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Planning, Reporting and Regulatory Framework

This document describes the key elements and methods of working in our development, agreement, and reporting of plans and scorecards in CP6. It also sets out how we consider the regulatory framework will fit around our methods of working with a greater focus on route-level regulation whilst continuing to operate within an unchanged legal framework.
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1. Development of our plans and scorecards

1.1 Develop and agree our plan

The route and central function strategic plans that comprise our Strategic Business Plan (SBP) have been developed in conjunction with our customers, funders and wider stakeholders. The prioritised requirements captured through this engagement, alongside the national priorities described in our strategic narrative, have helped to inform the shape of our SBP – our submission to ORR to inform its draft determination as part of the Periodic Review 2018.

Throughout CP6, our annual business plans will be developed through our continuous business planning cycle. To do this effectively we will engage with stakeholders at various stages in our strategic planning process to capture and prioritise requirements and to share information enabling stakeholders to shape and challenge our plans. We expect to have a deeper level of engagement with our customers (train and freight operators), who will be more involved in the granular development of our plans, compared to wider stakeholders (for example, local authorities), with whom we expect engagement to largely influence the direction of the plan rather than the specific detail. We will seek endorsement of our final plans from our customers and appropriate stakeholders.

1.2 Develop and agree our scorecards

We have a number of scorecards across our organisation; at a national, route, national function, customer and sub-functional level. The tiered relationship between our scorecards is described below and in Figure 1.

Our national scorecard provides a clear view of performance throughout the company and the performance incentives for all staff. This is underpinned by our route and national function scorecards which contain the key priorities of those areas, allowing the Managing Director and leadership team to manage across the route and function to deliver the required outputs. Our route scorecards are the platform for shared measures allowing greater alignment of our priorities to those of our customers. This allows us to drive track and train closer together, operating as one railway. Our customer scorecards create a platform to describe the specific priorities of each customer, where this is desired. Sub-function scorecards exist for some national functions to enable focus on delivery at a more granular level.

Figure 1: Scorecard framework

Our scorecards seek to balance the needs of all stakeholders and measure performance against targets on key metrics for safety, operational performance, asset management, project delivery, financial performance, and the specific areas of focus for routes and national functions. Our route scorecards include measures for safety, train performance, locally driven
measures, asset management (including long-term sustainability), and financial performance. National function scorecards contain measures for safety and financial performance and areas that are specific to the function.

Each route and national function (where relevant) will continue to develop and seek to agree scorecards in CP6 in line with our annual business planning process.

Where customers wish to monitor specific metrics outside a route scorecard, routes will develop and agree customer scorecards with their customers. Customer scorecards will reflect the key metrics required by the customer and where possible will be aligned to their own metrics. Customer scorecards will focus primarily on performance and locally driven measures outside of those mandated for the purposes of route comparison. Each customer scorecard will be reflected on a route scorecard in a way that is agreed between a route and its customer.

National functions have developed scorecards based on their stakeholders’ priorities for CP6. Some national function scorecards are underpinned by disaggregated sub-function scorecards or customer scorecards, agreed with customers and wider stakeholders where relevant. For example, and as described in the System Operator SBP submission, the System Operator scorecard will be underpinned by second tier scorecards aligning to the operational model. Supporting this structure, a third tier of scorecards will be agreed with route businesses and the operators for which they are lead route.

1.2.1 Ranges

It is not possible to forecast outputs with absolute certainty, particularly within a fixed funding envelope. Therefore our scorecard forecasts will be expressed as ranges with an upper and lower bound around a target and will be updated each year.

1.2.2 Customer agreement

The long-term scorecards included in our plans have been developed with our customers, funders and wider stakeholders. We have sought to agree the trajectories in scorecards with the relevant stakeholders.

The process for letting train operator franchises is separate from the process to set Network Rail’s funding and outputs. This has meant that it has not always been possible to agree forecast trajectories with all customers as there are a number of current franchises for which train operator performance targets are not achievable within Network Rail’s current plans. We want to see improved analysis and alignment of targets between Network Rail and our customers over time. We believe that this could be achieved through plans described in the SO SBP to recruit roles within the SO to provide assurance of the deliverability of franchise commitments within the franchising process.

