP4 will put GB in the upper quartile.

XXXXXX said that the question for the NTF is what do we do with this study? Is it a one off, should it be used by Planning Ahead to inform CP5 thinking?

XXXXXX invited questions / comments.

XXXXXX said that the ORR had been very keen to get this work done and finds it interesting, some messages can be used widely and immediately: e.g. GB rail is prepared to compare performance with other railways; performance is comparable to other railways; we plan to be better. Then, moving forward, this work will be useful for informing discussions regarding the next HLOS - allowing a better balance between what funders expect and what is likely to be achievable. XXXXX stressed that how it is used is important and noting that we are moving towards the front of the pack through CP4 he suggested, consistent with the Value for Money deliberations, that one should query how important is performance compared to other priorities; he also asked if other metrics are used. XXXXX asked if we are establishing relationships with other railways to see what good practice we may learn and adopt.

Responding, XXXXX said that from this work, there are now contacts with these railways and suggested that perhaps the NTF-OG, for the industry, should explore what should be done next. The metric that is missing from all other comparator railways is that none have anything similar to CaSL.

XXXXXX noted that this study was similar to a safety study, where most other railways struggled with accurate definitions and where there are comparators GB is near or at the front in performance.

Thanking members and XXXXX, XXXXX asked XXXXX to consider how to use the good news this study provides.

#### **4.0      GSM(R) - XXXXX**

XXXXXX explained that NR has recognised the need to change personnel within this project and is happy with the team now in place, his concern is that despite the big project team and the significant activity there is a lack of urgency regarding the need to get on with train readiness and deadlines are looming, the most pressing being that in December 2012 when the NRN switch off will happen south of the River Severn – The Wash. He reminded members that GSMR delivers safety and performance benefits for the railway. He acknowledged that for projects like this the Network Change process is clumsy and that the early project teams should have done more to get TOCs on board so that they were “pulling GSMR towards them.”

He said that infrastructure fitment is now happening “to a rhythm” but train preparation is not, the number of cabs ready for radio is very low and has stagnated for months, only 2% are radio installed and with technical acceptance broadly sorted the urgent issue is to get on with delivery and train readiness.

XXXXXX noted that the fitted number is the total of the ScotRail trial and the Virgin fleet and said that Virgin Trains would not have been able to deliver its services in the last 18 months without GSMR capability, noting that getting trains moving can be within 30 second with GSMR compared to 6 minutes without and there is the safety benefit of drivers not having to exit cabs to use signal post telephones. Virgin has found the system wholly reliable and seeks to extend it across all its services as soon as possible.

Thanking XXXXX, XXXXX stressed that the system works, now TOCs have to move from technical acceptance to train-fitment, over 3 000 cabs have to be ready within two years. The fitment profile is already back end loaded and slipping despite lots of assistance from the ATOC team and from First Group. He said NR recognised that the way Network Change works means that the NCN5 will probably be rejected but this should not be an obstacle to bilateral agreements to get trains ready for radio and to date only 3 agreements are signed.

XXXXXX (*ATOC Champion GSMR*) said that it is true the Network Change processes drives TOCs towards rejecting NCN5 but there is no need for any operator to be concerned that agreeing bilateral fitment plans

prejudices their options for future Network Change Notices, he also advised that one can get trains ready for radio without the actual final step of radio fitment.

Concluding, XXXXX said that NTF has to:

1. Recognise the urgent need for train fitment.
2. Support a national programme of fitment through bilateral agreements.
3. Accelerate reaching agreement by quick responses from TOC teams using a reasonable approach to costs allowed within the code.
4. Agree to reporting cab-fitment to the NTF three-monthly.

The NTF accepted this position and agreed a progress report for the 29 September meeting.

## **5.0 ITPS – XXXXXX**

XXXXX confirmed that the critical release delayed from June was successfully installed one week late and has speeded up the bid process, prior to the release capability was 20 bids a day maximum, now it is circa 80 in 2.5 hours. Additionally NR is implementing actions from the last NR/TOC conference at which the TOC position had been coordinated by XXXXX and presented in a way that was helpful to NR and the industry. Actions agreed are:

1. A single point of contact within NR for each TOC.
2. Additional manual resource available if required – although the software fix looks like this is not necessary.
3. Offer for the December 2010 timetable weekend on 9 July.
4. Testing to see that the December offer doesn't undo other work.

Concerning Informed Traveller Timescales, XXXXX said that NR is in dialogue with NXEA, SE and XC, and is on target to meet agreed dates with all other TOCs and ATW, FCC (GN), LM are all planned to meet T-14 this week. Acknowledging TOC concern regarding compensation he advised that the entry to the process is through the CREs and noted that from some TOCs this is already happening. He advised that the milestone plan will be available to TOC practitioners on 9 July and that the further software releases scheduled impact NR internal processes and should have no impact on the Informed Traveller dates.

Noting that the current Informed Traveller programme still leaves three TOCs outside T-14 at the end of July XXXXX asked that NR consider what is required to bring all TOCs within the date by the end of July, XXXXX responded that this is really tough and the dates published are NR's best firm dates.

XXXXX reminded the meeting that extra administrative resource for checking progress had been requested and still seemed unavailable, citing that NXEA as published is incorrect and that this could have been spotted if someone was actually physically checking progress versus plan.

XXXXX advised that the ORR has received the independent report it commissioned, that it has discussed its findings with NR and will make a public statement week commencing 12 July.

It was agreed that ITPS is monitored at the NTF-OG and reported to the NTF until members are satisfied the programme is delivering as intended.

## **6.0 The Olympic Train Plan – Discussion**

This matter had been raised to NTF by the ATOC Commercial Director, however it was considered by the NTF that it had been brought prematurely.

It was agreed that there should be a three-way discussion ATOC, ODA and NR re timetable and Olympics, before the 22 July Commercial Board and that ATOC was in the lead for making this happen. *Post meeting note XXXXXXXX (ATOC Commercial Director) has been asked to initiate this with XXXXXXXX*

There was also concern that industry systems may not cope with a year's worth of advance bookings and that the planned transition in franchises at or around the time of the run up to the Olympics is another factor to bear in mind.

