

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

То:	Gerry Leighton, Head of Stations, Depots and Network Code Office of Rail and Road One Kemble Street London WC2B 4AN	Tel: Email:		
cc:	Richard Morris Chairman, Delay Attribution Board. Michael Scarff – ORR	Date:	24 th June 2015	

Submission of proposals for change to April 2015 Delay Attribution Guide (DAG)

Dear Gerry,

I am writing seeking approval for proposed changes to the Delay Attribution Guide in accordance with Track Access Condition B2.7.2.

Please find appended to this letter details of the following Proposals for Change:

DAB/P243 Change despatch to dispatch

NR/P171- Change Operational planning to Capacity planning

NR/P172 – Additional sectional section of 4.31.2(h)

NR/P173 - Further scenarios to section 4.8.13

NR/P175 –Additional wording in section 4.23.3

NR/P176 – Regulation of early running train matrix

The details for each proposal consist of the following information:

- 1 The Proposal for Change from the sponsor.
- 2 A list of the industry responses to the Proposal for Change.
- **3** The DAB decision and consideration of the responses from the industry.

The proposals for amendment to the Delay Attribution Guide were put out to Industry Parties for formal consultation in accordance with Track Access Condition B2.5.2. The deadline for Industry responses was 14th May, A number of Industry Parties responded to the consultation process and these responses are included in this submission.

All bar one decision (NR/P176) made by the Board have been unanimous. A copy of the minutes of the meetings where the proposed amendments were agreed is available should you require it.



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

I await your advice on whether you approve the amendment proposed. Finally, in accordance with Track Access Condition B2.7.1, the Board has agreed that any changes approved by the Regulator should come into effect **14**th **September 2015**

Should you wish to discuss any aspect of this submission or the proposals for that matter, please do not hesitate to contact me as detailed above.

Kind regards,

Ana Maria Sanchez, BA(Hons)

PA to DA Board Secretary



Consultation closed – 14th May

Proposal reference Number:	DAB/P243	NR/P170	NR/P171	NR/P172	NR/P173	NR/P174	NR/P175	NR/P176
Company Organisation								
Abellio Greater Anglia*	\checkmark							
Arriva Trains Wales								
c2c Rail Ltd								
Chiltern Railways								
Colas Rail								
DB Regio Tyne & Wear								
DBSchenker								
Devon & Cornwall Railways								
Direct Rail Services								
East Midland Trains								
Eurostar International								
First / Keolis Transpennine *	\checkmark							
First Greater Western *	\checkmark							
First Hull Trains								
Freightliner *	\checkmark							
GB Railfreight								
Govia Thameslink Railway *	\checkmark							
Grand Central Railway*	\checkmark							
Harsco Rail								



Consultation closed – 14th May

Proposal reference Number:	DAB/P243	NR/P170	NR/P171	NR/P172	NR/P173	NR/P174	NR/P175	NR/P176
Heathrow Express								
London Midland								
London Overground								
Merseyrail*	\checkmark							
North Yorkshire Moors								
Northern Rail *	\checkmark							
Scotrail *	\checkmark							
Southeastern Railway *	\checkmark							
Southern								
Stagecoach South West								
Virgin Trains (West Coast)*	\checkmark							
Virgin Trains East Coast								
West Coast Railway								
XC Trains								
Network Rail	\checkmark							

*Response through DAMG



Originators Reference Code / **DAB/P243** N⁰ Name of the original DAB sponsoring organisation(s) Change all entries of 'despatch' in the DAG to read 'dispatch' Exact details of the change proposed Remove the wording 'dated 15th September 2013' from the second paragraph in the foreword. Amend 4.3.7.3(a) circumstances wording from 'Where there is a greases on...' to 'Where there is grease on..' Reason for the change One proposal containing alterations that are required to the DAG that are considered non material but none the less required for accuracy, consistency and grammar Consistency with the wording 'dispatch' throughout the DAG In the foreword of the DAG the previous issue is written but requires a PfC each time. Suggested that the date is removed from the foreword and added to front cover (which can be changed by the Secretariat). Amendment to wording in 4.3.7.3(a) for grammatical correctness.

