



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: 07899 018037
Email: DABoffice@networkrail.co.uk

cc: Richard Morris
Chairman,
Delay Attribution Board.
Hector Anderson - ORR

Date: 27th September 2017

Submission of proposals for change to the June 2017 Delay Attribution Principles and Rules

Dear Gerry,

I am writing to seek ORR approval for a number of Proposals to change the Delay Attribution Principles and Rules in accordance with Track Access Condition B2.7.2.

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

- ***DAB P294 – Infrastructure Failures on – off network***
- ***DAB P295 – Stock Swaps***
- ***DAB P296 – TRUST errors***
- ***DAB P297 – Service Recovery***
- ***DAB P298 – Process Guides***
- ***DAB P299 – Vandalism Tidy Up***

The details provided for each proposal consist of the following information:

- 1** The Proposal for Change from the sponsor.
- 2** The industry responses to the Proposal for Change.
- 3** The Board considerations and decision on the responses from the industry.

The proposals for amendment to the Delay Attribution Principles and Rules (excluding DAB P299) 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 4th September 2017. A number of Industry Parties responded to the consultation process and these responses are included in this submission.

Proposal DAB P299 was submitted to the Board, without Consultation, as a non-material Proposal to improve formatting and was agreed unanimously by the Board.



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

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 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 on **10th December 2017**

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.

For information, a further set of Proposals is being Consulted with Industry presently and is due to be reviewed by the Board at their September meeting.

Kind regards,

Mark Southon

Board Secretary
TEL: 07899 018037

Consultation closed – 4th September 2017

Proposal reference Number:	DAB/P294	DAB/P295	DAB/P296	DAB/P297	DAB/P298
Abellio Greater Anglia					
Arriva Trains London					
Arriva Trains Wales					
Chiltern Railways					
Colas Rail					
CrossCountry Trains					
DB Cargo					
DB Regio Tyne & Wear					
Devon & Cornwall Railways					
Direct Rail Services					
East Midland Trains					
Eurostar International					
First Greater Western*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
First Transpennine					
Freightliner					
GB Railfreight					
Govia Thameslink Railway					
Grand Central Railway					
Harsco Rail					
Heathrow Express	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Hull Trains					
London Midland					
Merseyrail					
MTR Crossrail					
NEXET Trains Ltd (c2c Rail)					
North Yorkshire Moors					
Northern Rail *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Scotrail					
Serco Caledonian Sleepers					
Southeastern Trains					
Stagecoach South West Trains					
Virgin Trains (West Coast)*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Virgin Trains East Coast					
West Coast Railway Company					
Network Rail	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