## **7.0 Papers for Noting**

### **7.1 Passenger Information During Disruption – XXXXXXXX**

XXXXXXX explained that the intent is to make the processes for PIDD “day job” by December 2010 and the plan is to disband the PIDD Steering Group within a year. However at present there are still concerns regarding “buy in” and progress. He advised the NTF that following discussion at the last steering group the ORR will be invited to attend future meetings and that it will be given a progress update from the group later this week in a report from XXXXXXXX as chair.

XXXXXXX confirmed that the ORR is to join the group and stressed the importance of PIDD.

XXXXXXX drew member attention to the new reporting grid in the pack in front of members, explaining that SWT had identified errors for their progress on the grid circulated to members with the meeting papers, discovering this he has asked the joint project managers to go back and check the accuracy of all TOC reports.

### **7.2 NTF Review Interim Report – XXXXXXXX**

Assuming members had read his paper and stressing that it is an interim report seeking agreement to finalising the conclusions for the 4 August meeting, XXXXXXXX invited any comment.

XXXXXXX said that Virgin Trains have yet to be interviewed and don't agree with the timing of the review. They strongly urge that it be postponed until there is clarity from the Government and other stakeholders regarding industry structure.

It was agreed that XXXXXXXX would continue with the review, Virgin's strong concern was noted and would be discussed further in an interview with them.

There being no other business the chair closed the meeting at 17:29.

### **ACTIONS ARISING FROM NTF 7 July 2010**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHAT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>100707/01</b>	To establish work programmes within NR and ATOC for PDG regarding overcrowding and timetable “Padding”	XX	w/c 12/07/10
<b>100707/02</b>	To consider how to use international benchmarking for industry reputational benefit	XX	As required
<b>100707/03</b>	To consider if further benefit may be derived from closer work with other railways – consider at NTF-OG	XX	23/07/10
<b>100707/04</b>	TOCs to urgently address bilateral agreements for train readiness for GSMR	XX	From Now
<b>100707/05</b>	Project to report fleet fitment to NTF every three months	XX	29/09/10
<b>100707/06</b>	To ensure NTF-OG management of and NTF visibility of ITPS programme and to consider if all TOCs can be brought within Informed Traveller by 31 July	XX	Ongoing
<b>100707/07</b>	To make recommendations for NTF future based on current review	XX	04/08/10
<b>100707/08</b>	To set up a meeting with NR and the ODA to consider the Olympic Timetable and Ticketing position	XX	Before 22/07/10



## Future Meeting Plan

Meeting Date	What	Who
<b>4 August 2010</b>	NR Asset Reliability	XX
<b>4 August 2010</b>	NTF Review	XX
<b>4 August 2010</b>	RSSB Report	XX
<b>4 August 2010</b>	Workstream Leaders Reports – Priority 2 Weather Actions papers or presentations depending on workstream	Workstream Leaders
<b>29 September 2010</b>	ITPS Plan – Assurance for December	XX
<b>29 September 2010</b>	Fleet Performance – Fleet Challenge	XX (ATOC) / XX (Fleet Challenge)
<b>29 September 2010</b>	Train Readiness for GSMR	XX / XX (ATOC)
<b>29 September 2010</b>	Passenger Information During Disruption	XX (NRE) / XX (NR) / XX (NX)
<b>27 October 2010</b>	Report Back from PDG on future of PDG and discussions on overcrowding and timetable design	Chair
<b>27 October 2010</b>	NTF trajectories and goals for 2011/12	XX
<b>27 October 2010</b>	NR Asset Reliability	XX
<b>27 October 2010</b>	RSSB Report	XX
<b>Undated</b>	Sub-threshold delays – progress report	XX (NR) / XX (ATOC)
<b>Undated</b>	Change of government – any changes to performance reporting?	XX

This plan is draft only and subject to review from agreed member direction / suggestion, it is current only at time of typing. All members are welcome to contact the secretary and for ATOC, NR and DfT there is a meeting every period to allow them to make any input.

Blue shading	Means a paper for noting not currently a scheduled presentation
--------------	---

## NOTES FROM A MEETING OF THE NATIONAL TASK FORCE

**Date:** 9 June 2010

**Venue:** Bridge Room – ATOC

**Members:** XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXX (secretary)  
XXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXX

**Guests:** XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX (LOROL/Chiltern)  
XXXXXXXX (National Express) XXXXXXXX (NR) <sup>item 4</sup>  
XXXXXXXX (Eversholt Rail) XXXXXXXX (SN) <sup>item 4</sup>  
XXXXXXXX (ATOC) XXXXXXXX (NR) <sup>item 5</sup>  
XXXXXXXX (DfT) <sup>item 3</sup>

**Apologies:** XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

### **1.0 Opening Remarks**

XXXXXXXX welcomed members and guests and apologising, advised that in addition to the published agenda NR is to provide the meeting with an update on ITPS given ATOC member urgent concerns regarding further slippage in progress since the 12 May NTF meeting. Given agenda pressure, for the first time, there is no scheduled performance report; he said that this was not a change for all meetings, simply a reflection of relatively good performance and the need to discuss other matters.

He reported on the first meeting with the new Rail Minister, Theresa Villiers, (*NTF member attendees were XXXXXXXX*). She had opened the meeting saying that she would be challenging the industry and that the government expected a continued focus on performance. The East Coast TOC and route team attended and shared the presentation provided to the last NTF, XXXXXXXX presented on cross-industry performance processes, including the current role of the NTF, and the delivery through TOCs and NR's bilateral JPIPS, and XXXXXXXX led her through the period 1 report. She had said she was impressed with the way the railway manages and reports performance but raised some issues she wanted the PDG rail members to consider and report back. The first was the belief that the industry pads timetables with time before destination to massage performance figures, the second to consider overcrowding on trains, the third was improving CaSL.

