



Les Waters
Network Regulation Policy Manager
Office of Rail Regulation
1 Waterhouse Square
138-142 Holborn
London
EC1N 2TQ

4 February 2005

Dear Mr Waters,

Go-Ahead supports the ATOC response to your request for comments on a balance scorecard for Network Rail. The Go-Ahead owns two TOCs – Southern and Thameslink. For clarity we offer the following comments which are in line with the ATOC view but emphasise issues most pertinent to Go-Ahead TOCs.

Do consultees agree that publication of the Network Rail Monitor should be quarterly, or is there a case for a more frequent publication?

Go-Ahead agree that a quarterly response is a useful periodicity as will it enable sufficient data to be collated and emerging trends monitored. However, it should be noted that franchise reviews are currently held 4 weekly with the SRA, and the obligations in our contracts with the SRA also accord with this time interval. We may need the Network Rail data to match these timescales.

Do consultees agree that the range of proposed KPIs is sufficient for the purpose of providing a broad overview of Network Rail's stewardship of the network? Is there anything missing or anything which is of no use?

Go-Ahead TOCs approves of the list but believes that train cancellations resulting should be explicit (not accounted within delay minutes). This figure should be train cancellations as a result of NR caused delays and those arising from NR's actions to restore the timetable during network disruption. This is an issue, which has a profound impact on passengers. Post Rail Review, as NR becomes the final arbiter of the means of restoring the timetable, we believe there needs to be clear sight of the trend in the number cancellations arising. We would also like to see some means of aligning Network Rail with TOC passenger objectives.

Do consultees agree that the proposed ‘traffic light’ representation of performance is sufficient to provide an easy-to-understand overview? Are the threshold levels at which the colour coding changes appropriate in each case?

Go-Ahead TOCs agree with the Traffic Light format: it is consistent with other KPI management formats within the industry and it fulfills the goal of clarity and simplicity in the scorecard management.

Do consultees agree with the proposal to adopt the FEI until more robust measures of unit costs have been developed?

Go-Ahead TOCs welcome the development of a more transparent reporting format for the costs of NR’s specific renewal and maintenance costs. We would welcome the disaggregation of these unit costs to provide comparative unit costs for NR Routes. This would enable users to understand relative efficiencies and costs based on geographical or regional operational considerations.

Do consultees agree with the proposed proportional split of the components for Asset Quality?

Go-Ahead TOCs suggest that some of the measures should be given a regional weight in e.g. electrification failures will have a far more significant impact on some networks and routes than others, and the asset being measured varies too: third rail failures should be split out from OHL failures, giving a far more accurate understanding of the comparative robustness of both assets

Go-Ahead TOCs has the following comment on Annex A

Network Capability

No reduction in the capability of any route for broadly existing use from April 2001 levels except through established Network Change.

We recognize the need for NR to be able to make commercial decisions on the level of maintenance which it applies to its assets based on the expected usage. However it is not acceptable for NR to effectively remove assets from the network by ‘mothballing’ them without consultation or Network Change. This does not allow operators or stakeholders to understand the true network capability and plan their business accordingly.

Such assets should be regarded as having full functionality, which NR should be responsible for restoring should an operator require access to this part of the network to operate its services.

Structures and electrification

Condition and serviceability to return to 2001/02 levels.

Where an asset type has been significantly renewed – e.g. the Go-Ahead TOCs power supply upgrade we would consider it reasonable to expect higher outputs particularly in terms of reliability. We believe the output targets should reflect this

Once again thank you for the opportunity to respond to your consultation.

Yours sincerely

KEITH LUDEMAN
Chief Executive – Rail