DAB/P243

Company Organisation	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1.	DAMG on behalf of the identified companies accepts this proposal.
Network Rail	Network Rail accept the proposal
DAB DECISION	The Board when reaching its decision at the 9 th June board meeting, considered the industry consultation feedback and the reasoning provided within the original proposal prior to considering the same for submission for ORR approval.



Consultation closed – 14th May

Originators Reference Code / Nº	NR/P171
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Network Rail
Exact details of the change proposed	Change all references within the DAG of Operational Planning to Capacity Planning
Reason for the change	To bring the DAG in line with current organisational names

Company Organisation	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1.	DAMG on behalf of the identified companies accepts this proposal.
Network Rail	Network Rail accept the proposal
DAB DECISION	The Board when reaching its decision at the 9 th June board meeting, considered the industry consultation feedback and the reasoning provided within the original proposal prior to considering the same for submission for ORR approval.



Consultation closed – 14th May

Originators Reference Code / Nº	NR/P172					
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Network Rail					
Exact details of the change proposed	Add new 4.31.2(h)					
proposed	No.	Circumstance	Delay Code	Incident Attribution		
	h.	Short Term Plan (STP) errors in connection with a freight schedule	QM	Network Rail (QQAK)		
	Add ne	w 4.31.7				
	4.31.7	Event that has caused the n	Managem protocol (N in Slot sho created fo eed for th	ent of Freight ICI 9.1), the ould be attributed or the Disruptive		
Reason for the change	 to the TRUST delay incident created for the Event that has caused the need for the Alternation Train Slot to be implemented. This PfC is proposed to cover two common areas investigated to be progressed to the freight scheduling. They have both been part of internal briefing but are requested to be progressed to the further visibility and understanding. The first part is proposed in response to requirement Amended Schedule Processing Manager (STP) to hav schedule incidents due to Short Term Planning attrib QQAK. This is expected to save time with internal reat and allow causes of incidents to be established quick improvement in analysis. The second part is in response to requirements under revised operational protocol for managing freight set disruption. One of the consequences of the implementation of N the prime delay minutes attributed to any incident w reduced as affected trains are provided with an Alternation Slot (ATS). A concern raised by a number of FOCs, an within Network Rail, is that this reduction in the num minutes may adversely affect the ability to identify the disruption caused by an incident and thus diminish a 		internal Network to the DAG for ments from the b have all Freight attributed to al reattribution quicker and under the nt services during of MFSD is that ent will be Alternative Train s, and shared number of delay tify the scale of			



Previous evidence showed that whilst this generally occurs it is
not always the case, and the cancellation of the unused Base
Train Slot may be attributed to FL, P* or Q* cause codes before
correction. By ensuring that all such cancellations are correctly
coded on the day, the impact of any incident subject to the
MFSD protocol will be visible through both cancellations and
delay minutes in PSS and reduction in discussions and reworking
at Level 2.

Company Organisation	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1.	DAMG on behalf of the identified companies accepts this proposal.
Network Rail	Network Rail accept the proposal
DAB DECISION	The Board when reaching its decision at the 9 th June board meeting, considered the industry consultation feedback and the reasoning provided within the original proposal prior to considering the same for submission for ORR approval.