### **2.0 ITPS – XXXXXXXX**

XXXXXXXX acknowledged that a series of local issues exist that affected passenger and freight operators, he stated that the issues with publishing schedules and the impact this had on data integrity were solved with a software release on 5/6 June. Two of the other four system issues identified, *i.e.* limited capability for electronic bid importing and system response times will be addressed by a software release on 25/26 June. Tools to edit the National Rail Timetable will be available from mid July, and

improving the quality of the ITPS information will be solved at the beginning of August. In the meantime temporary fixes are in place pending these software leases with the exception of the edit feature for NRT for which there is no requirement until the final solution is in place.

He provided updated timescales for Informed Traveller, conceding slippage since the last NTF advice.

The dates for the December offer were provided to the meeting:

- SX will be at T-24, 25 June;
- SO/Sun A&B periods will be at T-22, 9 July; and
- SO/Sun C&D periods will be at T-21, 16 July.

Thanking members for an opportunity to explain the situation XXXXXX confirmed that as planned NR will provide a full report to the 7 July NTF and is reporting four-weekly to the NTF-OG and weekly through telephone conferences.

XXXXXX asked for a definitive date for the system to be open for the August bank holiday. XXXXXX said he would confirm an exact date outside the meeting but it is within a week or two. *Post meeting note advice to NXEA is 18/06.* XXXXXX described that line closures are not on the system, so customers planning to travel will have no idea that they will be on bus substitution and their journeys disrupted and that this is not the only issue, adding that the lack of correct schedules and ARS programming is causing operational delays. He said that the industry accepts NR is working hard to deal with the problems but it has no confidence that timescales will be met. He ended observing that TOC planning teams are over-burdened with additional work through the NR failures and NR needs to find more resource to assist.

XXXXXX said that the simple fact is that progress has stalled in the last 4 weeks, and there is no confidence that progress will be made, in fact it could go backwards, he noted that XXXXXX had been unable to answer the question about the August bank holiday and that we are already outside the Informed Traveller timescale for this. The TOC's confidence is low because NR keeps missing its own dates and that when it does provide solutions these do not address all the problems they are designed to solve. He said that NR continuing to apologise doesn't solve the issue of the burden it is placing on TOCs, and questioned why it isn't offering resources to its TOC customers given the amount of rework that is required.

XXXXXX noted that the main fix weekend is the same date that NR is moving people to Milton Keynes and that for East Coast the local TOC familiarisation training agreed for NR staff has not yet happened. Supporting other comments made, she said that promised fixes don't work fully and are provided late. She asked for, and received assurance that TOCs will be compensated by NR for their losses.

XXXXXX summarised: the problems are causing the industry additional costs, lost revenue, reduced performance and providing customers with inadequate information. The TOC community still doesn't have the confidence it has been seeking from NR at NTF and other fora that the issues are in control and will be fully addressed at the dates given. The actions agreed were: 1) for NR to supply a full recovery plan to be shared with TOC NTF members and that a full report is required at the 7 July meeting and 2) NR to confirm the TOC compensation position for those incurring losses. *Post meeting note, XXXXXX advises that route CREs are the first point of contact for TOCs seeking compensation and that the process for making claims has been advised on several weekly telephone conferences.*

### **3.0 TSAG Update – XXXXXX (DfT)**

XXXXXX reminded NTF members that the TSAG has a thirty year time frame and as agreed last year it is important that the NTF is sighted on and influences its activities, stating that the TSAG is not “solutions looking for a problem” and therefore industry direction and “pull” is very important if activity is to be realistic and sustained and not simply interesting thoughts. In this the Planning Ahead Group has been useful but the NTF also has a role in shaping direction. Additionally, working with the NTF is important because, with the NTF’s membership, any duplication of activity may be quickly identified and corrected.

There are three priorities for the TSAG: i) Game Changers – areas of strategic research; ii) Pathfinders – feasibility studies; iii) Technology Research.

#### **3.1 Game Changers**

There are four game changers.

##### **3.1.1 Traffic Management – the next generation**

There are real opportunities in the next generation but one traffic management capability. Dynamic real time timetabling could enable traffic regulation according to overall network priorities at any given time, for example in the peak it could be driven by capacity and reliability, at other times it could be punctuality or economic use of energy.

This also covers work to provide better information to those making operational decisions and improving communication to customers during normal and disrupted service operation.

##### **3.1.2 Strategy for Energy**

The industry cannot afford the continuing increase in energy costs it requires, it needs to consider: the availability of hydrocarbon fuels; sustainability of other alternatives; the significant non traction electricity consumption and the challenges of low volume traffic on lightly used lines. Working with marine and automotive industries there is expertise to be shared and developed, for example stored energy systems may be promising.

##### **3.1.3 System Reliability**

Two workstreams, one to report in July 2010 is about building the evidence for a strategic approach to whole system reliability, the other, led by NR, deals with questions such as how to deal with a doubling in demand, the cost and opportunity of a system that operates at 99.9% reliability, future cost of unreliability.

##### **3.1.4 Enabling Innovation**

This is to feed into the McNulty Value for Money study and there are three intervention stages: i) Create leadership capability with regard to innovation; ii) enhance innovation capability within industry; iii) reducing the risks of introducing innovation.

### 3.2 Pathfinders and Technology Research

Opportunities exist to collaborate with other research bodies to seek new ideas and 50/50 funding from these bodies. Current propositions are reviewing how to overcome the constraints imposed by nodes on the network, proposing to examine new materials for the industry and examining the operation of large complex systems.

### 3.3 Key Dates

The TSAG timetable is:

2010

- Summer – build consensus for the game changers;
- Autumn
  - Publish Rail Technical Strategy Progress Report;
  - Respond to the external funding proposals regarding new materials and prepare for large and complex networks;
  - Bid for co-funding for next generation traffic management.

2011/12

- HLOS 2 engagement

Closing his briefing, XXXXXX asked if the NTF:

1. Agree the game changers address the challenges the industry faces?
2. Recognises the challenge of enabling innovation and the requirement for the industry to:
  - a. Provide “Pull”;
  - b. Participate in “handover”
  - c. Accept that it should co-fund with cash or benefits in kind R&D?
3. Supports the TSAG’s programme?
4. Could say how the TSAG should continue to engage with it?

Thanking XXXXXX, XXXXXX said that it is good to see that longer-term thinking is happening, he invited comment.

