Long Term Planning Framework
Train Service Performance Metrics
Introduction

• National Task Force (NTF) was remitted to develop proposals for performance metrics and targets beyond CP4

• NTF is a senior cross-industry representative group which, among other roles, is responsible for setting challenging objectives and developing strategies and plans for performance improvement

• The proposals were to be based on analysis of:
  – The best metrics to use for train performance; and
  – The main cost/benefit trade-offs of improving performance.
Why good performance is important

- Good performance allows the railway to operate as planned;
- Poor performance leads to inefficiency in resource utilisation;
- Research shows that good performance is a key driver of overall passenger satisfaction;
- High performance differentiates rail from other transport modes and generates demand; and
- Poor performance therefore costs the industry money.
CP4 Metrics (regulatory outputs)

• Public Performance Measure (PPM): the percentage of trains which were not cancelled and arrived at their final destination within 5 minutes of their booked time (10 minutes on long distance services);

• Cancellations and Significant Lateness (CaSL): The percentage of trains cancelled or arriving at their final destination more than 30 minutes later than booked;

• Network Rail caused delay minutes; and

• Network Rail caused delay per 100 train kilometres to Freight services.
The performance metric should:

- Drive performance improvement in those areas which have biggest impact on rail usage, revenue and passenger satisfaction;
- Be easy to understand by the public, stakeholders and industry;
- Be possible to measure using existing systems; and
- Be a true indicator of punctuality and reliability for the passengers using the train service.
Issues to be addressed

• Stakeholder concern as to the credibility of PPM as a performance measure in its current definition;

• Selection thresholds, accounting for limitations of existing train detection systems, and addressing some inconsistencies between service groups;

• Demonstrate that the selected performance measures are consistent with improving customer satisfaction;

• Publishing the right data at the right level of detail – we already publish more detailed performance information than many other modes.
“You focus on trains running six or eleven minutes late at the expense of those running on time”

“Once a train is very late and can't achieve PPM you don’t care any more”

“You focus on high frequency shuttle services”

“Service Recovery doesn’t consider the passenger”

“You put padding at the end of a train’s journey purely to ensure it meets PPM even if it was late at all its main stopping points”

“When you cancel the entire service the day before you report perfect performance”

“You focus on train performance not passenger performance”
Options explored

- Measure PPM at all stations, not just the train’s terminus:
  - A train only passes PPM if it calls at all stations on time;
  - Or each train’s PPM is the proportion of stations it called at on time.
- Measure PPM at key stations with (or without weighting);
- Passenger weighted PPM; and
- Publication of more disaggregated performance information, for example by station, service group, peak service or train.
Addressing the PPM challenge

Strong correlation between very different performance metrics indicates that PPM has not led to perverse overall behaviour – improvements in PPM have resulted in the average lateness of our passengers falling.

Improving PPM has improved “Right Time” arrivals and to improve PPM increasingly the industry has focussed on initiatives which remove small but consistent delays.
National Task Force Conclusions

- PPM can be shown to drive management and operating behaviours which improve performance;
- PPM should therefore be retained as the primary publically-reported measure of performance;
- Reporting threshold inconsistencies in a small proportion of services should be addressed;
- Right-time service delivery should be the internal operational focus;
- Industry joint performance improvement processes should be used to address specific performance issues;
- The Cancellations and Significant Lateness (CaSL) metric can be more effectively used to manage performance delivery;
- Proposals for the publication of PPM by station/train were not adopted;
- Any proposals to change PPM thresholds should be supported by a business case.