NR/P1	73			
Network Rail				
Add fu	rther scenarios to DAG 4.8.13:	-		
No.	Circumstance	Delay Code	Incident Attribution	
p.	Overrun of possession, due to a substandard action or inaction of a member of route operations staff (e.g. signallers, MOM's, LOM's)	15	Network Rail (OQ**)	
q.	Overrun of possession, due to the removal of staff from a worksite(s)	15	Network Rail (IQ**)	
r.	Overrun of possession, due to a substandard action or inaction of a member of NSC operations staff	15	Network Rail (IQAW)	
Although contrary to customary practice and DAG 4.8.13 4.16.2 it should be noted that DAG 4.8.5 does not specific responsible manager code for use with I5 and as such the of an Infrastructure Reason Code and an Operational Responsible Manager Code (e.g operational staff such as signallers, LOMs. MOM's, controllers, etc) are not covered appropriately. This proposal looks to clarify that in certain circumstance possession over runs are the responsibility of operational personnel rather than the maintenance organisation but importantly, still remain an I5 coding.				
	NetwoAdd fuNo.p.q.q.q.r.Althou4.16.2responof an IrResporsignalleappropThis prpossesperson	Add further scenarios to DAG 4.8.13: No. Circumstance p. Overrun of possession, due to a substandard action or inaction of a member of route operations staff (e.g. signallers, MOM's, LOM's) q. Overrun of possession, due to the removal of staff from a worksite(s) r. Overrun of possession, due to a substandard action or inaction of a member of NSC operations staff Although contrary to customary pract 4.16.2 it should be noted that DAG 4.8 responsible manager code for use with of an Infrastructure Reason Code and Responsible Manager Code (e.g operations, appropriately. This proposal looks to clarify that in compossession over runs are the responsible personnel rather than the maintenance	Network Rail Add further scenarios to DAG 4.8.13:- No. Circumstance Delay Code p. Overrun of possession, due to a substandard action or inaction of a member of route operations staff (e.g. signallers, MOM's, LOM's) 15 q. Overrun of possession, due to the removal of staff from a worksite(s) 15 r. Overrun of possession, due to a substandard action or inaction of a member of NSC operations staff 15 Although contrary to customary practice and DA 4.16.2 it should be noted that DAG 4.8.5 does no responsible manager code for use with 15 and as of an Infrastructure Reason Code and an Operat Responsible Manager Code (e.g operational staf signallers, LOMs. MOM's, controllers, etc) are no appropriately. This proposal looks to clarify that in certain circu possession over runs are the responsibility of op personnel rather than the maintenance organisa	



Company Organisation	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1.	DAMG on behalf of the identified companies accepts this proposal.
Network Rail	Network Rail accept the proposal
DAB DECISION	The Board when reaching its decision at the 9 th June board meeting, considered the industry consultation feedback and the reasoning provided within the original proposal prior to considering the same for submission for ORR approval.



Consultation closed – 14th May

Originators Reference Code / Nº	NR/P175
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Network Rail
Exact details of the change proposed	 Additional wording in paragraph 4.23.3 (red) 4.23.3 In the event of a train being incorrectly regulated or routed as a result of a signaller correctly applying an incorrectly-produced Train Service Simplifier, the 'Minutes Delay' should be attributed to Network Rail and coded OQ/OQ**. This coding shall apply irrespective of who created the simplifier or the source of the information. The exception is when the simplifiers are produced by Capacity Planning which should be coded to (QA/QM / QQ**).
Reason for the change	Internally to Network Rail, much debate is had about the provision and accuracy of simplifiers with reasons for errors often cited as being the information source (sometimes provided by Operators) This proposal seeks to highlight that the source of information for simplifiers should not detract from the simplifier error itself. Correction to 'Capacity Planning' also considered at the same time (see also separate proposal)

Company Organisation	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1.	DAMG on behalf of the identified companies accepts this proposal.
Network Rail	Network Rail accept the proposal
DAB DECISION	The Board when reaching its decision at the 9 th June board meeting, considered the industry consultation feedback and the reasoning provided within the original proposal prior to considering the same for submission for ORR approval.



Consultation closed – 14th May

Originators Reference Code / Nº	NR/P176
Name of the original	Network Rail
sponsoring organisation(s)	
Exact details of the change proposed	New 4.23.6
	4.23.6 Regulation of early running trains
	(Add matrix shown below)
Reason for the change	A significant amount of parties' performance team's time is spent debating regulation decisions, and often relates to early running trains across Route or signalling control boundaries and where any control or mitigation could have occurred.
	This proposal seeks to highlight and clarify the reasons for and subsequent rationale for attribution for the common delays and mitigatory possibilities for early running trains

No.	Circumstances	Delay Code	Incident Attribution
a.	Train running early (any reason) and regulating error occurs at point of delay (i.e. early train could have been held at that point causing no delay)	OB	Attribution to LOM code controlling section that regulation error occurred (OQ**)
b.	Train running early that could have been held at a prior regulating point where no delay would have occurred (no regulating error at point of delay)	OC	Attribution to LOM code controlling section where train could have been held Note – if the section is on another Route then DAG 2.6.17applies (OQ**)
С.	Train running early on control agreement (not withstanding scenario 1)	OD	Attribution to go to the Control Manager that agreed running early Note – If it is another Route Control agreement then 2.6.17 applies (OQ**)
d.	Train running early due to a driver / shunter request that signaller agrees to (i.e. not processed through Control) (not withstanding scenario 1)	OC	Attribution to LOM code controlling the 'box that allowed early running (OQ**)
е.	Train running early as a direct result of a known incident – e.g. diverted via quicker route. (not withstanding scenario 1)	Prime cause incident	Attribution to the incident causing early running.