XXXXXX said that XXXXXX has shown very bespoke solutions, with money so tight a more general approach is required, XXXXXX responded that the TSAG is seeking commercially viable solutions to the problems and that in the first round of public spending reviews TSAG and similar bodies have come through with funding remaining because of the need to redress the economy away from the service bias it has developed.

XXXXXX argued from the opposite perspective, saying that the TSAG output is too broad brush and trying to hit everything and that the single biggest issue is the amount of energy the industry consumes. Even if money were not an issue, rail demand for electricity could outstrip supply. Turning to innovation he argued that it isn’t lack of bright ideas that stifles innovation but the industry contractual framework which discourages the right behaviours, ERTMS, GSMR, CIS, ITPS, would all be easier in a different industry framework. In future information on asset condition, location, and performance against the trainplan will be provided through equipment on the train, a complete reversal of now, and someone has to address the issues this will raise.

Closing the discussions, the chair said that the NTF has indicated its broad support for the Game Changers and that the TSAG should engage with the NTF collectively through updates agreed with the NTF Secretary when the TSAG has something it needs to share or on which it needs input.

#### **4.0        Barriers to Full Integration of Control Centres – XXXXXX (SN) and XXXXXXXX (NR)**

Discussion at the March meeting of the NTF had resulted in Southern volunteering to explore what is preventing further control centre rationalisation and integration. A cross-industry group has discussed the issue and made suggestions to resolve them and identified who should lead the activity. Six barriers were identified.

1. No definitive case has been made that integration leads to performance improvement.

Suggest cost saving is an argument for integration and that no national policy is required, it is a matter for each TOC and route.

2. Parties don't trust each other:

- Leaders want to control their own business drivers;
- Secondary operators have rights and
- The desire for a company to lead its response to incidents.

Suggest future metrics for Control centres and priorities are developed as best practice and use this work to drive CP5, future franchise structure; suggested owners NTF and POG.

3. Incentives to improve performance don't align between organisations:

- Financial incentives to apportion blame;
- TOC and NR pressure to focus on their "own" minutes and
- Don't get to root causes.

Suggest Reviewing Schedule 8 – is it still effective and valid and establishing a mechanism which mutually incentivises NR and TOCs to improve. In the short-term manage and prioritise performance improvement investment at JPIP level. Suggested owner: ORR with NR and TOC input

4. Current control structure has a culture that is not conducive to integration, there is a silo mentality and success for a control is about meeting individual companies' objectives not common objectives. There is a shortage of competent controllers and no common training package or competence process.

Controllers focus on tasks, not managing and they need help with planning, organising, data handling and team management.

Suggested next step is for the NTF-OG to agree core competency skills for controllers and develop a competence process and training package.

5. Controls vary in size and function; there is no one size fits all, this leads to differing approaches to contingency planning, differing management of resources and CIS, and nationally a sub-optimal control function.

Suggested next steps are for the NTF-OG to design a best practice template for a control office, set out fundamental roles for the control to undertake and reflect these in roles, training, and competence of controllers.

6. Different organisations have different goals, for example PPM, or delay minutes, right time, cancellations, managing capacity, differing priorities for handling customers.

Suggested next steps are use good practice developed by Southern and Sussex and define what may be done jointly in the JPIP, thereby actively using the JPIP to jointly drive performance rather than simply being a reference document. Longer term DfT and ORR to consider how to align through regulation and franchise contract.

Thanking XXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX invited comment.

XXXXXXX said that it was a valuable piece of work and at the heart of it is the development of a model of what good looks like. However there are costs that may be escaped through effective integration, this is especially important with the drive for value for money from the industry and this is in part how it was sold to the then secretary of state by a previous NTF chair.

XXXXXXX argued strongly against the conclusions. He said that it is correct that no one size fits all adding that if the idea is so good for performance improvement or cost escapement then TOCs would have done it, no direction from the centre is required, nor is DfT and ORR intervention. He offered that better communication is not only achieved through joined control centres and that NR and VT have shown that planned briefing processes can engage all employees including train-crew and signallers and controllers and this is more effective than managing through a shared control for the Virgin Trains business. Additionally the argument about cost reduction is only one side of the question; one may also answer whether additional resource drives revenue improvement.

XXXXXXX said that recent further integration in East Anglia has shown benefits for NR and the NXEA and that the controllers think it is an improvement, with better communication between companies.

XXXXXXX said that it is all about the first barrier, and this is the question to which we should seek an answer.

XXXXXXX agreed with those who said that there is no one answer and looking across NR's controls he can see three models, but this doesn't change the fact that we should and could be better at managing the control function, irrespective of specific control centre set-ups. Trust is the important issue, not simply contractual protection, and with current levels of performance schedule 8 needs a review, TOCs need financial protection from very good or very poor NR performance. He questioned why a good practice template is needed, stating that this is what XXXXXXXX has been paid to do, and it is simply a matter of communicating what he has done. He argued against setting out what good looks like as a future franchise blueprint, a better solution will emerge through the franchising process producing differing proposals from varied bidders.

XXXXXXX agreed that schedule 8 will be picked up in the review for CP5 and that alignment of incentives is a good thing, pointing out that the alignment in CP4 is better than in CP3. He said that the ORR doesn't see Schedule 8 as an incentive mechanism, but a risk transfer one, it provides a buffer to TOCs if NR is not providing access to a necessary standard.

XXXXXXX agreed that one size isn't the answer, he pointed out that through the WICC, NR and SSWT have taken costs and people out and agreed that the latter has enabled the overall standard of a "controller" to be raised. Supporting XXXXXXXX he agreed that the incentives work except at extremes of performance and that this is what the DfT and ORR should be considering in planning for CP5.

XXXXXXX summarised the position reached as:

- It is a matter for each TOC and NR to agree control structure to suit, there is no central guiding mind;
- The NTF-OG should consider XXXXXX's point, what clear cost saving evidence is there for integration based on experience (e.g. WICC/EA) that can be shared with the industry?
- The NTF-OG should consider setting out and communicating the core principles for roles in a(n integrated) control (building on the XXXXXX work) and moving forward with a single controller competency framework;
- In the immediate term it is right that TOCs and NR consider how to align metrics in JPIPs but that it is right for DfT and ORR to consider how to better align outputs and industry structure in the longer-term.