1.2.3 Balanced scorecards

Our scorecards seek to balance the needs of all stakeholders including those of the current end users, the future end users and taxpayers. Current end user requirements are focused on train performance, access, timetabling, asset management and locally driven measures. Future end users interests are reflected in the asset management sections ensuring we are maintaining, renewing and enhancing the network effectively to ensure a sustainable future. Taxpayers are focused on value for money which is reflected in our financial performance and train performance measures.

Our route and national function scorecards, included in the SBP, do not include weightings. These will be agreed annually as part of our business planning cycle. In order that scorecards are balanced, we would expect all scorecards to place significant weight on safety, operational performance, financial performance and asset management, recognising that these issues will be core priorities for customers, end users and funders.

1.2.4 Scorecards as a comparison tool

There are a number of measures on route scorecards that are consistent and that are mandatory, providing a level of comparability between routes. This includes the measures in the scorecard sections for safety, financial performance and asset management (including sustainability). Within the
train performance section of geographic route scorecards, two measures have been mandated; a consistent route measure for the delivery of train performance (CRM-P) and the route Freight Delivery Metric (FDM-R). These measures will be included in the performance section of route scorecards alongside performance measures required by customers. National FDM has been mandated for the FNPO scorecard.

The consistent route measure of performance is defined as the annual minutes of Network Rail attributed delay to passenger trains from incidents occurring within the route boundary, normalised by train kilometres travelled by passenger trains within that routes. The measure takes account of all ‘in service’ passenger train services and includes delays to all passenger operators including minor operators. Use of this metric will enable a focus on Network Rail’s direct contribution to the overall performance of the railway and a consistent basis for comparison between routes.

This measure does not include reactionary delay caused by TOC incidents that Network Rail ultimately has responsibility for managing. Annex A describes how we will manage TOC caused reactionary delay and the data that will be available to monitor Network Rail’s performance.

To facilitate comparison of routes’ progress against their plans, we have developed a route comparison scorecard. This scorecard will contain all centrally mandated route scorecard measures for safety, financial performance, asset management and train performance alongside measures for end user experience (passenger satisfaction with the overall journey and passenger satisfaction with the managed station), use of the network (passenger and freight net tonne miles travelled) and third party investment. Our proposed route comparison scorecard is included in Annex B and continues to build on our CP5 comparison scorecard which is part of our Executive Committee report and is shared with ORR on a periodic basis.
2. Monitoring progress against our plan

2.1 Internal reporting and monitoring

As a matrix organisation, our governance framework operates across two organisational dimensions: first, holding to account route businesses and functions for the delivery of their objectives; and second, ensuring there are effective opportunities to share best practice and benchmark between businesses.
2.1.1 Use of scorecards and further data

In CP6, scorecards, which represent outputs of each route and national function’s plan, will continue to form the basis of our internal monitoring framework. Each route or function is accountable for the delivery of its scorecard and scorecards will form a core part of route and functional executive meetings. National functions are accountable to their customers – the routes – and will hold regular meetings with routes to allow effective benchmarking of performance and sharing of best practice. Our Executive Committee will monitor scorecards holding routes and national functions to account for delivery of scorecard targets. Network Rail’s Board will hold the Executive Committee to account to support the delivery of the national, route and functional scorecards.

Our internal reporting and meeting structure will provide the appropriate level of information where it is required in the business to monitor performance, provide assurance and inform decisions. Local monitoring and decision-making will be informed by more granular information, beyond what is recorded within a scorecard, at a route and functional level. This information will be rolled up to report on progress against our key business priorities at various levels across the organisation. The outputs from regular meetings will be channelled upwards through our meeting structure to inform decisions. This will provide a line of sight and allow us to identify areas for improvement and share best practice across the organisation. Where performance is not in line with plan, these concerns will be escalated within the internal governance structure.

We are developing our reporting and meeting structure so that each area of the business will be responsible for updating its stakeholders on progress against scorecard targets, and ensuring opportunities for those stakeholders to continue to provide challenge. We provide more detail about how we will report transparently to stakeholders in sections 2.2 and 4.

In the context of route based regulation, Corporate Services will independently monitor and challenge routes’ progress against targets, seeking further information to explain positive and negative variance to target and supporting the implementation of local and national improvement programmes as appropriate.