Company Organisation	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1.	 DAMG on behalf of the identified companies rejects in current form, Reason 1) how early is early, 1 min or 20 mins, as is this proposal will create disputes due to lack of specification. Reason 2) Propose change to part a: the language is not clear . reword to "Train running early is incorrectly given priority causing delay, where no prior regulation opportunity exists, regardless of reason for early running" Reason 3) reword part b : "Train running early is incorrectly given priority causing delay, where prior regulation opportunity exists, regardless of reason for early running" Reason 3) reword part b : "Train running early is incorrectly given priority causing delay, where prior regulation opportunity exists, regardless of reason for early running." Reason 4) reword c : "Train running early given priority by control agreement causing delay, except where 'e' takes precedent" A also potentially contradicts NR/P170 – Reason 5) In addition to NP176 b –Control would generally not request that a train runs early. Any such request would be to recover a delay or mitigate against further delay to that train or another service. Should this not be a reactionary delay and be part of NP176 e?
Network Rail	Network Rail accepts the proposal on the proviso that the phrase Train running early and out of path' replace 'train running early' and that the references be changed to reflect alphabetical instead of numerical.
DAB DECISION	The Board when reaching its decision at the 9 th June board meeting, considered the industry consultation feedback and the reasoning provided within the original proposal prior to considering the same for submission for ORR approval. This proposal was approved subject to non-material amendments. The Board suggested that under each proposed circumstance, the sentence should read – <i>Train</i> <i>running early and out of path</i> . As well as to change the referencing within the circumstances dialogue, from a number format to a letter format in line with the No. column. These suggestions were accepted as they provided greater clarity.



Operator's (via DAMG) comments where were provided
through the consultation process were rejected as the Board
agreed that they caused further confusion. A vote to
establish whether to approve the original proposal was
taken; with the result of 10 members approving the wording
to stay as originally proposed subject to the afore mentioned
non-material alterations and 2 against the proposal as cited
within the DAMG comments.



Proposal for approval

Originators Reference Code / Nº	NR/P176
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Network Rail
Exact details of the change proposed	New 4.23.6 4.23.6 Regulation of early running trains (Add matrix shown below)
Reason for the change	A significant amount of parties' performance team's time is spent debating regulation decisions, and often relates to early running trains across Route or signalling control boundaries and where any control or mitigation could have occurred. This proposal seeks to highlight and clarify the reasons for and subsequent rationale for attribution for the common delays and mitigatory possibilities for early running trains

No.	Circumstances	Delay Code	Incident Attribution
a.	Train running early and out of path (any reason) and regulating error occurs at point of delay (i.e. early train could have been held at that point causing no delay)	OB	Attribution to LOM code controlling section that regulation error occurred (OQ**)
b.	Train running early <i>and out of path</i> that could have been held at a prior regulating point where no delay would have occurred (no regulating error at point of delay)	OC	Attribution to LOM code controlling section where train could have been held Note – if the section is on another Route then DAG 2.6.17applies (OQ**)
С.	Train running early <i>and out of path</i> on control agreement (not withstanding scenario a)	OD	Attribution to go to the Control Manager that agreed running early Note – If it is another Route Control agreement then 2.6.17 applies (OQ**)
d.	Train running early and out of path due to a driver / shunter request that signaller agrees to (i.e. not processed through Control) (not withstanding scenario a)	OC	Attribution to LOM code controlling the 'box that allowed early running (OQ**)
e.	Train running early <i>and out of path</i> as a direct result of a known incident – e.g. diverted via quicker route. (not withstanding scenario a)	Prime cause incident	Attribution to the incident causing early running.