## **5.0 Report Back on Metrics Study – XXXXXXXXX (NR)**

*A back up pack of material was provided to members at the meeting and e-mailed out the following day. XXXXXX took NTF through the work of the cross-industry team since the initial paper presented to the February NTF meeting and the subsequent updates to the March and May NTF meetings.*

The NTF members were of the view that the rail industry already publishes more data than other industries and that the case for publishing more, or for making the measures tighter, has not been made by the stakeholders that seek change. Additionally, cost pressures faced by the industry and government mean this is not a time to make the same level of performance apparently worse, through changing reporting requirements.

It was agreed that:

- PPM does drive behaviour to improve performance and that Passenger Focus criticism is unjustified and unhelpful to customers and to the industry;
- Destination PPM should be kept as the primary publically reported measure of performance;
- Inconsistencies in a small proportion of services could be addressed in dialogue between NR and the TOC and DfT, but the potential drawbacks identified for tightening thresholds apply to any services that would move from T10 to T5.
- Right time delivery should be the internal operational focus;
- Bad Days should be focussed through bilateral actions described with a JPIP and measured within the JPIP;
- CaSL be retained and used more than currently to manage performance delivery and
- The amended timetables suggestion be developed further and reported back.

NTF did not agree to:

- Publishing station PPM;
- Developing "My Train" and
- Tightening PPM thresholds, but made the observations noted below.

In determining its current position regarding tightening PPM thresholds the NTF required some rational justification for making a change which would make the same levels of performance appear to be worse. Concerns were expressed by members regarding the impact on reputation, customer satisfaction, and revenue, all of which would be brought about by unnecessary changes, and would be unwelcome to government as well as industry. If there is pressure from sources external to the industry to make these changes then further work is required to quantify the impact of, and justify the need for, such changes.



The NTF noted the expert view that undertaking more work on the relationship between demand and performance would be wasted and that focussing on improving performance modelling and accuracy of cost estimation would be more useful.

It was agreed that this position be fed back to Planning Oversight Group by XXXXXX.

## **6.0 NTF Review – XXXXXXXX**

Assuming members had read the paper describing the content, timescale and process for the review, XXXXXX summarised:

- Individual interviews with NTF members that desire one, by 30 June;
- Paper and time for discussion at 7 July NTF meeting and
- Agree proposal 4 August NTF meeting.

He asked if there was any issue missing from his proposed remit, section 3 of the paper, and no points were raised and the review was agreed as stated in the paper.

## **7.0 Papers for Noting**

### **7.1 Performance**

**Table 1: Period 2 Performance**

	<b>Delay Minutes</b>	<b>% Change on Previous Year</b>	<b>Delay Minutes Target</b>	<b>% Variance to Target</b>	<b>Period PPM</b>	<b>PPM MAA</b>
<b>Network Rail</b>	<b>436k</b>	<b>4.9W</b>	<b>412k</b>	<b>5.8W</b>		
<b>TOC Self</b>	<b>216k</b>	<b>2.3W</b>	<b>250K</b>	<b>8.4B</b>		
<b>TOC on TOC</b>	<b>71k</b>	<b>6.5B</b>	<b>85k</b>	<b>16.9B</b>		
<b>This Year E&amp;W</b>					<b>93.4</b>	<b>91.6</b>
<b>Last Year E&amp;W</b>					<b>93.6</b>	<b>90.8</b>
<b>This Year All</b>					<b>93.6</b>	<b>91.5</b>
<b>Variance to Trajectory E&amp;W</b>					<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1B</b>
<b>Variance to Trajectory All</b>					<b>0.3B</b>	<b>0.1B</b>

### **7.2 PIDD Darwin Roll-Out – Paper E from XXXXXXXX**

XXXXXX, supported by XXXXXX suggested that the roll out looks supplier led, and that it should be driven by impact on the number of passenger journeys affected, and that leaving big TOCs later in the programme should be rethought. XXXXXX agreed that this was a good challenge and XXXXXX said that as chair of PIDD Steering Group he would review the roll out, but the crucial issue is to get on with the pilot with Virgin Trains.

XXXXXX reminded the NTF that the ORR sees this as a serious issue and that it had said that it required a visible robust plan from the industry and then delivery of this plan. He said that the ORR needs to be closer to this and he will be working with XXXXXX as chair of PIDDSG to agree how this may be done.

### **7.3 NTF Weather Review – Paper F XXXXXXXXXX**

NTF noted the paper and required that workstream leaders present progress in person to the 4 August meeting. They will be required to: detail what they are doing with their Priority 2 activities; demonstrate they have a plan to deliver them in time for the onset of winter; show how delivery will be visible to industry; what contingency arrangements / alternatives they have set up, ready to go, should their plans not deliver the desired outcome and show how they will measure the relative impact after implementation of each intervention. They should also outline what their Priority 3 plans are.

There being no other business the chair closed the meeting at 17:54

**ACTIONS ARISING FROM NTF 9 June NTF**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHAT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>090610/01</b>	XXXXXXX to circulate NR's ITPS recovery plan to NTF members	XX	w/c 14/06
<b>0906110/02</b>	The TSAG to arrange with NTF Business Director relevant engagement when information to share or NTF steer would assist.	XX TSAG	January 2011
<b>090610/03</b>	The NTF-OG to consider if there is a performance or cost case for integration	XX	September 2010
<b>090610/04</b>	The NTF-OG to review if work is required on role of control and controller competence and if so to get it done	XX	September 2010
<b>090610/05</b>	CP5 future franchising to better align performance process and incentives	DfT / ORR	Part of Planning Ahead
<b>090610/06</b>	NTF view on performance metrics to be fed to Planning Ahead Group	XXX	June 2010
<b>090610/07</b>	NRE and PIDD to review Darwin Roll Out to check if supplier led is best approach compared to customer flow led	XXX / XXX	25 June 2010

