



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

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

**Tel:**  
**Email:**



**cc:**



**Date:** 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016

### **Submission of proposals for change to April 2016 Delay Attribution Guide (DAG)**

Dear Gerry,

I am writing to seek approval from your office, for a number of Proposals to change 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/P267 – General Corrections  
DAB/P268 – DAG wording changes  
DAB/P269 – Attribution of several small delays  
DAB/P270 – Attribution of delays when staff are travelling passenger  
VTEC/002 – Retrieval of dropped items

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 the 4<sup>th</sup> May. 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 amendments were agreed is available should you require it.

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 19<sup>th</sup> September 2016**



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 that reads 'Ana Maria Sanchez'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'A'.

Ana Maria Sanchez

PA to Mark Southon  
Board Secretary



Proposal reference Number:	DAB/P267 General corrections	DAB/P268 DAG wording changes	DAB/P269 Several Small Delays Attribution	DAB/P270 Staff Travelling Passenger	VTEC 002 Retrieval of dropped items
<b>Company Organisation</b>					
Abellio Greater Anglia*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Arriva Trains Wales					
c2c Rail Ltd					
Chiltern Railways					
Colas Rail					
DB Regio Tyne & Wear					
DB Cargo					
Devon & Cornwall Railways					
Direct Rail Services*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
East Midland Trains*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Eurostar International					
Transpennine Express	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Great Western Railway*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
First Hull Trains*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Freightliner					
GB Railfreight					
Govia Thameslink Railway*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Grand Central Railway					
Harsco Rail					
Heathrow Express					
London Midland					
London Overground					
Merseyrail					
North Yorkshire Moors					
North Rail					

Proposal reference Number:	DAB/P267 General corrections	DAB/P268 DAG wording changes	DAB/P269 Several Small Delays Attribution	DAB/P270 Staff Travelling Passenger	VTEC 002 Retrieval of dropped items
Scotrail*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Southeastern Railway					
Stagecoach South West					
Virgin Trains (West Coast)*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Virgin Trains East Coast					
West Coast Railway					
XC Trains					
Network Rail	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

Any Track Access Party may sponsor a proposed amendment to the Delay Attribution Guide (DAG) or Performance Data Accuracy Code (PDAC) (as defined in the Network Code Part B 2.5.1). This form sets out the information requirements for any proposal submitted for consideration by the Delay Attribution Board.

Appendices should be provided where necessary

Originators Reference Code / N <sup>o</sup>	<b>DAB P267 DAG TIDY UPS AND GENERAL CORRECTIONS</b>
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB
Exact details of the change proposed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1) Amend reference to 4.2.2.4 within section 4.2.2.4 (itself) to reference 4.2.4.2</b></li> <li><b>2) Add missing title within section 4.9 to read:- 4.9.1 The Train Plan</b></li> <li><b>3) Remove wording 'Appendix A' from Section 5 and subsequent references in the Contents</b></li> <li><b>4) Amend the reference to 4.2.4.2 within section 4.1.6.3 to read 4.5.2</b></li> <li><b>5) Remove clause 'r' (IQAW) from 4.13.2.13 as IQAW not used.</b></li> <li><b>6) Amend referencing 'as per DAG' wording in flowcharts 4.3.1.6.1 and 4.3.1.6.2 and 4.14.5.7 to read 'Section'</b></li> <li><b>7) Amend 'FPM' to read 'FDM' in first bullet in 4.8.3</b></li> <li><b>8) Amend reference to 4.11 in the bottom right diamond within flowchart 4.11.11 to read 4.11.2</b></li> <li><b>9) Amend wording in 4.15.2.4f from 'see 'o' below' to read 'see circumstance 'o' below'</b></li> <li><b>10) Amend wording in 4.15.2.4o from 'see m' to read 'see circumstance 'm' above'</b></li> <li><b>11) Amend Incident Attribution in 4.3.2.3h to read 'Network Rail (OQ**)'</b></li> <li><b>12) Amend 4.5.2.2b with the addition of F##* and M##* under Incident Attribution column</b></li> <li><b>13) Amend 4.15.2.4i Incident Attribution from IQ##* to IQ**</b></li> <li><b>14) Amend 4.11.2ai Incident Attribution from R*** to R##*</b></li> </ol>

