

# Delay Attribution Board

## Supplementary Document to the September 2010 Edition of the Delay Attribution Guide

Issue Dated – 19<sup>th</sup> September 2010

Issued By:  
The Secretary  
Delay Attribution Board  
Floor 8  
1Eversholt Street  
London  
NW1 2DN

# Delay Attribution Board

## Delay Attribution Board

The purpose of the Delay Attribution Board is to manage and oversee the effectiveness and accuracy of the delay attribution process within the railway industry.

The Board receives Proposals for Amendment to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code and has the responsibility for considering whether or not they should be amended. The Board also provides guidance to parties holding a Track Access Contract, on request, to assist in the resolution of disagreements concerning delay attribution.

## Establishment and composition of the Board

The Delay Attribution Board consists of a Chairman, a Board Secretary, a Secretariat and 12 Members of whom one is appointed Deputy Chairman.

The Members are appointed by the following Bands and Classes:

- Six Members from Network Rail
- One Member by each of the three Bands of the Franchised Passenger Class
- One Member by each of the two Bands of the Non-Passenger Class principally freight train operating companies.
- One Member by the Non-Franchised Passenger Class

## Operation

Ordinarily the Board meets every four weeks, with minutes of the meeting published thereafter on the public area of the Delay Attribution Board (DAB) website. "click on link" and enter as a guest – <http://dab.webexone.com/>

For the Board to conduct business and be quorate, a minimum of 7 members of which one member must either be the Chairman or the Deputy Chairman and 3 members from train operating companies and 3 members from Network Rail.

## Who is the Delay Attribution Board?

Within the Board there is a mix of individuals from train operating companies and within Network Rail in order to make sure that the requirements for the Delay Attribution Board, which are set out in the Network Code are met.

# Delay Attribution Board

<b>Franchised Passenger Class Band 1</b>	<b>DAB representatives</b>
First ScotRail Railway Ltd First Great Western Ltd West Coast Trains Ltd Northern Rail Ltd	John Barker - First Great Western
<b>Franchised Passenger Class Band 2</b>	
Arriva Trains Wales Ltd East Coast Main Line Company Ltd Stagecoach South Western Trains Ltd London Eastern Railway Ltd London & South Eastern Railway Southern Railway Ltd XC Trains Ltd	Keith Palmer - National Express East Anglia
<b>Franchised Passenger Class Band 3</b>	
East Midlands Trains Ltd London Overground Rail Operations Ltd London & Birmingham Railway Ltd First Capital Connect Ltd C2C Rail Ltd The Chiltern Railway Company Ltd Merseyrail Electrics First/Keolis Transpennine Ltd	Nathan Thompson - London Midland
<b>Non-Franchised Passenger Class</b>	
Eurostar Grand Central Railway Hull Trains Company Ltd Nexus North Yorkshire Moors Railway The West Coast Company	Steve Carter - Eurostar
<b>Non-Passenger Class companies Band 1</b>	
DB Schenker Rail (UK) Freightliner Ltd	Nigel Oatway - DB Schenker (also Deputy Chairman of the DAB)
<b>Non-Passenger Class companies Band 2</b>	
Amey Railways Ltd Babcock Rail Balfour Beatty Plant & Fleet Services Carillion Rail (2004) COLAS Rail Ltd Direct Rail Services English Welsh & Scottish Railway International Fastline Ltd First GBRf Freightliner Heavy Haul Ltd Grant Rail Ltd Jarvis Rail Ltd Rail Express Systems Ltd Serco Railtest	Randolph Baller - Freightliner Heavy Haul

# Delay Attribution Board

<b>Network Rail</b>	Mark Southon Nic Coome Andrew Rowe Mark Scourfield Paul Stanford Alex Kenney
---------------------	---