*Response through DAMG

Originators Reference Code / N ^o	DAB P294 – Infrastructure Failures on – off network										
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB										
Exact details of the change proposed	<p>Amend DAPR H1.2(a) to read:-</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="325 611 1474 757"> <tr> <td data-bbox="325 611 400 757">a.</td> <td data-bbox="400 611 963 757">Infrastructure defect or problem on Network Rail network infrastructure affecting trains entering the Network Rail network</td> <td data-bbox="963 611 1193 757">I*/J*/X* as appropriate</td> <td data-bbox="1193 611 1474 757">See Section O1 and also Process Guide PGD14</td> </tr> </table> <p>Amend DAPR H3.3(a) to read:-</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="325 864 1474 1010"> <tr> <td data-bbox="325 864 400 1010">a.</td> <td data-bbox="400 864 963 1010">Infrastructure defect or problem on Network Rail network infrastructure affecting trains entering the Network Rail network</td> <td data-bbox="963 864 1193 1010">I*/J*/X* as appropriate</td> <td data-bbox="1193 864 1474 1010">See Section O1 and also Process Guide PGD14</td> </tr> </table> <p>Add new bullet to DAPR O1.1:-</p> <ul data-bbox="368 1122 1474 1189" style="list-style-type: none"> • Failures caused as a direct result of an off Network Rail network infrastructure fault or failure (See Process Guide PGD14) 			a.	Infrastructure defect or problem on Network Rail network infrastructure affecting trains entering the Network Rail network	I*/J*/X* as appropriate	See Section O1 and also Process Guide PGD14	a.	Infrastructure defect or problem on Network Rail network infrastructure affecting trains entering the Network Rail network	I*/J*/X* as appropriate	See Section O1 and also Process Guide PGD14
a.	Infrastructure defect or problem on Network Rail network infrastructure affecting trains entering the Network Rail network	I*/J*/X* as appropriate	See Section O1 and also Process Guide PGD14								
a.	Infrastructure defect or problem on Network Rail network infrastructure affecting trains entering the Network Rail network	I*/J*/X* as appropriate	See Section O1 and also Process Guide PGD14								
Reason for the change	<p>Asset failures occurring on and off network but affecting assets on the opposite side of the boundary have been an area highlighted as needing clarification and inclusion in the DAPR.</p> <p>The common scenarios have been collated, discussed and agreed through Industry forums and incorporated into a DAB Process Guide Document (PGD14)</p> <p>It was felt including the full suite of scenarios in the DAPR was too detailed and as such it is suggested to include a couple of scenarios outlining the principles in the DAPR with reference to the aforementioned Process Guide.</p> <p>The entries are suggested to be made in Section H (Depot, Yards and Sidings) and also Section O (Infrastructure Incidents) as incidents of this nature relate to both.</p>										

DAB/P294 Response	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies in the response matrix	Accepts the Proposal as submitted.
Network Rail	Accepts the Proposal as submitted.
Heathrow Express Limited	<p>Rejected</p> <p>Whilst I agree the process is applicable for Yards / Sdgs / Depot I don't believe this will work for other off-network areas. The prime one for us being the boundary between Network Rail Infrastructure and Heathrow Rail infrastructure (Heathrow Tunnel Jcn)</p> <p>There are a number of assets on Network Rail infrastructure that are split between Network Rail & Heathrow Rail. The current agreement sees incidents being attributed to whoever owns the failed asset.</p> <p>I don't believe PDG14 is relevant to the network boundary at Heathrow Tunnel Jcn in part as it only refers to Sidings and Depot which the Heathrow Tunnels are not.</p> <p>Asking for clarity that everyone agrees that these rules do not apply to the boundary between Network Rail & Heathrow Rail and that the existing practices still continue.</p> <p>PDG14 does not apply to Heathrow Rail off-network – separate agreement in place where the owners of a failed asset at Heathrow Tunnel Jcn are attributed these incidents irrespective whether trains can enter / leave off- network.</p> <p><i>A Network Rail asset failure at Heathrow Tunnel Jcn preventing our trains from entering the Heathrow tunnels under PDG14 would be attributed to Heathrow Rail (HEX). Where as now it goes to the asset owner. The commercial impact would require Heathrow Rail to compensate us for assets not under their control.</i></p>
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board reviewed and discussed the Industry Consultation feedback at the 26th September 2017 Board meeting.</p> <p>The Proposal was accepted with grammatical amendment. The word 'operated' was replaced with 'network' to ensure there is no confusion between infrastructure that Network Rail operates 'off network' on behalf of another Party.</p> <p>The rejection by HEX was considered but not taken into account as it was felt the arrangements that HEX have in place constitute a commercial arrangements and that the DAPR (although used by other Infrastructure Operators by reference in their Network Codes) applies to the Network Rail network. Therefore the DAPR cannot include off network arrangements in place.</p>