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

	<b>15) Add A##* to Incident Attribution column in 4.13.1e</b>
Reason for the change	<p>All the changes covered above are for the purpose of improved consistency, tidying the relevant sections or corrections of errors within the DAG.</p> <p>No change proposed alters current delay code attribution or ultimate responsibility.</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.*

No – All changes are for consistency / correction and do not change any current responsibility or delay coding

**2. 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.**

n/a

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

<b>Company Organisation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<p><b>P267 DAG TIDY UPS AND GENERAL CORRECTIONS</b></p> <p>DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1</p>	<p>We accept this proposal as submitted</p>
<p>Network Rail</p>	<p>We accept this proposal as submitted</p>
<p>DAB DECISION</p>	<p>The Board when reaching its decision at the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016, 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.</p> <p>The Proposal was accepted as submitted for consultation.</p>

## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

Any Track Access Party may sponsor a proposed amendment to the Delay Attribution Guide (DAG) or Performance Data Accuracy Code (PDAC) (as defined in the Network Code Part B 2.5.1). This form sets out the information requirements for any proposal submitted for consideration by the Delay Attribution Board.

Appendices should be provided where necessary

Originators Reference Code / N <sup>o</sup>	<b>DAB/P268 DAG WORDING CHANGES</b>
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB



## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

Exact details of the change proposed	<p><b>1) Amend second sentence (only) of 1.6.1 to read:-</b></p> <p>Revisions should be made <b>and submitted</b> in writing <b>as</b> 1.5.3 above providing the following information:</p> <p><b>2) Remove section 4.1.6.6 as near duplicate of 4.1.3.1 and erroneous where it is.</b></p> <p><b>3) Amend the opening paragraph (only) of 4.4.2.1 to read:-</b></p> <p>4.4.2.1 Where trains are introduced that have the ability to tilt they are fitted with a Tilt Authorisation and Speed Supervision (TASS) system to meet the <b>current Rules and Standards</b>. There are systems on the trackside – a Balise, and on the train – the on-board TASS system. In the event of failure of either system then delay coding should be:</p> <p><b>4) Amend 4.15.1.1 to remove TU and FU references to read as below (alts in red):-</b></p> <p>4.15.1.1 If an incident occurs on Network Rail infrastructure, for which the outcome of a Formal Inquiry, as convened in accordance with current group standards, is required to establish responsibility and this could lie with at least one Train Operator, <b>then refer to the Holding Codes section 4.15.4</b>. If two or more Train Operators are responsible, a separate Incident <b>may be required</b> for the trains of each. The formal investigation conclusion as to cause may enable the attribution to be resolved and will allow the Incident(s) to be recoded as appropriate. In all other cases the Incident to be coded as per 4.15.1.2 and or 4.15.1.3</p> <p><b>5) Amend 4.15.1.3(e) to read</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 5%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">e.</td> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 2px;">Displaced conductor rail.</td> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 2px;">I1 <b>or where agreed use Holding Code D*</b></td> <td style="width: 45%; padding: 2px;"><b>As appropriate to either Network Rail (IQ**) or Operator of train concerned where Holding Code agreed.</b></td> </tr> </table>	e.	Displaced conductor rail.	I1 <b>or where agreed use Holding Code D*</b>	<b>As appropriate to either Network Rail (IQ**) or Operator of train concerned where Holding Code agreed.</b>
e.	Displaced conductor rail.	I1 <b>or where agreed use Holding Code D*</b>	<b>As appropriate to either Network Rail (IQ**) or Operator of train concerned where Holding Code agreed.</b>		