## Future Meeting Plan

Meeting Date	What	Who
<b>9 June 2010</b>	Sub-threshold delays – progress report	XX (NR) / XX (ATOC)
<b>7 July 2010</b>	NTF Review	XX
<b>7 July 2010</b>	Change of government – any changes to performance reporting?	XX
<b>7 July 2010</b>	Fleet Challenge – What next after LiveTrain?	XX
<b>7 July 2010</b>	International Performance Benchmarking	XX
<b>7 July 2010</b>	GSMR	XX
<b>7 July 2010</b>	ITPS Detailed Plan	XX
<b>4 August 2010</b>	NR Asset Reliability	XX
<b>4 August 2010</b>	NTF Review and JRPP Content	XX
<b>4 August 2010</b>	RSSB Report	XX
<b>4 August 2010</b>	Workstream Leaders Reports – Priority 2 Weather Actions	Workstream Leaders
<b>29 September 2010</b>	ITPS Plan – Assurance for December	XX

This plan is draft only and subject to review from agreed member direction / suggestion, it is current only at time of typing. All members are welcome to contact the secretary and for ATOC, NR and DfT there is a meeting every period to allow them to make any input.

Blue shading	Means a paper for noting not currently a scheduled presentation
Green shading	Brief discussion if required neither paper nor presentation currently expected

## **NOTES FROM A MEETING OF THE NATIONAL TASK FORCE**

**Date:** 12 May 2010

**Venue:** Bridge Room – ATOC

<b><u>Members:</u></b>	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX (Chair)	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX

<b><u>Guests:</u></b>	XXXXXXXX (Virgin Trains)	XXXXXXXX (LOROL/Chiltern)
	XXXXXXXX (National Express)	XXXXXXXX (NRLNE) item 3
	XXXXXXXX (MDEC) item 3	XXXXXXXX (NR)

<b><u>Apologies:</u></b>	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
	XXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXX welcomed NTF members and guests, gave the apologies received.

### **1.0 Opening Remarks**

XXXXXXXX explained that he had been invited to chair today because XXXXXXXX was already unavailable before the recent news concerning his position.

He reminded members that the NTF periodically reviews its need, purpose and associated processes, and suggested that as has been discussed between the meeting secretary and a number of members, a review should be initiated now. He asked for, and received member agreement to, a process led, as in the past, by the NTF Business Director as a neutral resource for the NTF, based on discussions with members and reporting back progress to 9 June meeting and with a view to reaching a conclusion at the 7 July meeting. He indicated that this should also consider the appointment of a chair.

### **2.0 Period 1 Performance – XXXXXXXX**

Period 1 has been a good period; NPPMMAA is 0.9 points ahead of last year at 91.5% compared to the NTF trajectory of 92.3%, period performance was 94.0% equal to the industry's best ever performance in period 5 last year. Southern had its best performance day at 98.1% on 26 April.

CrossCountry and East Coast missed plan for the period, the latter forms part of the agenda for today's NTF meeting, for CrossCountry there were issues with a major incident at Birmingham New Street, a bankslip, cable theft and some crew related issues. The size of the gap to plan in the period has tipped both TOCs into MAA red versus plan. He drew attention to CaSL, noting continuing reductions in the

Virgin Trains measure, but repeating his message to previous NTF meetings that the industry needs to focus on and manage CaSL; he said he will be raising the matter with the NTF-OG.

Seven TOCs are worse than plan by industry delay minutes; for NR, external and track are worse than plan by category and for TOCs traincrew and stations are worse than plan; but only external delay is widespread, the others are worse versus plan in one route / TOC. The big issue with external delay is cable theft which is causing serious problems in many parts of the country; this is to be discussed fully at the May NTF-OG and will be covered in the East Coast presentation in this meeting.

XXXXXXX noted that working the fleets harder to provide additional services for customers during the ash cloud caused air disruption has not shown up in reduced asset reliability.

**Table 1: Period 1 Performance**

	<b>Delay Minutes</b>	<b>% Change on Previous Year</b>	<b>Delay Minutes Target</b>	<b>% Variance to Target</b>	<b>Period PPM</b>	<b>PPM MAA</b>
<b>Network Rail</b>	<b>429k</b>	<b>13.4B</b>	<b>451k</b>	<b>5.0B</b>		
<b>TOC Self</b>	<b>229k</b>	<b>4.9B</b>	<b>250K</b>	<b>8.3B</b>		
<b>TOC on TOC</b>	<b>84k</b>	<b>13.2B</b>	<b>80k</b>	<b>4.9W</b>		
<b>This Year E&amp;W</b>					<b>94.0</b>	<b>91.6</b>
<b>Last Year E&amp;W</b>					<b>93.5</b>	<b>90.7</b>
<b>This Year All</b>					<b>94.0</b>	<b>91.5</b>
<b>Variance to Trajectory E&amp;W</b>					<b>1.9W</b>	<b>0.1B</b>
<b>Variance to Trajectory All</b>					<b>1.9W</b>	<b>0.1B</b>

TSRs remain under control, P1 numbers better than P13 for first time, and delays caused are 40% less than the norm four years ago. XXXXXXXX asked if the improvement is across the country or varies by route. XXXXXXXX explained that information is provided to each TOC MD every week and there is cause driven variation in numbers; for example the drying of the clay banks caused a rise in the south and east last year, severe weather caused a rise in the north. XXXXXXXX praised the tremendous result but inquired about the impact of the slow-down in renewals; XXXXXXXX explained that with the reduction in renewal expenditure, additional maintenance activity has been funded and is allowing control of the impact and number of TSRs.

### **3.0 East Coast and LNE Performance XXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXX**

*Secretary note: The TOC/Route were at NTF as part of the task force process inviting member companies to the NTF when they have failed to meet performance plan levels for three periods or more. The purpose is to explain why and set out a recovery plan.*

XXXXXXX explained that XXX and XXXXXXXX are giving an agreed joint presentation and it will cover current performance, why plan has been missed and a recovery plan.

The characteristics of the route and service offer unique challenges to building PPM resilience:

- Route length – covering three NR areas;
- Diversionary capability does not maintain performance;
- Two track sections;
- For the TOC 1 train is 1 PPM point for the day;
- Two fleets, no service spares, availability stretched;
- Limited options for recovery from incidents.