## **Non-Voting Members of Delay Attribution Board**

Chairman: John Rhodes  
Secretary Lee Amass  
Secretariat Ana-Maria Sanchez

## **Want to know more?**

The delay attribution Board has a website, where minutes of previous DAB meetings are held, useful links to other relevant industry documents exist and where contact details are shown – should you want to make contact with the Delay Attribution Board to obtain further information regarding the process for proposing amendments to the DAG/PDAC and requesting guidance please email [ana.sanchez@networkrail.co.uk](mailto:ana.sanchez@networkrail.co.uk)

# Delay Attribution Board

## **Introduction**

The aim of this document is to inform users of the main changes incorporated in the September 2010 edition of the Delay Attribution Guide (DAG)

Rail industry parties submitted proposed changes to the May 2010 DAG and these were circulated for industry consultation. The Office of Rail Regulation approved the proposals on the 11<sup>th</sup> August 2010. The amendments take effect on the 19<sup>th</sup> September 2010. The changes were processed in accordance with the Network Code Condition B2.5 – B2.7 (inclusive).

The September 2010, Delay Attribution Guide, sees the addition of 6 new delay codes as well as the replacement of DAG 4.3 – Adhesion Problems including Leaf-Fall. There are also minor changes to improve clarification and referencing within the DAG.

The tables below highlight the significant changes. Each of the following sections of this supplementary document details:

1. the section of the DAG affected
2. the change made and
3. the reason for the change

This information is consistent with that given to the ORR when these changes were submitted for approval.

# Delay Attribution Board

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>4.3</b>
<b>Change</b>	<b><i>Replace DAG 4.3</i></b>  This section has undergone a complete change and therefore, it would be prudent to make yourselves familiar with the content of section 4.3 in its entirety.
<b>Reason for change</b>	Inconsistencies identified by Network Rail regarding autumn attribution needed to be addressed and the content of 4.3 was deemed out of date and not appropriate for current attribution standards, and as such a cause for many of the inconsistencies.  Many of the processes utilised for autumn in Network Rail routes with their respective TOCs are improvements on the current processes set out within the DAG as it stands and so the DAG needs to be updated to reflect those good practices.  Many parts of the May 2010 DAG section 4.3 eluded to the process of defining the commercial deal and not specifically attribution so this, needed to be removed.  There are many omissions for clarity and coding that required inclusion and further aspects that needed clarification.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>Appendix A – Section O</b>
<b>Change</b>	Insert new code: ON – Delays not properly investigated by Network Rail
<b>Reason for change</b>	Following a review, it was identified that in a number of circumstances deemed attribution errors were being attributed to different delay codes. A common approach to resolving this attribution issue was deemed necessary and therefore a specific operational code to reflect that attribution sits under the operational and customer services function within Network Rail was deemed an appropriate method.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>Appendix A – Section OU</b>
<b>Change</b>	Insert new code: OU – Delays not investigated by Network Rail
<b>Reason for change</b>	The route performance measurement managers group discussed the merits of having a common approach to the attribution of incidents which have not been investigated either by default or by choice. It was agreed that in principle, a short term code would be appropriate in order to improve reporting and analysis.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>DAG 4.16.3</b>
<b>Change</b>	In some cases, failure of an insulated block joint (IBJ), i.e. the insulation between two track circuits, may cause a track circuit failure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the insulation on the IBJ fails or is faulty but does not cause a track fault, the delays should be coded as a track circuit failure - IC.</li> <li>○ If the IBJ fault lies with the joint itself, then the delays should be coded as a track fault, irrespective of whether the track circuit also fails - IS.</li> </ul>