Originators Reference Code / N ^o	DAB P295 – Stock Swaps																	
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB																	
Exact details of the change proposed	<p>Add new Section K9 as below:-</p> <p>K9 Stock Swaps</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="667 555 1345 1664"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="667 555 738 622">No.</th> <th data-bbox="738 555 1002 622">Circumstance</th> <th data-bbox="1002 555 1174 622">Delay Code</th> <th data-bbox="1174 555 1345 622">Incident Attribution</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="667 622 738 1021">a</td> <td data-bbox="738 622 1002 1021">The Signaller carries out an unplanned stock move and there are no pre-agreed localised arrangements in place between Network Rail and the Operator</td> <td data-bbox="1002 622 1174 1021">OC</td> <td data-bbox="1174 622 1345 1021">Network Rail (OQ**)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="667 1021 738 1664" rowspan="2">b</td> <td data-bbox="738 1021 1002 1664" rowspan="2">Network Rail Control agrees to a stock swap and re-plans with no delay impact foreseen. The Signaller deviates from the Control plan.</td> <td data-bbox="1002 1021 1174 1379">OC - Where no rationale is provided for the deviation from the plan.</td> <td data-bbox="1174 1021 1345 1379">Network Rail (OQ**)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1002 1379 1174 1664">Where the rationale for deviation is explained allocate to that reason.</td> <td data-bbox="1174 1379 1345 1664">Reaction to reason identified</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="699 1709 1345 1809">Note: For further scenarios and attribution relating to Stock Swaps please refer to Process Guide Document (PGD16)</p>				No.	Circumstance	Delay Code	Incident Attribution	a	The Signaller carries out an unplanned stock move and there are no pre-agreed localised arrangements in place between Network Rail and the Operator	OC	Network Rail (OQ**)	b	Network Rail Control agrees to a stock swap and re-plans with no delay impact foreseen. The Signaller deviates from the Control plan.	OC - Where no rationale is provided for the deviation from the plan.	Network Rail (OQ**)	Where the rationale for deviation is explained allocate to that reason.	Reaction to reason identified
No.	Circumstance	Delay Code	Incident Attribution															
a	The Signaller carries out an unplanned stock move and there are no pre-agreed localised arrangements in place between Network Rail and the Operator	OC	Network Rail (OQ**)															
b	Network Rail Control agrees to a stock swap and re-plans with no delay impact foreseen. The Signaller deviates from the Control plan.	OC - Where no rationale is provided for the deviation from the plan.	Network Rail (OQ**)															
		Where the rationale for deviation is explained allocate to that reason.	Reaction to reason identified															

Add new situations into N2 as below:

No.	Circumstance	Delay Code	Incident Attribution
an	Operator request via Station Control Point to swap two units on different platforms to form different services. No additional stock moves required and no Network Rail involvement.	As per Operator reason for requirement	As per Operator reason for requirement
ao	The Signaller carries out an unplanned stock move in line with pre-agreed localised arrangements between Network Rail and the Operator	As per reason for requirement	As per reason for requirement

Add additional note under N2 to read:-

Note: For further scenarios and attribution relating to Stock Swaps at stations please refer to Process Guide Document (PGD16)

Reason for the change

Delays caused by stock swaps have been an area highlighted as needing clarification and inclusion in the DAPR.

The common scenarios have been collated, discussed and agreed through Industry forums and incorporated into a DAB Process Guide Document (PGD16)

It was felt including the full suite of scenarios in the DAPR was too detailed and as such it is therefore suggested to include a couple of scenarios outlining the principles in the DAPR with reference to the aforementioned Process Guide.

The entries are suggested to be made in Section K (Regulation and Signalling of Trains) and also Section N (Station Operating Delays) as stock swap activity relates to both Sections.

DAB/P295 Response	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies in the response matrix	Accepts the Proposal as submitted.
Network Rail	<p>Accepts the Proposal with proposed amendments;-</p> <p>The new paragraph K9 appears to be labelled K8, which needs correcting.</p> <p>Para a “The signaller.....” Para b delete “move” , and “the signaller.....” Underneath replace “allocation” with “attribution”. Para ao “The signaller.....” Underneath replace “allocation” with “attribution”.</p>
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board reviewed and discussed the Industry Consultation feedback at the 26th September 2017 Board meeting.</p> <p>The Proposal was agreed as submitted but incorporating the grammatical amendments suggested by Network Rail.</p>