In recent periods there is no positive correlation between NPS and PPM; this raises the question of the need for possible further research on the relationship for long-distance services.

In the last four years, the TOC PPM has been lower than national long-distance PPM, caught it up, overtaken it, and now fallen behind again in the latter half of the 2009/10 year.

The causes of the recent deterioration in PPM delivery can be traced to: severe weather, landslips, cable theft, incidents, including the derailment of East Midlands stock in Neville Hill, the collision at Darlington, fatalities, in service failures and events simultaneously occurring in two parts of the route. Overall this has hit PPMMAA by 0.7 PPM point, but at 89.5% this is two years ahead of the HLOS plan. The route is exposed to the impact of weather, delays due to this is 50% higher than on west coast and 400% higher than on FGW route.

For the TOC the overriding issue is to address fleet performance, XXXX said that the engineering function is being reviewed and orientated to be accountable for all aspects of the train given that it is central to the TOC's customers' experiences. For NR track asset performance is better than other routes and OHL, often noted as a weak point, is nearly 50% ahead of target, but points, signalling systems, cable theft are significantly worse than plan.

XXXXXXX and XXXXXXXX took NTF through plans to address the issues identified; noting that for some, *e.g.* cable theft and fatalities, the route and TOC cannot act alone. Concerning cable theft there is a need for government assistance and cross-industry action to deal with the previously identified need for legislative change and briefing of magistrates. The TOC is starting using intelligent software on the train (i-train from Avenca) to not only provide information regarding rolling stock condition but to identify train-running between monitoring points and identify areas where the trainplan may be improved through greater understanding and granularity ; three units are currently fitted and full fleet roll-out is planned. (*Secretary note: Avenca demonstrated its system to the NTF-OG and ATOC Engineering Council several years ago, at the time their system was in prototype development*)

To give perspective, and noting that East Coast comprises 0.6% NPPM, XXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXX shared route and TOC achievements with NTF including: the leading role in making seven day railway a reality, planned use of coasting during engineering work and minimising use of bus substitution through extensive single line working. They confirmed that the TOC and route are working as partners and offered to share the JPIP with any NTF members.

Together they:

- Have a detailed JPIP agreed that addresses all issues not simply technical matters;
- Participate in the ORR review of East Coast Performance;
- Focus on reducing both the number of incidents and their impact;
- Are investigating ARS and sub-threshold delays;
- Are implementing a revised performance management process between TOC and route;

- Are alert to the risks of the King's Cross re-development;
- Are returning to basic good operational practices;
- Are implementing low cost signalling and line-speed improvements.

Concluding, XXXXXXXX showed that the TOC and route are already having to make up shortfall versus plan because of two significant events in Period 1 that jointly caused over 100 PPM failures of the 156 in total. He advised that the current JPIP was too challenging and the TOC and route are agreeing a less ambitious plan that will reflect true joint working described and give the teams a chance to deliver it.

NTF member discussion agreed the reduction in ambition in the plan on the basis that the effect on the national trajectory would be immaterial and focussed on cable theft. XXXXXXXX stated that his team are dealing with this on a daily basis and stating that it impacts on their day job; it is currently running at twice the rate of 2009. He argued that a simple legislative change preventing scrap dealers paying for copper cable in cash would help, as would further work across the UK with magistrates and the wider judiciary. XXXXXXXX said that an evidence based approach is required to have a chance in gaining ministers' attention; advising that we need to make it a big story. *Secretary note: cable theft was raised with ministers at PDG on a number of occasions in 2007 to 2008 and in June 2008 a paper outlining the problem and seeking assistance was presented to XXXXXXXX. No report back was given from him or his successors, if PDG continues with the new administration we need to explain the issue and consequences again.*

XXXXXX said the industry has to do more regarding fatalities, observing that the BTP is obsessed with the 90 minute target, to the exclusion of a more customer friendly approach of flexibility, for example getting two lines open within ten minutes and having longer to fully open all routes. NTF members concurred with XXXXXXXX that BTP are target driven and the industry should be pressing for greater flexibility and building this into the policing plan. XXXXXXXX explained that the RSSB facilitated Community safety Steering Group (CSSG) has recently brought together NR and BTP fatality management projects and this will give better direction and sharing of good practices. XXXXXXXX continued, outlining that there are things the industry can do as well, for example making it harder for potential suicide victims to use fast platforms that are not regularly used.

XXXXXX thanked XXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXX for their honest and detailed explanation of the causes of PPM failure and their future plans, noting also the agreement to revise their JPIP and that this wouldn't be material on the agreed NTF 20010/11 trajectory.

#### **4.0 Integrated Train Planning System (ITPS) – XXXXXXXX (NR)**

XXXXXX explained that he wished to address current problems and share the reasons why ITPS is important.

He observed that current industry planning tools are crude and inadequate and allow for incorrect data entry and give no opportunity for optioneering; in addition transaction and human costs are high and the process flow is not visible hence not trackable nor manageable. Fully functioning ITPS will allow better human resource management, timetable optioneering, and specified quality controlled data entry and management. Through these changes, timetables of greater resilience based on agreed parameters will be delivered – optimising the likelihood of effective capacity management and resistance to perturbation, other benefits are reduced transaction costs and interface costs.

He admitted there have been recent problems that have affected TOC and the wider industry ability to provide accurate timetable information to customers. XXXXXXXX noted that the problems experienced give



users low confidence in ITPS and in NR as a project manager, under questioning he conceded that there is no easy or comprehensive, automatic way to assess the quality of the information in downstream systems before they are live.

The current position is:

1. Production of the National Rail Timetable. NR missed the required date of having information available for derivatives 8 weeks before the timetable change date and what was provided was poor quality. Problems remain with the presentation of 'associations' in the system and the absence of some schedules although XXXXX commented that a new software version release on 17 May was intended to fix these problems in advance of the timetable change on 23 May. At this point the correct information of appropriate quality will be available to TOCs through the system and on CD. Regrettably the privately published NRT will be inaccurate.
2. There are a very high number of short-term freight schedule alterations, some with turnarounds of five hours – NR now is on top of this.
3. Useable reports – short-term fix using excel data files, permanent fix is coming.
4. Strike planning – process designed that will allow for accurate timetable information on typical seven days notice. The issue in the last run was interfacing with TSDB and as TSDB is switched off there is no longer a problem.