# Delay Attribution Board

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the IBJ fault does not cause the track circuit to fail but does result in trains being delayed, e.g. through cautioning of trains due to a dipped joint, the delay should be coded IS.</li> </ul> <div style="text-align: center;"> <pre> graph TD     A[Train Held due to Track Circuit Failure (as per DAG 4.16.3b)] --&gt; B{IBJ Insulation Failed?}     B -- No --&gt; C([Attribute to an Incident with Delay Code IS 'Track defects (other than rail defects i.e. fish plates, wet beds etc)'])     B -- Yes --&gt; D([Attribute to an Incident with Delay Code IC 'Track circuit failure'])             </pre> </div>
<b>Reason for change</b>	During an O&CS/Maintenance attribution workshop, a requirement to make sure that IBJ incidents were always attributed to the code IS as it was identified that their failure was not a failure of the track circuit but rather evidence that the track circuit is functioning as it is designed to do.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>DAG 4.4</b>
<b>Change</b>	<p>Section 4.4 is now called: Animal incursion, strikes and infestation.</p> <p>4.4.1 The term 'infestation' used in this section, represents animal behaviour which on the balance of probability, commenced prior to the last planned infrastructure maintenance inspection; or two months before the date of infrastructure failure; whichever is sooner.</p> <p>4.4.1.1 If the incident is the result of damage due to repeated and chronic animal behaviour (infestation as opposed to incursion or strike), code to I*/J* Delay Code for the equipment failure type.</p> <p>4.4.1.2 In the event of damage caused to the infrastructure by an animal, where the animal is present (alive or dead), and removal results in rectification with no remedial works, use delay code X8.</p> <p>4.4.1.3 In the event of animal/infrastructure interface, where the animal is present (alive or dead), and infrastructure damage has been caused by that interface, with post-removal rectification works required, code to I*/J* code for the equipment failure type.</p> <p>4.4.1.4 If the incident is the result of a sudden acute incursion and the animal is not present at the point of failure, use delay code I8."</p>
<b>Reason for change</b>	The DAG required a review and potential change in respect to attribution to incidents caused by animals, aerial and terrestrial. Guidance in respect of Infrastructure/animal interfaces was less comprehensive. For the purposes of attribution, only animal actions affecting infrastructure equipment are considered. Current guidance regarding obstruction and effects upon train operations remain unaltered.

# Delay Attribution Board

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>DAG 4.16.15</b>
<b>Change</b>	<p>Addition of section 4.16.15 – Accepted design limitations</p> <p>Accepted Design Limitations (ADLs) is a generic title applied to network related operational constraints that have the capacity to cause delay because equipment is unable to cater for particular circumstances, despite not being in “failure mode”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the ADL causes an infrastructure failure, use the appropriate I*/J* delay code for the equipment failure type.</li> <li>b. If the ADL causes no failure, but still causes delay, further investigation will be required.</li> <li>c. If the ADL is included in the Special Box Instructions or similar, the signaller is able to mitigate the ADL effects and does not do so, use delay code OC.</li> <li>d. If the ADL is included in the Special Box Instructions or similar, the signaller is unable to mitigate the ADL effects and does not otherwise cause delay, use the appropriate I*/J* delay code for the equipment type as if it did fail and attribute to the maintenance organisation.</li> <li>e. If the ADL is not included in the Special Box Instructions or similar, use the appropriate I*/J* delay code for the equipment type as if it did fail and attribute to the maintenance organisation.</li> <li>f. If, via the RT 3973 process, train planning have had the opportunity to reflect the impact of the ADL in the train plan and the train plan doesn’t reflect it and no other delay cause exists, use delay code QA/QM and allocate to the Train Planning Centre.”</li> </ol>
<b>Reason for change</b>	For the purposes of attribution, ADLs are assumed to have been accepted by the Maintenance organisation from Infrastructure Investment, and are referred to as “Accepted Design Limitations (ADLs). The key to attribution is identification of the function best able to mitigate the effects of the limitation.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>DAG 4.28.2</b>
<b>Change</b>	No. ae - New code RY – Passenger fallen between platform and a train whilst boarding/alighting from that train.
<b>Reason for change</b>	<p>To clarify the scenario of passengers falling between platform and train whilst attempting to board or alight from that train.</p> <p>In this particular scenario, it is wholly the operator’s responsibility as it involves the operation of the train and the interface of the passenger and that train. There is no intention to trespass.</p> <p>In circumstances not involving a train it would be attributed to Network Rail.</p>