Originators Reference Code / N ^o	DAB P296 - TRUST Errors
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB
Exact details of the change proposed	<p><i>Amend Section E3 TRUST Berth Errors to read as follows:-</i></p> <p>E3 TRUST Reporting Errors and Anomalies</p> <p>E3.1 TRUST Berth errors occur due to anomalies in TRUST automatic reporting, whereby a train might appear to lose time as the result of an inaccurate report, only to recover it immediately. This can still occur even if the Berth Offsets are agreed as being accurate.</p> <p>E3.2 In certain circumstances, these anomalies may be sufficiently pronounced to cause the generation of a Delay Alert. Such anomalous reports and incorrect TRUST timings should be highlighted and corrected in accordance with the relevant standards as set out in the Performance Data Accuracy Code before application of what is set out in E3.3 to E3.5 below.</p> <p>E3.3 If both parties agree that the Delay Alert has been entirely generated due to an inaccurate report and would not have been generated otherwise, the delay alert generated should be attributed to an incident coded PT. Any resulting above threshold reactionary delay should be re-attributed to the largest identified cause at that point.</p> <p>E3.4 If both parties agree that a sub threshold delay has occurred, but has been artificially inflated to create an above threshold delay alert due to an inaccurate report then a new incident coded PT is to be created to account for the spurious delay (ONLY) and the remaining sub-threshold delay and any reactionary delay attributed to it is to be attributed as per normal attribution rules.</p> <p>E3.5 If both parties agree that an above threshold delay alert has occurred which has been artificially inflated due to an inaccurate report, but is of sufficient magnitude that it would have been generated anyway, the delay itself and any reactionary delay is to be attributed as per normal attribution rules, with no time removed.</p> <p>Note: For the supporting process covering the identification and correction of TRUST anomalies please refer to PGD15</p>
Reason for the change	<p>With more Operators and Routes moving towards sub-threshold delay attribution, the inability of TRUST to accurately record sub-threshold losses has been highlighted.</p> <p>This Proposal has been developed through a DAB Sub Group in parallel with production of the Board's new Process Guide (PGD15) setting out the processes to follow for the identification, agreement and correction</p>

	<p>of anomalies.</p> <p>Even when SMART and TRUST are working 100% correctly and berthing offsets are agreed as being as precise as they can be, the combination of planning to half minutes/measuring to full minutes; truncation rather than rounding SMART timings to create TRUST times; relying on departure offsets that are a compromise for trains passing or calling at stations can combine to generate spurious 1 or even 2 minute delays.</p> <p>The current guidance for dealing with system-generated delays is deemed to be insufficient and focuses only on delays due to inaccurate offsets, not the inherent inaccuracy of TRUST itself, so specific guidance is needed for this area.</p> <p>The current Paragraph E3.1 has been split into two for improved reading. The current and proposed text is differentiated in black and red text respectively.</p>
--	--

DAB/P296 Response	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies in the response matrix	Accepts the Proposal as submitted.
Network Rail	Accepts the Proposal with the following amendment proposed:- E3.3 (Second sentence) "Any <i>resulting above threshold.....</i> "
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board reviewed and discussed the Industry Consultation feedback at the 26th September 2017 Board meeting.</p> <p>The Proposal was agreed as submitted but incorporating the grammatical amendments suggested by Network Rail.</p>