2.1.2 Comparison

Devolution is helping to create a competitive dynamic between routes and national functions which in turn drives improvement. To facilitate effective route comparison, our route and national function scorecards contain a number of centrally mandated and consistent measures. The route comparison scorecard will bring together into one place all consistent measures, enabling comparison across routes.

The route comparison scorecard will be firmly rooted in our governance structure in CP6, driving continuous improvement in our overall performance across routes and national functions. The scorecard will be a key input to route business performance review meetings, providing a line of sight on core performance outcomes from the route businesses in a consistent way. It will also be an input to national function/route business meetings which enable alignment between the services and solutions provided by the national functions and the performance needs of the routes. Our governance framework is being updated as part of our Transformation Plan and further detail of the precise fora in which we will use the route comparison scorecard is being developed. We will engage with our customers, funders and ORR as this work evolves and concludes ahead of the start of CP6.

2.1.3 Stakeholder engagement assessment

We will assess the quality of stakeholder engagement against principles of best practice, so that we consistently engage with our customers and wider stakeholders in the most effective way. Routes and the SO own the relationships with their customers and stakeholders and will, in the first instance, assess the quality of their engagement. Corporate Services will set consistent principles of stakeholder engagement through an updated Stakeholder Relations Code of Practice, on which we intend to consult in the spring of 2018. Guidance will also be issued to routes and the SO on the
minimum requirements of stakeholder engagement. Routes and the SO will submit the results of their assessment to Corporate Services as part of a broader stakeholder engagement submission. Corporate Services will independently assess route and the SO submissions against the principles of engagement and will collate and package up the results of that assessment. These will be distributed internally enabling best practice to be shared driving continuous improvement. We will also share the results of our assessment with our stakeholders and with ORR.

2.1.4 Licence compliance

We will continue to proactively monitor compliance with our licence obligations. A compliance culture will be embedded through our internal monitoring framework. In order for this to be successful, we believe that the current Network Licence requires review and revision such that it is more accessible to our route and SO businesses. Discussions with ORR about reform of our existing licence are continuing.

2.2 Reporting to our customers and stakeholders

We will engage with our customers, funders and wider stakeholders to provide updates on performance. We will share relevant scorecards with customers, funders and wider stakeholders on a regular basis to provide them with information they need to continue to engage with us in a meaningful way. We will also engage with our customers to explain how we are delivering our plan and fulfilling their requirements so that we can work together to continue to improve overall industry performance. We will provide appropriate opportunities for customers and wider stakeholders to review our progress, both multilaterally and bilaterally. We expect that customers will hold us to account for delivering our plans to the customers and stakeholders.

Where performance is outside target ranges, routes and national functions will, as appropriate, provide stakeholders with additional information that they need to understand the reasons for this. This could include additional analysis or proposals for improvement plans which we would seek to agree with stakeholders. Our governance framework will provide a line of sight and a clear escalation process for customers and stakeholders who do not feel that their requirements are being considered.

As well as sharing scorecards and engaging with stakeholders directly, independently chaired Route Supervisory Boards (RSBs) will bring Network Rail together with its customers to assess the integrated performance of the route, reviewing the strategic priorities and assessing risks and opportunities. Route scorecards will be a key input to these fora.

2.3 Regulatory reporting and monitoring

We anticipate that ORR will monitor and report on our delivery using our scorecards alongside a broader suite of data. We will share our scorecards (including our route comparison scorecard) with ORR on a periodic basis.

We expect to agree a regulatory reporting specification with ORR to provide the routine additional information that it needs to monitor our performance. We anticipate that this specification will be based on the information we use to run our business. We will agree a meeting structure that reflects our matrix organisation for relevant business areas to engage with ORR. We envisage that ORR will monitor our performance against our plans through our regulatory reporting and the bilateral engagement between ORR and the different units within our matrix structure.

The consistent measures on our route (and some national function) scorecards will allow ORR to monitor the relative performance in a consistent and transparent way, reinforcing the competitive dynamic within our matrix organisation.