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

Reason for the change	<p><b>6) Remove first sentence of 4.11.3 ‘Changes to Section 5 have resulted in a considerable net increase in TOC R* delay codes’</b></p> <p><b>7) Remove wording ‘Infrastructure Maintainer’ from 4.15.2.4g so to read:-</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="488 542 1286 654"> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 542 560 654">g.</td> <td data-bbox="560 542 975 654">Network Rail staff confirm presence of reported obstruction</td> <td data-bbox="975 542 1098 654">JX</td> <td data-bbox="1098 542 1286 654">Network Rail (IQ**)</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>8) Amend wording for the two entries in 4.3.1.7.3a of ‘Infrastructure Maintainer’ to read ‘Network Rail’</b></p> <p><b>9) Amend 4.4.1.3e to read as follows:-</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="488 869 1302 1120"> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 869 549 1120">e.</td> <td data-bbox="549 869 772 1120">Delays associated with On Track <b>Machines and other Yellow</b> Plant equipment</td> <td data-bbox="772 869 903 1120">MV</td> <td data-bbox="903 869 1126 1120"><b>On Track Machines / ‘Yellow Plant’ Equipment</b></td> <td data-bbox="1126 869 1302 1120">Train Operator (M##*)</td> </tr> </table>	g.	Network Rail staff confirm presence of reported obstruction	JX	Network Rail (IQ**)	e.	Delays associated with On Track <b>Machines and other Yellow</b> Plant equipment	MV	<b>On Track Machines / ‘Yellow Plant’ Equipment</b>	Train Operator (M##*)
g.	Network Rail staff confirm presence of reported obstruction	JX	Network Rail (IQ**)							
e.	Delays associated with On Track <b>Machines and other Yellow</b> Plant equipment	MV	<b>On Track Machines / ‘Yellow Plant’ Equipment</b>	Train Operator (M##*)						
Reason for the change	<p>All the changes covered above are for the purpose of improved clarity and improved wording within the relevant sections or corrections of errors within the DAG.</p> <p>No change proposed alters current delay code attribution or ultimate responsibility.</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.*

No – All changes are for consistency / correction / clarification

**2. 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.**

n/a

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
<p><b>P268 DAG WORDING CHANGES</b> DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1</p>	<p>We accept this proposal as submitted</p>
<p>Network Rail</p>	<p>Network Rail accept this proposal subject to the following :</p> <p><b>1) Amend second sentence (only) of 1.6.1 to read:-</b></p> <p>Revisions should be made and submitted in writing as 1.5.3 above providing the following information:</p> <p><b>Should be amended as follows:</b></p> <p>Revisions should be made and submitted in writing as <i>described in paragraph 1.5.3</i> above providing the following information:</p> <p><b>Further, this</b></p> <p><b>4) Amend 4.15.1.1 to remove TU and FU references to read as below (alts in red):-</b></p> <p>4.15.1.1 If an incident occurs on Network Rail infrastructure, for which the outcome of a Formal Inquiry, as convened in accordance with current group standards, is required to establish responsibility and this could lie with at least one Train Operator, then refer to the Holding Codes section 4.15.4. If two or more Train Operators are responsible, a separate Incident may be required for the trains of each. The formal investigation conclusion as to cause may enable the attribution to be resolved and will allow the Incident(s) to be recoded as appropriate. In all other cases the Incident to be coded as per 4.15.1.2 and or 4.15.1.3</p> <p><b>Should have the relevant sentence altered as follows;</b></p> <p>The <i>conclusion</i> of the formal investigation <del>conclusion as to cause</del> may enable the attribution to be resolved and will allow the Incident(s) to be recoded as appropriate.</p>

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board when reaching its decision at the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016, 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.</p> <p>The wording alterations suggested by Network Rail were accepted as being non-material to improve the grammar.</p>

## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

Any Track Access Party may sponsor a proposed amendment to the Delay Attribution Guide (DAG) or Performance Data Accuracy Code (PDAC) (as defined in the Network Code Part B 2.5.1). This form sets out the information requirements for any proposal submitted for consideration by the Delay Attribution Board.

Appendices should be provided where necessary

Originators Reference Code / N <sup>o</sup>	<b>DAB/P269 Several Small Delays Attribution</b>
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB
Exact details of the change proposed	<p><b>Amend 4.2.4.1 to read:-</b></p> <p>4.2.4.1 This section covers trains that have <b>no prior attributable threshold delay but have</b> incurred several small delays below the normal explanation threshold <b>and</b> then suffer or cause a Reactionary Delay of at least as many minutes as the threshold (3 minutes or more for most Operators) <b>and at the time of subsequent delay is the largest cause of lateness.</b></p> <p><b>Amend 4.2.4.2 to read:-</b></p> <p>4.2.4.2 If the train has been regulated correctly <b>due to its own lateness, or has caused delay to another train,</b> and it is known <b>after investigation</b> why it has <b>previously</b> lost time (e.g. several TSRs or <b>examples of</b> station overtimes) then separate Incident(s) should be created with Delay Codes describing the cause(s) and attributed as per the appropriate section of this Guide. The Reactionary Delay <b>of the regulation</b> should then be attributed <b>to and split between the incidents (as appropriate, including the initial sub threshold prime delays) – see principles in section 4.1.6.</b> When the below threshold delays are due to P-coded TSRs, the reactionary delay should be coded JB/IQ**, as per paragraph 2.6.7. Where possible, delays below the threshold should be attributed.</p> <p><b>Amend 4.2.4.3 to read:-</b></p> <p>4.2.4.3 If the cause of the previous ‘Minutes Delay’ is <b>unexplained</b> and the train has been regulated correctly a separate Incident Coded ZZ with Responsible Manager Code ZQ** is to be created. However, if the circumstances of paragraph 4.2.2.1 apply then a separate Incident is to be created as per that section. In either case the Reactionary Delay, appropriately coded, <b>is</b> to be allocated to the Incident created.</p>

## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

	<p><b>4.2.4.4 remains unaltered</b></p> <p><b>Add new 4.2.4.5</b></p> <p>4.2.4.5 Certain circumstances should be considered as Cumulative Delay in that they may be separate delays but due to the same cause / responsibility. Cumulative delay should be attributed to the same incident cause. Examples of cumulative delay are trains running on low power or TT delay (see 4.3.1.5.2). Unrelated station overtime delays and TSR delays should be considered separate causes and attributed to individual incidents with standard attribution rules applying to reactionary delay.</p> <p><b>Add new 4.2.4.6</b></p> <p>4.2.4.6 In circumstances where a threshold section delay is demonstrated to be a combination of known separate causes then this delay should be split into relevant sized delays and attributed to incidents with appropriate Delay Codes describing the cause. For example a 3 minute delay split to 1 minute in IR due to a TSR and 2 minutes in RB due to passengers loading.</p> <p><b>Add new 4.2.4.7</b></p> <p>4.2.4.7 Example scenarios of trains incurring several small delays and the application of cumulative delay</p> <p>Unless stated, all examples presume no other delays and no lateness recovered.</p> <p>The principles demonstrated in the examples shown apply equally to delay causes in the same section as well as different sections. The caveat being that the causes are identified (e.g. RB rather than RZ)</p>
--	--

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

	<p><b>Sub Threshold Example 1 - Attribution of TSRs</b></p> <p>TSR A – 2’ coded IS allocated to TIN X          TSR B – 2’ coded IR allocated to TIN Y          TSR C – 2’ coded JA allocated to TIN Z</p> <p>The train arrives at destination 6 late and the return working has a 6 late start          The 6 late start is split to 3 x 2’ delays and split into the 3 separate TSR TINs X, Y and Z</p> <p>If there was a further 3’ delay on the inward journey in another TIN then the 6’ late start would be attributed to that TIN as the greatest impacting cause</p> <p><i>Note: TSRs are identified causes with definitive delay codes and can potentially be 3 different causes and 3 different responsibilities, therefore 3 different incidents.          Network Rail needs to capture and report all TSRs as separate causal incidents even where they are the same delay cause they are reported as individual events.          The exception to this is Blanket Speed restrictions which will be captured in one incident for each DU Area</i></p> <hr/> <p><b>Sub Threshold Example 2 - Attribution of Station Delays</b></p> <p>Loading bike – 2’ coded RS allocated to TIN X          Loading wheelchair – 2’ coded RQ allocated to TIN Y          Late dispatch – 2’ coded R1 allocated to TIN Z</p> <p>The train arrives at destination 6 late and the return working has a 6 late start          The 6 late start is split to 3 x 2’ delays and split into the 3 separate R* TINs X, Y and Z</p> <p>If there was a further 3’ delay on the inward journey in another TIN then the 6’ late start would be attributed to that TIN as the greatest impacting cause</p> <p><i>Note: Station delays are potentially 3 different causes and 3 different responsibilities, therefore 3 different incidents (exceptions such as door problem would be as underpowered trains below).</i></p>
--	---