# Delay Attribution Board

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>DAG 4.28.2</b>
<b>Change</b>	<p>No af-al</p> <p>No af: New code RP – Passenger dropped object whilst boarding/alighting from train preventing the departure of that train.</p> <p>No ag: New code JX – Passenger dropped object whilst not in the process of boarding/alighting that is an obstruction of the line and prevents the movement of a train to/from the affected platform</p> <p>No ah: New code OC – Signaller prevents passage of train after request to recover item where the item is not considered an obstruction of the line.</p> <p>No ai: New code IA – Failure of/defect with CD/RA equipment except where agreed operator mitigation not implemented.</p> <p>No aj &amp; al: New code R1- Failure of/defect with CD/RA equipment where agreed operator mitigation not implemented Or Sunlight on CD/RA equipment where agreed operator mitigation not implemented</p> <p>No ak: New code XU –Sunlight on CD/RA equipment except where agreed operator mitigation not implemented</p>
<b>Reason for change</b>	<p>No af-ah: To clarify the correct use of delay code RP (Passenger dropped object)</p> <p>No ai-al: The rationale is that whilst the failure/defect of CD/RA is deemed Network Rail's responsibility, the mitigation to dispatch trains sits with the operator it must be considered in these cases that the track access is available as the signal must be 'off' for the despatch procedure to commence.</p>

# Delay Attribution Board

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>4.37.6d</b>
<b>Change</b>	<p>Alteration to the NB message and the fleet arm of the chart.</p> <p>Alter the Fleet arm of the chart to: -</p> <pre> graph TD     Fleet[Fleet] --&gt; D1{Is it due to a running brake test and/or a fleet imposed restriction in accordance with the rule book?}     D1 -- Yes --&gt; VW1([VW (MW freight)])     D1 -- No --&gt; D2{Were severe weather criteria met?}     D2 -- Yes --&gt; VW2([VW (MW freight)])     D2 -- No --&gt; MW([MW])     </pre> <p>N.B. In the case of infrastructure assets (with the exception of OLE and 3<sup>rd</sup> rail) where key route weather strategy has been implemented and the asset is working within design parameters but overwhelmed then code XT should be used</p>
<b>Reason for change</b>	To provide further clarification in the DAG for weather related issues specifically those affecting visibility.
<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>4.37.6e</b>
<b>Change</b>	New flow chart – delay code guidance for dealing with the impact of visibility caused the sun
<b>Reason for change</b>	To provide further clarification in the DAG for weather related issues specifically affecting visibility. The proposal also takes into account the guidance provided in ADP39.
<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>4.37.6f</b>
<b>Change</b>	New flow chart – delay code guidance for dealing with the impact of visibility caused by fog, snow, rain
<b>Reason for change</b>	To provide further clarification in the DAG for weather related issues specifically affecting visibility.

# Delay Attribution Board

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>Appendix T &amp; V</b>
<b>Change</b>	New code TW – Driver adhering to company professional driving standards or policy. New code VR – Driver adhering to company professional driving standards or policies during severe weather conditions that are not fleet related
<b>Reason for change</b>	To provide further clarification in the DAG for weather related issues specifically affecting visibility.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>Appendix X</b>
<b>Change</b>	New cause for code XI – visibility in semaphore signalled areas, or special working for fog and falling snow implemented by Network Rail – in all signalling areas
<b>Reason for change</b>	To provide further clarification in the DAG for weather related issues specifically affecting visibility.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>4.37</b>
<b>Change</b>	New section 4.37.7
<b>Reason for change</b>	Following the DAB 22 ruling, it was considered reasonable that proposals to the DAG be submitted with regard to incidents involving extreme cold and /or snow conditions.

<b>DAG Section Affected</b>	<b>4.37.5</b>
<b>Change</b>	New section ac – where drivers of freight services confirm that delay is a result of adherence to company driving standards or policies during adverse weather conditions.  New code: FG – Driver adhering to company professional driving standards or policy
<b>Reason for change</b>	To provide further clarification in the DAG for weather related issues specifically affecting visibility.

END

---