Where performance is not in line with our scorecard targets, we expect ORR to consider information that is available, including how we have engaged with our stakeholders, to inform its risk based approach to monitoring. We
will share our assessment of the quality of stakeholder engagement with ORR, and we anticipate that ORR will also seek stakeholder views directly.

ORR will determine regulatory minimum floors for network sustainability and train performance. For train performance these will be determined for the route comparison measure for passenger train performance. For freight performance these will be determined for FDM-R and national FDM. ORR will set floors at a level below the trajectories in its PR18 determination. The rationale for a regulatory minimum floor is to help codify the link between our licence obligations and an outcome. Were a floor to be breached we anticipate that ORR would be likely to consider whether there is cause to undertake formal investigation. We have proposed floors for sustainability and train performance within our route plans alongside details of our proposed methodology.

While we do not expect RSBs to be a formal part of ORR’s approach to monitoring, we will transparently inform ORR of discussions and outcomes of RSBs. We aim to agree with ORR an approach to considering the output of RSBs to inform its monitoring of each route’s performance.

Where ORR does make regulatory interventions, such as enhanced monitoring, we will adjust our reporting and engagement arrangements accordingly to provide ORR with the information it needs to assess performance. Individual business units will be accountable for issues that ORR has escalated, and, with support from national functions, will lead engagement with ORR to provide the appropriate information to resolve any issues. We will review this position regularly to ensure that the level of engagement with ORR remains appropriate and proportionate to the issue.
3. Updating our plan and scorecards

Network Rail needs to be able to respond to risks and opportunities during the control period, the scale and nature of which are not possible to anticipate at this point in time, to support the efficient delivery of outputs for customers. It is therefore not possible to forecast outputs with certainty, particularly within a fixed funding envelope. We also need to be able to respond to changes that arise outside our organisation, for example, franchise change or faster than anticipated growth in passenger numbers. While we propose to minimise the impact of risk and uncertainty by including sufficient financial headroom in our plans (at a route and portfolio level), we will review and update our plans and scorecards annually in consultation with our stakeholders. Further information on our proposed approach to managing risk and uncertainty is included within the Risk and Uncertainty paper, which forms part of our SBP submission.

We recognise the importance of explaining any changes to our plans during CP6, including the consequence of those changes, to our customers, funders, and relevant stakeholders. Any changes we make during the control period will be made transparently with the implications of material change made clear to our customers, funders and ORR.

We have a well-developed engagement framework with customers, funders and ORR and will use this to inform relevant parties of proposed changes to measures and/or forecasts, to set out the anticipated impact of changes and to update parties on progress throughout the change process. To ensure the process to manage change is transparent we will review and clarify which fora will be used to discuss and manage change and at what points in time during our continuous planning cycle. This will require amendments to the terms of reference of some fora. We will do this at a route and functional perspective, but also at a corporate level.

We will work collaboratively with customers, funders, wider stakeholders and ORR to identify the most efficient and effective ways of managing the railway within the funds available. We will do this in a proportionate way depending on the scale of the anticipated impact of change.

Changes to our organisational or governance structure may impact how responsibilities and accountabilities are drawn up across our organisation. Where relevant, we will publically explain these changes to customers, funders, wider stakeholders and ORR, providing assurance in relation to the terms of the settlement and the obligations within our licence.

Network Rail’s national functions will have a critical role to manage and report change. Corporate Services will continue to provide a national overview of business plans and, in consultation with routes and the national functions, agree and manage the governance framework for change.

ORR will want to scrutinise the changes we make to our plans and scorecards to assure itself that any impacts of these changes do not raise concerns in relation to the terms of the PR18 settlement and our licence obligations. It will also allow ORR to continue to make meaningful comparisons between routes and to make adjustments to PR18 baselines where it judges this is necessary.

We do not think it is necessary for ORR to introduce additional processes or require ORR approval for changes to our plans during the control period, which could increase the regulatory burden and generate additional cost. Where the changes we propose are substantial enough to impact the PR18 settlement, ORR may publish a formal opinion. We will consider this formal opinion in deciding how and whether to implement the proposed change.