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

	<p><b>Sub Threshold Example 3 - Attribution of TT incidents</b></p> <p>Autumn A – 2’ coded TT allocated to TIN X  Autumn B – 2’ coded TT allocated to TIN Y  Autumn C – 2’ coded TT allocated to TIN Z</p> <p>The train arrives at destination 6 late and the return working has a 6 late start  The 6 late start is split to 3 x 2’ delays and split into the 3 separate TT TINs X, Y and Z</p> <p>If there was a further 3’ delay on the inward journey in another (non leaf fall) TIN then the 6’ late start would be still be attributed to the TT TINs as they remain the greatest impacting cause.  If one of the TT delays was a 3’ delay then the 6’ late start would be attributed to that TIN (cumulative leaf fall still outweighing any other cause)</p> <p><i>Note: TT coded delay, per DAG 4.3.1.5.2 (main paragraph) and 4.3.1.8 (Example 4), is treated as cumulative despite being attributed to separate incidents.</i></p> <p><b>Sub Threshold Example 4 - Attribution of an Underpowered Train</b></p> <p>Underpowered delay A – 2’ coded MC in TIN X  Underpowered delay B – 2’ coded MC in TIN X  Underpowered delay C – 2’ coded MC in TIN X</p> <p>The train arrives at destination 6 late and the return working has a 6 late start  The 6 late start is attributed in full to TIN X</p> <p>If there was a further 3’ delay on the inward journey in another TIN then the 6’ late start would still remain a reactionary to TIN X as it remains the greatest impacting incident cause.</p> <p><i>Note: Underpowered train delays are the same loco / unit, same cause and same responsibility therefore the same incident. Operator reporting requirements on fleet reliability requires such faults / failures to be allocated to one incident.</i></p>
Reason for the change	<p>Gauging opinions and feedback from Industry parties it is apparent that this section needs clarifying and expanding as being often misinterpreted causing increased discussion for resolution.</p> <p>Primarily section 4.2.4 is around trains losing several small delays that have no previous attributable threshold (3’) delays. This has been clarified in the</p>



## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

	<p>amended 4.2.4.1</p> <p>Section 4.2.4.2 was the paragraph identified as being in need of the most review and clarification which now sets out clearer guidance on attribution of individual small delays.</p> <p>4.2.4.3 has been slightly altered to reflect more common terminology of 'unexplained' rather than 'not known'.</p> <p>The opportunity has also been taken to expand the section to cover off improved guidance and understanding of the application of cumulative delays (new section 4.2.4.5) particularly referencing the TT application.</p> <p>Current 4.3.1.5.2, for reference, sets out that cumulative for TT is the exception to the 'largest single cause' principle despite being in separate incidents. 4.3.1.8 (Example 4) reiterates this.</p> <p>A new 4.2.4.6 has also been proposed to improve understanding of attribution of sub threshold delays that, by the nature of system reporting, are flagged as one threshold delay. In these circumstances, where definitive delay causes can be identified then they should be attributed to their identified causes (e.g. a 1' TSR should be attributed to the TSR and the remaining minutes to another cause).</p> <p>A new 4.2.4.7 covers relevant examples to demonstrate the principles.</p> <p>The proposals above are believed to be fully in line with and ultimately clarify current practices / application.</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.*

No impact intended. Whilst there may be pockets of inconsistency, these would be near impossible to identify specifically and calculate impact. General consensus is that current practices are as set out in the proposal.

**2. 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.**

If any Operator / Route that has commercial arrangements in place that are not consistent with the proposal then those Commercial arrangements still supersede the DAG until renegotiated.

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
<p><b>P269 Small minute attribution</b> DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1</p>	<p>No, whilst the principle of clarification of this section of DAG is fully supported it is noted that several potential changes have unforeseen consequences that need to be clarified or addressed</p> <p>4.2.4.1 as written requires the attributor to look at train to see if it has any prior threshold attributed delays, if there are then this section does not apply, so if a train loses three minutes then recovers back to 1 late, then loses a series of 1 minute delays the guidance implies allocation to the recovered above threshold delay. This will have a commercial impact on any train that has recovered time to a subthreshold level. The proposer is requested to make amendments to clarify this. E.g. ‘and at the time of the subsequent delay is the largest cause of lateness’</p> <p>4.2.4.2 Holds any allocated incident culpable for all reactionary delay even if not the largest sub threshold cause and clarifies the requirement not to investigate any further. This is contradictory to attribution practice on some routes. Please consider the example, a train loses 1 minute to a TSR, then has a 2 minute station overtime. As the TSR is networked it is auto allocated, and the 2 mins is uninvestigated at this point. Any reactionary to this train will be allocated to the TSR, yet custom and practice is to investigate the 2 mins station overtime and allocate reactionary to that cause. The proposer is requested to make amendments to clarify this e.g. “and it is known <i>after investigation</i> why it has...”</p> <p>4.2.4.3 the changes fail to clarify whether majority uninvestigated delay is the cause. if a train loses 10 mins of which 2 minutes are allocated speeds and 8 minutes are uninvestigated, does 8 mins count as ‘the cause’ or does the 2 minutes of allocated speeds. The proposer is requested to make amendments to clarify this e.g. “if <i>after investigation</i> the cause of the previous...”</p> <p>The last line of 4.2.4.2 requires where possible all delays to be attributed, this requires the allocation of delays that are currently treated as uninvestigated, and following guidance should these be coded ZZ. Can the proposer please clarify this as it is felt this is the correct process to allow management of subthreshold delays but will have an impact on the quantity of delay</p>

