



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

To: Gerry Leighton,
Head of Stations & Depots and
Network Code
Office of Rail Regulation
One Kemble Street
London
WC2B 4AN

From: Ana Maria Sanchez
PA to Board Secretary
Delay Attribution Board
Floor 8
One Eversholt Street
London
NW1 2DN

cc: Richard Morris
Chairman,
Delay Attribution Board.

Tel:
Email:



Date: 30th January 2015

Submission of proposals for change to October 2014, 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/P233- Remove section 4.1.19 – Franchise company table
- DAB/P234- Amend section 4.28.2, item y – delay code from VB to VA
- DAB/P235- Amend section 4.16.4 Remove the word only from the second paragraph

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 Proposals 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 January 9th 2015. A number of Industry Parties responded to the consultation process and these responses are included in this submission.

All decisions made by the Board have been unanimous. A copy of the minutes of the meetings where the proposed amendment was agreed is available should you require them.

I await your advice on whether you approve the amendments 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 1st April 2015



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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ana Maria Sanchez', is written over a light pink rectangular background.

Ana Maria Sanchez, BA(Hons)

PA to DA Board Secretary
Mark Southon



Enc –

DAB/P233 – Remove section 4.1.19 – Franchise company table

DAB/P234 - Amend section 4.28.2, item y – delay code from VB to VA

DAB/P235 – Amend section 4.16.4 Remove the word only from the second paragraph



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

Industry Responses to Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide – October 2014 edition.

Proposal reference no:

DAB/P233 – Remove section 4.1.19 – Franchise company table

DAB/P234 - Amend section 4.28.2, item y – delay code from VB to VA

DAB/P235 – Amend section 4.16.4 Remove the word only from the second paragraph

Consultation closed – 9th January 2015

Responses received from:

DRSL
East Coast Trains
First Greater Western
First Hull Trains
First Transpennine Express
Grand Central
GTR
LOROL
Network Rail
Northern Rail
Scotrail
South Eastern Railways
Virgin trains

Originators Reference Code / N°	DAB/P233
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Delay Attribution Board
Exact details of the change proposed	Remove section 4.1.19
Reason for the change	<p>The information contained within the tables is subject to regular change as companies go through the franchise change process.</p> <p>The intention is for the DAB Secretariat to provide an appendix which can be provided separately to that of the DAG.</p>

1. Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?

If yes;

For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.

For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

This proposal aims to rid the guide of a section which is regularly erroneous due to the timing of the franchise change and that of the DAG publication cycle.

If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.

The Board suggests that by providing the operating company business codes - section 4.1.19 -separately to that of the DAG, the document can be maintained up to date without having to go through the document control process of that of the DAG.



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

Originators Reference Code / N°	DAB/P234
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Delay Attribution Board
Exact details of the change proposed	Amend section 4.28.2 y - delay code -from VB to VA
Reason for the change	So that both section 7 and section 4.28.1y are aligned. Section 7V of the DAG clearly states that disorder/drunks/assaults/theft/vagrants and serious crimes at a station should be coded VA. VB according to section 7 is vandalism or theft.

Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?

If yes;

For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.

For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

There is no known adverse impact to amending this now known error.

If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.

This proposal aims to ratify an earlier error

Originators Reference Code / N°	DAB/P235
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Delay Attribution Board
Exact details of the change proposed	<p>Amend section 4.16.4 second paragraph which reads</p> <p>“The code IR should be used where the rail is broken. The code IS should only be used where a suspected track defect is reported but no fault is found”.</p> <p>to:</p> <p>The code IR should be used where the rail is broken. The code IS should be used where a suspected track defect is reported but no fault is found.</p>
Reason for the change	<p>Removal of the word only allows for the correct attribution of delays caused by suspected track defects being reported which are then found to be unsubstantiated.</p> <p>There is known confusion amongst L1 staff as to where to attribute these delays in real-time. Presently, NFF track defects can sometimes be coded to IT; although this code should strictly be used for when bumps are reported and no fault is found.</p>

Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?

If yes;

For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.

For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

There is no known adverse impact to amending this now known error.

If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.

This proposal aims to provide opportunities for performance improvement through the correct recording of reported track defects which result in no fault found.

Company Organisation	Comments
Abellio Greater Anglia	No response received
Arriva Trains Wales	No response received
c2c Rail Ltd	No response received
Chiltern Railways	No response received
Colas Rail	No response received
DB Regio Tyne & Wear	No response received
DBSchenker	No response received
Devon & Cornwall Railways	No response received
Direct Rail Services	As per the response provided by the DAMG
East Coast	As per the response provided by the DAMG
East Midland Trains	No response received
Eurostar International	No response received
First / Keolis Transpennine	As per the response provided by the DAMG
First Greater Western	As per the response provided by the DAMG
First Hull Trains	As per the response provided by the DAMG
First Scotrail	As per the response provided by the DAMG
Freightliner	No response received
GB Railfreight	No response received
Grand Central Railway	As per the response provided by the DAMG
GTR	As per the response provided by the DAMG
Harsco Rail	No response received
Heathrow Express	No response received
London Midland	No response received
London Overground	As per the response provided by the DAMG
Merseyrail	No response received
North Yorkshire Moors	No response received
Northern Rail	As per the response provided by the DAMG
Southeastern	As per the response provided by the DAMG
Southern	No response received
Stagecoach South West	No response received
Virgin Trains	As per the response provided by the DAMG
West Coast Railway	No response received
XC Trains	No response received
DAMG - on behalf of the above companies	Accepts the proposed changes
Network Rail	Accepts the proposed changes
DAB DECISION	At the 20 th January 2015, Board meeting. The Board when reaching its decision to submit the proposals to ORR for approval, considered the industry consultation feedback and the reasoning provided within the original proposals. The Board agreed to submit these proposals for ORR approval.