Originators Reference Code / N°	DAB P297 – Service Recovery																																																		
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB																																																		
Exact details of the change proposed	<p>Add new Section M3 as below:-</p> <p>M3 Service Recovery</p> <p>M3.1 Activities relating to Service Recovery</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>No.</th> <th>Circumstances</th> <th>Delay Code</th> <th>Incident Attribution</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>Waiting for authorised Special Stop Orders to be issued</td> <td>RL</td> <td>Operator of train involved (R##*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>Waiting for unauthorised Special Stop Orders to be issued</td> <td>RJ</td> <td>Operator of train involved (R##*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>Special Stop Order within TOC and Network Rail Contingency Plan or agreed as part of a Service Recovery Plan</td> <td>YM</td> <td>Prime incident causing train to require SSO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>Special Stop Order authorised by TOC Control but outwith the TOC and Network Rail Contingency Plan</td> <td>RL</td> <td>Operator of train involved (R##*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>Special Stop Order not authorised by TOC Control and outwith the TOC and Network Rail Service Recovery Plan</td> <td>RJ</td> <td>Operator of train involved (R##*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f.</td> <td>Waiting passenger connection not authorised by TOC Control and out-with the Connectional policy.</td> <td>RI</td> <td>Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>g.</td> <td>Waiting passenger connections authorised by TOC Control but outwith the TOC and Network Rail Connectional Policy or Service Recovery Plan</td> <td>RK/TM</td> <td>Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>h.</td> <td>Waiting passenger connections within the Connectional Policy or agreed as part of a Service Recovery Plan</td> <td>YL</td> <td>Prime incident causing incoming train to be late at that point</td> </tr> <tr> <td>i.</td> <td>Waiting passenger connections from other modes of transport (e.g bus replacement)</td> <td>RM / T3</td> <td>Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>j.</td> <td>During an ongoing disruptive incident a member of train crew is stepped up / reallocated duties for service recovery purposes.</td> <td>YN</td> <td>Prime incident necessitating the reallocation of train crew</td> </tr> <tr> <td>k.</td> <td>In relation to an ongoing disruptive incident it is agreed to cancel a train (in full</td> <td>YR</td> <td>Prime incident necessitating the</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			No.	Circumstances	Delay Code	Incident Attribution	a.	Waiting for authorised Special Stop Orders to be issued	RL	Operator of train involved (R##*)	b.	Waiting for unauthorised Special Stop Orders to be issued	RJ	Operator of train involved (R##*)	c.	Special Stop Order within TOC and Network Rail Contingency Plan or agreed as part of a Service Recovery Plan	YM	Prime incident causing train to require SSO	d.	Special Stop Order authorised by TOC Control but outwith the TOC and Network Rail Contingency Plan	RL	Operator of train involved (R##*)	e.	Special Stop Order not authorised by TOC Control and outwith the TOC and Network Rail Service Recovery Plan	RJ	Operator of train involved (R##*)	f.	Waiting passenger connection not authorised by TOC Control and out-with the Connectional policy.	RI	Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)	g.	Waiting passenger connections authorised by TOC Control but outwith the TOC and Network Rail Connectional Policy or Service Recovery Plan	RK/TM	Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)	h.	Waiting passenger connections within the Connectional Policy or agreed as part of a Service Recovery Plan	YL	Prime incident causing incoming train to be late at that point	i.	Waiting passenger connections from other modes of transport (e.g bus replacement)	RM / T3	Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)	j.	During an ongoing disruptive incident a member of train crew is stepped up / reallocated duties for service recovery purposes.	YN	Prime incident necessitating the reallocation of train crew	k.	In relation to an ongoing disruptive incident it is agreed to cancel a train (in full	YR	Prime incident necessitating the
No.	Circumstances	Delay Code	Incident Attribution																																																
a.	Waiting for authorised Special Stop Orders to be issued	RL	Operator of train involved (R##*)																																																
b.	Waiting for unauthorised Special Stop Orders to be issued	RJ	Operator of train involved (R##*)																																																
c.	Special Stop Order within TOC and Network Rail Contingency Plan or agreed as part of a Service Recovery Plan	YM	Prime incident causing train to require SSO																																																
d.	Special Stop Order authorised by TOC Control but outwith the TOC and Network Rail Contingency Plan	RL	Operator of train involved (R##*)																																																
e.	Special Stop Order not authorised by TOC Control and outwith the TOC and Network Rail Service Recovery Plan	RJ	Operator of train involved (R##*)																																																
f.	Waiting passenger connection not authorised by TOC Control and out-with the Connectional policy.	RI	Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)																																																
g.	Waiting passenger connections authorised by TOC Control but outwith the TOC and Network Rail Connectional Policy or Service Recovery Plan	RK/TM	Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)																																																
h.	Waiting passenger connections within the Connectional Policy or agreed as part of a Service Recovery Plan	YL	Prime incident causing incoming train to be late at that point																																																
i.	Waiting passenger connections from other modes of transport (e.g bus replacement)	RM / T3	Operator of train being held (R##*/T##*)																																																
j.	During an ongoing disruptive incident a member of train crew is stepped up / reallocated duties for service recovery purposes.	YN	Prime incident necessitating the reallocation of train crew																																																
k.	In relation to an ongoing disruptive incident it is agreed to cancel a train (in full	YR	Prime incident necessitating the																																																