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
	<p>reported and associated contractual regimes.</p> <p>The change introduces a change to where successive speeds are treated individually where historically they were treated as cumulatively. It is felt that this change will reduce the incentive to NWR to reduce the impact of TSR's</p> <p><b>1. Are there any specific amendments that you consider should be incorporated within the change proposal?</b></p> <p><i>If yes, please explain the changes here and the reasons why they are required.</i></p> <p><b>It is noted that throughout this section that recovered time is excluded from the guidance and this when dealing with small minute's time loss is a subject that needs clarification. When an incident is considered to be recovered and what value of lateness it carries when multiple time losses occur subsequently. DAB guidance on this issue will address this</b></p>
Network Rail	<p>The proposal is supported subject to number of suggested amendments.</p> <p><b>In 4.2.4.2.</b></p> <p>(e.g. several TSRs or station overtimes)</p> <p>Should read (e.g. several TSRs or examples of station overtime)</p> <p>And change as <i>italicised</i></p> <p>4.2.4.7 Example scenarios of <i>trains</i> incurring several small delays and <i>the</i> application of cumulative delay</p>
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board when reaching its decision at the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016, 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.</p> <p>The Network Rail suggestions to improve grammar</p>

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
	<p>were accepted</p> <p>The DAMG collective response was considered and agreed as follows.</p> <p>The points and suggestion raised relating to 4.2.4.1 was discussed and agreed for additional clarification to be included in the proposal</p> <p>The first point and suggestion raised relating to 4.2.4.2 was discussed and agreed for additional clarification to be included in the proposal</p> <p>For the points raised against 4.2.4.1 and 4.2.4.2 it was noted that current section 4.1.6 covers the general principles of reactionary delay and should be utilised in conjunction with this section.</p> <p>The point and suggestion relating to 4.2.4.3 was discussed but not accepted by the Board. The proposal as consulted for 4.2.4.3 only proposed to change wording 'not known' to 'unexplained' and therefore the comment from DAMG refers to what is already contained in the DAG. It was therefore considered that the DAMG suggestion should be considered for a separate Proposal for Change. Similarly the second point raised by DAMG for 4.2.4.2 was in relation to the last sentence in that paragraph which remains unaltered in the proposal. Again, the DAMG suggestion should be considered a new Proposal for Change.</p> <p>However the comments were noted and will be considered and factored into the upcoming DAB sub-threshold sub group.</p> <p>Additionally, for the points raised against 4.2.4.1, 4.2.4.2 and 4.2.4.3 it was noted that current section 4.1.6 covers the general principles of reactionary delay and should be utilised in conjunction with this section.</p> <p>The point made by DAMG against Network Rail attributing TSR delays as cumulative (and thus a</p>

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
	<p>material change) was countered by Network Rail representatives. It was stated that TSRs need to be and, are briefed to be, attributed individually and in essence it would not be in NR's interest to attribute the effect cumulatively. However, Network Rail reps agreed to progress the matter internally to ascertain whether this practice is taking place and if so to correct it where identified.</p> <p>The DAMG final point covering recovered time clarification was agreed and noted. This issue will be factored into the forthcoming work stream that will be looking at sub threshold delay in more detail. It was also noted that mention is made to recovered time in current 4.1.6.</p> <p>Alterations to the proposal agreed by the Board were considered to be non-material to improve clarity and are shown in <b>bold red</b> in the proposal above</p>

## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

Any Track Access Party may sponsor a proposed amendment to the Delay Attribution Guide (DAG) or Performance Data Accuracy Code (PDAC) (as defined in the Network Code Part B 2.5.1). This form sets out the information requirements for any proposal submitted for consideration by the Delay Attribution Board.

