



Delay Attribution Board
Floor 8
1 Eversholt Street
London
NW1 2DN

Delay Attribution Board Meeting of 21st November 2017

Summary of Meeting

DAB44 Guidance Note

The Guidance Note (DAB44) relating to the guidance provided to GTR and Network Rail at the September meeting was published and distributed to the Parties.

Members were advised that since publication GTR has challenged the Board's Guidance and raised the matter to the Access Dispute Committee for resolution.

The Board will review the Access Dispute Determination once available to understand if any changes or further clarity are required to be made to the DAPR as a consequence.

SE Route Management TINs

An update was provided to the Board relating to Management TINs on the Southeast Route. It was advised that the situation has not improved and that the Route are still not following the process as set out in PGD8 by not providing any updates to GTR regarding reattribution. In some cases TO incidents are being created on Day 8 and other incidents are being created with the freeform text clearly stating that the TDA clerk has not spoken to the signaller.

GTR has not yet taken up ORR's offer to talk to them about this issue but has raised its concerns at Route Executive level with a requirement for the Route to provide GTR with assurances that improvements will be made; else ORR's offer will be taken up. Presently whilst verbal assurances have been made by the Route there is no sight of a plan with either milestones or timelines.

It was surmised that something needs to materially change in terms of the approach the Route takes to attribution during autumn.

It was reluctantly accepted that there is nothing more specific the Board can do given that any escalation would be to the ORR who are already aware and monitoring the Route through the Regulatory Escalator. However, when the Route provide the improvement plan, the Board should review and monitor progress as an overseeing body.

Explaining DA Principles

A paper was presented to the Board building on a proposal at the October Board meeting for the Board to produce a guidance document explaining why certain attribution criteria are applied so as to alleviate some of the debates and discussions.

It was suggested that the Board produce the document in two styles – the first as presented for use with briefing Executive level staff and a less formal version for aiding Responsible Managers understand why attribution works the way it does.

Proposals for Amendment

The Board was provided with five draft Proposals for Amendment for review and agreement for them to be distributed for Industry Consultation.

NR P195 – OP removal.

This Proposal submitted by Network Rail seeks to remove a rarely used but often misused Delay Code and was agreed by the Board for distribution.

DAB P299 – Service Recovery Activities.

This Proposal is derived from Board discussions at the October Board Meeting to add a flow diagram to the DAPR for improved clarity for scenarios relating to Service Recovery. This was agreed for distribution pending some formatting changes for improved readability.

DAB P300 – Failed Train Recovery.

This Proposal is also derived from Board discussions over the previous two Board Meetings reflecting delays relating to recovery of failed trains. This was agreed for distribution pending a change of 'Part H' to 'Railway Operating Code' for correctness.

DAB P301 – Bird Size Proposal.

This Proposal is again derived from Board discussions from the October Board Meeting relating to better defining large birds. This was agreed for distribution pending expansion of the rationale for the proposal giving improved understanding.

GTR P01 – Management TINs.

This Proposal submitted by GTR follows up the concerns raised at the October Board Meeting relating to the creation and reattribution of Management TINs. This was agreed for distribution pending clarification that the referenced Process Guide is only a good practice document

P Code Discussion

A paper was presented setting out issues relating to the understanding, interpretation and application of P Codes which forms an action as part of the Board Objectives.

Members were asked to review the issues highlighted in the paper and consider if, in their view, they capture their concerns and to then consider the current P Codes and their descriptions.

It was suggested that there is a disconnect with agreements made prior to 22.00 for trains to be cancelled and the actual advice to passengers that they will be cancelled. The Reporting to DfT hinges on the advertising rather than the agreement.

It was pointed out that the Board needs to consider that attribution is in line with the Track Access Agreements and not any other contracts and agreements that Parties may have with different reporting requirements.

Members were asked to feedback their views on individual Delay Codes and whether they are actually needed and or need improved descriptions.



Delay Attribution Board
Floor 8
1 Eversholt Street
London
NW1 2DN

All those that were agreed as being required were still deemed to need improved descriptions and entries in the DAPR itself to improve interpretation and application.

All P Codes will be reviewed in terms of allocation to ensure any Delay Code removals, new descriptions or DAPR entries covering their usage are appropriately covered.

Subsequent questions raised during discussions which will be noted for consideration and review as part of the work stream were:-

How should a TSR be treated when it is allocated as partly P code and partly J code where the two components are then less than a subsequent incurred delay (e.g. a 4' TSR split to two separate 2' delays versus a stand-alone 3' delay to another cause – does the 3' take the reactionary or should the reactionary still go to the 4' TSR?)

Whilst there is certainly a benefit in Networking TSRs, is there not a risk that where that Network Delay is recorded as a P code that it could have trains allocated automatically that do not have the necessary Engineering Allowance?

Does the general 5% Engineering Allowance in the Southern Routes actually exist? Delays are regularly P coded but there is no specific way to evidence that the allowances are actually incorporated into the SRTs or schedules.

To progress this work stream the Secretary was asked to capture all that was discussed, agreed and questions posed for consideration and development by a small working group and to feedback progress at the next Board meeting.

Passenger Charter Discussion

The Board was presented a paper covering issues relating to the inclusion of Passenger Charter within the DAPR and the wider understanding and application of External Delay Codes which forms part of the Board Objectives.

Members were advised that it is believed only three Operators still have Passenger Charter arrangements in place and that ideally the DAPR, whilst still recognising that Passenger Charter is still in existence, should be amended to better focus on the external attribution element.

The Board were therefore taken through some initial proposals to amend the current DAPR that primarily removed all references (bar one) to Passenger Charter and looked to further enhance other entries to improve interpretation and application of V and X Delay Codes.

The draft proposals were discussed with various suggestions for improvement and clarifications being made that were captured for inclusion in a Proposal for Amendment.

The next steps with this work stream were proposed, and agreed, to look at the V and X Delay Codes to improve their descriptions and coverage in the DAPR or to potentially consider if some are required at all.



Delay Attribution Board
Floor 8
1 Eversholt Street
London
NW1 2DN

TRUST Changes

The Board was provided with an updated paper relating to progress made with two proposed TRUST changes first tabled in August.

Network Rail had progressed both issues internally with their Systems team and ATOS.

The first change proposed relates to TRJN Reports and the possibility of automation. This was considered a very useful functionality that is underused due to manual requests having to be made and time taken to get and interpret any useful data.

This would support the whole competency work stream if progressed and provide improved visibility to Operator's personnel as well as Network Rail.

The second change related to auto acceptance of incidents. Originally it had been requested to disable the facility completely but this was rejected by the Board. A compromise suggested and progressed was to raise the time limit from 8 to 48 hours.

The Board were asked to discuss the merits and cost versus benefit before agreeing whether either proposal should progress and also whether DAB should fund the changes from the System Development element of the Budget.

The Board agreed that both proposals should be progressed and funded by the Board. In the case of the extension to the auto acceptance functionality a briefing should be provided once go-live is planned to cover the rationale behind the change and expected benefits in terms of disputing incidents.

The official minutes will be available to Industry after sign-off at the 16th January meeting

Mark Southon

Secretary to the Delay Attribution Board