			or part) to reduce services through the affected area.		cancellation decision
	I.		In relation to an ongoing disruptive incident a unit / loco is stepped up / reallocated to another service for service recovery purposes.	YU	Prime incident necessitating the unit / loco to be reallocated to another service
	<p>Note: In all Service Recovery scenarios shown above the decisions and activity should be recorded as part of the 'SRCT' process to aid appropriate and efficient attribution of any associated delays.</p>				
Reason for the change	<p>This Proposal looks to expand Section M as originally envisaged on its creation in 2016, adding the Service Recovery aspects.</p> <p>The proposal covers the key scenarios deemed to be associated with service recovery and brings them together in one place within the DAPR for ease of reference.</p> <p>The proposal also brings Delay Codes YR and YU into the main body of the DAPR rather than just a mention in Section S</p> <p>Whilst many scenarios are copies of those covered in other Sections of the DAPR, most notably from Section N, there are some further clarifications and additions made for completeness.</p>				

DAB/P297 Response	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies in the response matrix (<i>excluding GWR – see below</i>)	<p>Accepts the Proposal as submitted</p> <p>It is felt that the addition of a flow chart to ease identification of allocation for the guidance summarised in table M3.1 of DAB P297. It is recognised that this would be considered a material change to the proposal so only the suggestion is recorded.</p>
Network Rail	Accepts the Proposal as submitted.
Greater Western Railway	<p>Rejected</p> <p>These changes would result in delays being allocated to Operator as a new prime cause rather than to root cause as is currently the case and as ought to be the case</p> <p>The proposed change would affect industry ability to identify the true impact of incidents</p> <p>It would also affect Schedule 8 responsibility</p> <p>This method of attribution would result in a shift in responsibility from root cause to the TOC as a new prime cause</p> <p><i>[specifically]</i></p> <p>M3.1</p> <p>A & B - attribution should be to the reason for the SSO requirement</p> <p>G - attribution should be to root cause if agreed with NR</p> <p>I – attribution should be to the reason for the alteration to the plan</p>

DAB/P297 Response	Comments
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board reviewed and discussed the Industry Consultation feedback at the 26th September 2017 Board meeting.</p> <p>The Proposal was agreed as submitted.</p> <p>The suggestion of a flow diagram from DAMG members was agreed to be progressed separately,</p> <p>The rejection from GWR was considered but not taken into account for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposal is combining current entries already in the DAPR and collating them in this new section for ease of reference – so the Proposal is not seeking to change attribution. • If GWR and their lead Route is applying attribution outside of what is currently in the DAPR then it should be considered a commercial arrangement and should not impact or be included in the DAPR. • The principles for attribution is to allocate to Prime cause. The GWR rejection is citing attribution to root cause.

Originators Reference Code / N ^o	DAB P298 – Process Guides
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB
Exact details of the change proposed	<p>Add new Section A7 as below:-</p> <p>A7 Process Guide Documents</p> <p>A7.1 The Board also produces Process Guide Documents (PGD) to supplement and support the DAPR. These documents are not part of the DAPR itself but have been developed to provide either suitable process advice or further assistance in the understanding and application of Delay Attribution principles.</p>
Reason for the change	<p><i>Over the last two years or so the DAB have been producing Process Guide Documents (PGDs) to either provide suitable process advice or further assistance in understand and applying attribution principles.</i></p> <p><i>These PGDs are referred to in the DAPR to ensure the user utilises both the DAPR itself and the PGDs where appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>It was felt that the existence and purposes of the PGDs is covered in the introduction the DAPR for completeness.</i></p>