Appendices should be provided where necessary

Originators Reference Code / N <sup>o</sup>	<b>DAB P270 Staff Travelling Passenger</b>			
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB			
Exact details of the change proposed	<b>Add additional scenarios to 4.7.2.3</b>			
	d.	If prior to working their train (after booking on duty), the relevant train-crew were booked to travel passenger on a train that was a Planned Cancellation (i.e. P* coded in line with the 22.00 cut off the previous day as per DAG 3.1.5) - Where diagram commences post the 22.00 agreement deadline.	FH / TI	Operator of train crew booked pass (F##* / T##*)
	e	If prior to working their train (after booking on duty), the relevant train-crew were booked to travel passenger on a train that was a Planned Cancellation (i.e. P* coded in line with the 22.00 cut off the previous day as per DAG 3.1.5) - Where diagram is already in operation prior to the 22.00 agreement deadline.	As appropriate to incident causing the Planned Cancellation	Responsibility of incident causing the Planned Cancellation
Reason for the change	<p>This is a re-consultation of a previous Pfc from Network Rail (NR P189) that required DAB re-work after consultation responses. The original issue was highlighted in a DAB Sub Group.</p> <p>The overarching principle being that if an Operator relies on another Operator's service to pass their train crew on as part of their diagram, then it is up to that Operator to make arrangements to:-</p> <p>1) be made aware of, or check that the relevant trains are still booked to run and;</p> <p>2) make alternative arrangements should the utilised trains be planned cancellations (in line with DAG 3.1.5)</p> <p>There have been occasions where requests have been made to attribute a resulting delay / cancellation to either the Operator who planned to cancel the train or the reason that the train had to be a planned cancellation which was felt to be an inappropriate responsibility.</p> <p>However, in the case where the member of crew is already on duty prior to 22.00 it</p>			

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

	was considered that the 'un-planned' principle should apply – namely the resulting delay is attributed to the cause of cancellation.
--	--

**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.*

Clarification of application and current practice in 'd' although 'e' is considered a potential scenario but not believed to have occurred.
---

**2. 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.**

n/a
-----

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
<b>P270 Staff Travelling Passenger</b> DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1	This proposal is accepted as submitted
Network Rail	This proposal is accepted as submitted
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board when reaching its decision at the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016, 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.</p> <p>The Proposal was accepted as submitted for consultation.</p>



## Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form A)

Any Track Access Party may sponsor a proposed amendment to the Delay Attribution Guide (DAG) or Performance Data Accuracy Code (PDAC) (as defined in the Network Code Part B 2.5.1). This form sets out the information requirements for any proposal submitted for consideration by the Delay Attribution Board.

Appendices should be provided where necessary

Originators Reference Code / N <sup>o</sup>	VTEC002 Retrieval of Dropped Items			
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	Virgin Trains East Coast.			
Exact details of the change proposed	Amend 4.11 STATION OPERATING DELAYS			
	<b>Amend OC to OZ in 4.11.2(ag)</b>			
	4.11.2 ag.	<i>Signaller prevents passage of train after request to recover item where item is not considered an obstruction of the line.</i>	<b>OZ</b>	<i>Network Rail (OQ**)</i>
Reason for the change	<p>Signallers have cited refusing blocks to be taken for the retrieval of non-obstructive objects if they will be attributed the resultant delays. This could even be in the case of disabled customers who have lost parts of wheelchairs, etc. In order to take some of the “sting” out of such incidents it is proposed to code them OZ rather than the more emotive OC.</p> <p>It is proposed to keep the responsibility with the Ops Organisation.</p> <p>Consideration is given to the risk that if Signaller’s refused to give a line block there could be resulting trespass.</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.*

No – Some adjustment to KPI recording may be necessary
--

**2. 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.**

n/a
-----

Template for Submission of Proposed Amendments to the Delay Attribution Guide or the Performance Data Accuracy Code (Form B)

Company Organisation	Comments
<b>VTEC 002</b> <b>Retrieval of dropped items</b> DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies as per page 1	This proposal is accepted as submitted
Network Rail	This proposal is accepted as submitted
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board when reaching its decision at the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016, 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.</p> <p>The Proposal was accepted as submitted for consultation.</p>