Thanking XXXX, XXXXXX said that ITPS has had a difficult birth and perhaps the most important question today was the need for NR to give comfort that: all is now right for 23/05; to provide assurance that the process for the December timetable plan is fixed; and to satisfy users that mass uploading / amending will work, *e.g.* snow plans, *i.e.* when seven days notice isn't possible. He invited comment.

XXXXXXX asked when T-14 will be met, XXXXX said that dates are planned but he hadn't brought them to the meeting. *They are added to these notes – XXXXX.*

XXXXXXX noted that NRE information is still incorrect and said that the strike process XXXX had outlined will still mean customers have wrong information for five days in the run up to industrial action, at a time when their need for correct information is higher than the norm. XXXX said that NRE data will be corrected this weekend, he conceded there is no way of testing data accuracy other than using TOC and NR staff to sample the data and this is happening.

XXXXXX stressed the point XXXXXX had made, the real test being mass upload of information of emergency timetables, a snowplan for example, such that plans could be loaded, as an example, on a Sunday for a Monday.

XXXXXXX asked what had happened to the original offer of exporting data back to TOCs for use in Voyager Plan, XXXXX said that this isn't currently offered and would be looked on as an enhancement.

XXXXXXX said that NR is obligated to provide the information to agreed times at sufficient quality and the ORR will be investigating why the risks inherent in the change to ITPS had not been adequately identified and managed by NR.

In general discussion, TOC members of the NTF were not satisfied that NR has managed the transition well, nor that their questions were answered wholly satisfactorily. They remain concerned after the presentation that NR does not have a robust plan to ensure future permanent changes will not suffer the same failings and to address the issues with mass uploading. XXXXXX suggested that a "dry run" of the December change be considered later in summer. NR was requested to return to the July NTF

meeting with a plan that addresses: i) TOC confidence in the process to produce the December 2010 timetable and ii) an agreed industry approach to mass schedule deletion and upload (in the event of short-notice strikes, weather events etc) and to continue its reports to the NTFOG and updates through TOC conferences.

## **5.0 Chief Executive's Report to NTF – XXXXXXXX RSSB**

Given time, and the completeness of XXXXXXXX's pre-circulated paper, XXXXXX asked XXXXXXXX to be brief.

XXXXXX drew attention to:

- Rail Notices – they now cover reporting for rolling stock defects, operational safety advice, internal NR notices and workforce safety notices, more information is available at [www.railnotices.net](http://www.railnotices.net) - registration is required;
- The re-orientation of Community Safety Steering Group and its 2010/11 priorities for suicide prevention, level crossing user behaviour, alcohol and public disorder;
- The planned recruitment of a new chair for the CIRAS committee;
- The date, 29 September, of the Industry Safety Meeting, and the altered arrangements for representation;
- Key safety report\*, drawing attention to workforce accidents and two fatalities;
- The opportunities for GB Rail to improve the way it engages with Europe in standards;
- The benefits of the core R&D programme;
- New approach to rules, the first revised tranche coming into force on 5 June, the end of the consultation period for tranche 2 on 14 May and the timetable for tranches 3 and 4. He drew attention to tranches 5-12, which address the way the railway operates and the crucial role TOCs have in this and the wide range of views expressed, to which RSSB is responding. He acknowledged that the business case for TOCs is not as positive as for other industry members but still positive. He advised that a full briefing paper is available from himself or the NTF secretary.

\* This shown as annex "A" to these notes.

## **6.0 Papers for Noting**

Papers noted the comments were:

- 6.1 JPIPs
  - i) As noted earlier in the meeting the East Coast JPIP submitted will be less challenging, this will not impact the agreed NTF trajectory;
  - ii) In response to a question from the Chair it was confirmed that the CRR position is that agreed at the March NTF meeting.
- 6.2 XXXXXX suggested that by an "NTF" review, we mean the industry members not the DfT and ORR, this was agreed. XXXXXXXX to circulate responses to NTF members 20/05 for quick comment by 24/05 – deadline is 25/05.
- 6.3 LiveTrain, XXXX reported that the national project had failed the performance fund governance and activity stopped. The Fleet Challenge group is working to agree what

the next steps are including a specific project on NXEA class 90s and will report to 7 July NTF meeting.

There being no other business the chair closed the meeting at 17:43.

**ACTIONS ARISING FROM NTF 12 May 2010**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>WHAT</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>120510/01</b>	NR to provide a more detailed implementation plan for ITPS covering the need to mass uploading, and a dry run to demonstrate the reliability of the December timetable change. To provide four weekly updates to NTF-OG and to return to NTF 7 July.	XX	28/05 OG and onwards 07/07 NTF
<b>120510/02</b>	To circulate weather review responses to the NTF when draft complete	XX	20/05
<b>120510/03</b>	To note East Coast and NR will review JPIP	-	-

## Future Meeting Plan

Meeting Date	What	Who
9 June 2010	Performance Metrics and Demand Relationships	XXXXXX
9 June 2010	TSAG / SIC Report	XXXXXX
9 June 2010	Croydon Control Centre Review	XXXXXX (SN)
9 June 2010	Sub-threshold delays – progress report	XXXXXX (NR) / XXXXXX(ATOC)
7 July 2010	NTF Review	XXXXXXX
7 July 2010	Change of government – any changes to performance reporting?	XXXXXXX
7 July 2010	JRPP 2010 - 2012	XXXXXXX
7 July 2010	Fleet Challenge Progress Report	XXXXXXX
7 July 2010	ITPS Plan	XXXXXXX
4 August 2010	NR Asset Reliability	XXXXXXX
29 September 2010	ITPS Plan – Assurance for December	XXXXXXX

This plan is draft only and subject to review from agreed member direction / suggestion, it is current only at time of typing.

Blue shading	Means a paper for noting not currently a scheduled presentation
--------------	---

## Annex A to 12 May NTF Meeting – RSSB Key Safety Reports