DAB/P298 Response	Comments
DAMG - on behalf of the identified companies in the response matrix	Accepts the Proposal as submitted.
Network Rail	Accepts the Proposal as submitted.
DAB DECISION	<p>The Board reviewed and discussed the Industry Consultation feedback at the 26th September 2017 Board meeting.</p> <p>The Proposal was agreed as submitted but incorporating grammatical amendments suggested by the Board at the meeting:-</p> <p>The Delay Attribution Board should read just The Board’ and removal of the word ‘formally’ from the second sentence.</p>

Additional Proposal for Amendment – Non Material Change

Originators Reference Code / N ^o	DAB/P299 VANDALISM TIDY UP											
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)	DAB											
Exact details of the change proposed	<p>Reformat Q4.1(b) as shown below</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="486 607 1465 1464"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="486 607 576 678">No.</th> <th data-bbox="576 607 1051 678">Circumstances</th> <th data-bbox="1051 607 1214 678">Delay Code</th> <th data-bbox="1214 607 1465 678">Incident Attribution</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="486 678 576 1464">b.</td> <td data-bbox="576 678 1051 1464"> <p>Where it is identified:</p> <p>That an Infrastructure failure is due to vandalism or theft (other than to cables); or</p> <p>Objects have been placed deliberately on Network Rail Infrastructure, including in points; or</p> <p>Objects that have been thrown or fired at trains or the track on Network Rail Infrastructure, whether from outside railway premises or from railway premises including stations, and adjacent property (such as car parks); or</p> <p>Objects being thrown or fired from Network Rail Infrastructure at trains or onto track on non-Network Rail Infrastructure (including LUL).</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1051 678 1214 1464">XB</td> <td data-bbox="1214 678 1465 1464">Network Rail (XQ**)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				No.	Circumstances	Delay Code	Incident Attribution	b.	<p>Where it is identified:</p> <p>That an Infrastructure failure is due to vandalism or theft (other than to cables); or</p> <p>Objects have been placed deliberately on Network Rail Infrastructure, including in points; or</p> <p>Objects that have been thrown or fired at trains or the track on Network Rail Infrastructure, whether from outside railway premises or from railway premises including stations, and adjacent property (such as car parks); or</p> <p>Objects being thrown or fired from Network Rail Infrastructure at trains or onto track on non-Network Rail Infrastructure (including LUL).</p>	XB	Network Rail (XQ**)
No.	Circumstances	Delay Code	Incident Attribution									
b.	<p>Where it is identified:</p> <p>That an Infrastructure failure is due to vandalism or theft (other than to cables); or</p> <p>Objects have been placed deliberately on Network Rail Infrastructure, including in points; or</p> <p>Objects that have been thrown or fired at trains or the track on Network Rail Infrastructure, whether from outside railway premises or from railway premises including stations, and adjacent property (such as car parks); or</p> <p>Objects being thrown or fired from Network Rail Infrastructure at trains or onto track on non-Network Rail Infrastructure (including LUL).</p>	XB	Network Rail (XQ**)									
Reason for the change	<p>The current entry under Q4.1(b) is poorly formatted and contains various examples that should ideally be separated out into individual entries. However, for the purpose of assisting in making the entry clearer it is proposed to initially just space out the examples. This could be considered as being non-material and possibly agreed (unanimously) by the Board to take effect in the December DAPR.</p> <p>A full review of the Section Q is part of the Board’s Objectives for later in the year (for the April 2018 DAPR) and thus this section can be improved further within that work stream.</p>											

DAB DECISION	<p>The Board reviewed and discussed the Industry Consultation feedback at the 26th September 2017 Board meeting.</p> <p>The Proposal was agreed unanimously as a non-material change as submitted.</p>
--------------	---