Where we make changes to our plan, and where ORR is assured of the rationale and impact of the change (including that it has been agreed or endorsed by relevant stakeholders) we anticipate ORR will monitor our delivery against the updated plan and scorecards.
4. Transparency

Network Rail is committed to transparently reporting on our performance. We believe that being transparent and accountable to our customers, funders, wider stakeholders and the public will drive continuous improvement to help us to become more efficient and responsive in delivering for all users of the railway. We believe that transparency is about providing relevant information to stakeholders, rather than reporting all things to all people.

We will publish a delivery plan at the start of each financial year, providing an update on what we plan to deliver over the remaining control period. As described in our network licence, the publication of our delivery plan enables service providers to plan their businesses and funders to plan their future financial and service requirements. We will need to agree the specification for the delivery plan with ORR based around our joint requirements, but we would anticipate that our delivery plan would be centred on our scorecards. We will also share more granular information with ORR about our plan to deliver scorecards.

As well as regularly sharing scorecards with stakeholders, we will publicly report on our performance against our forecasts. We will continue to report on our performance on an annual basis through our Annual Report and Accounts, the Annual Return and Regulatory Financial statements. Our Annual Return will include route comparison data and the route comparison scorecard. In CP6, we propose to publish route scorecards on a quarterly basis. Our public reporting framework for CP6 continues to be developed and precise details of the frequency and content of public reporting will be discussed with stakeholders (including ORR) ahead of the start of CP6.

Where we make significant changes to our plan, as determined by guidelines agreed with ORR and other stakeholders, we will publish an explanation of the changes and the impact of the changes. We will also publicly explain changes to our organisation and our governance framework.

We will assess and report on the quality of customer, funder and wider stakeholder engagement, against high level principles of good practice. These principles will be included within our updated Stakeholder Relations Code of Practice by 31 March 2018, subject to the consultation process.
ANNEX A

A.1 Management of TOC caused reactionary delay

Background

Reactionary delay is delay to trains in locations remote from the initial incident. TOC caused reactionary delay is the reactionary delay allocated to incidents due to operator causes, and may include both ‘on self’ delays to the operator causing the incident, and ‘on TOC’ delays: delays to other operators.

Network Rail is responsible for managing reactionary delay as controller of the network under the Railway Operational Code. Whilst Network Rail is responsible for managing disruption, the direct extent of reactionary delay is determined by many factors, which require industry action to both control on the day, and drive improvement to over time, including:

- the size of the initial fault causing the incident
- the speed of response and repair
- availability of contingency plans, and contingent resources to operate re-planned services
- overall network congestion
- passenger loadings (if trains are full, there is less scope to cancel services to speed up service recovery and reduce reactionary delay).

These factors apply whether incidents are caused by Network Rail or operators, and reduction of reactionary delays is dependent on a wide range of inputs many of which are not within Network Rail’s direct control, and sometimes ‘traded off’ against other industry outcomes.

Across the industry about 70 per cent of delay is reactionary. This is split into about 35 per cent due to operator caused incidents, 43 per cent due to Network Rail causes and 22 per cent caused by external and weather-related events. We manage all types of reactionary delay with the same level of attention.

Monitoring and reporting

Network Rail’s central performance team currently monitors reactionary delay through the following data:

- primary-reactionary ratio: total reactionary delay per minute of primary delay (at a network, route or operator level). This is the lead indicator recognising that it is the nature of the primary delay that is a prime driver, and less the organisation causing the incident.
- reactionary delay location: total reactionary delay by location to monitor key hotspots on the network
- TOC on TOC matrix: reactionary delay caused to other operators (normalised by TOC-on-Self delay)
- route on route matrix: reactionary delay caused in a route attributed to incidents from a neighbouring route.

In CP6, Network Rail intends to increase the visibility of reactionary delay within our organisation. Our central performance team will include the data above in a periodic performance report to routes and the SO. This report will form a core part of our periodic route performance management meetings enabling reactionary delay to be monitored and reviewed within the route and the SO governance framework. This data will be included in our Executive Committee reporting pack, when relevant.

Reactionary delay is currently reported to, and reviewed by, the National Task Force (NTF) and other industry fora. In CP6 we want to increase the
meaningfulness of the data in the reports reviewed by operators. The introduction of Industry Train Event Data (ITED) and the Traffic Management System (TMS) alongside expected improvements in our measurement and analysis systems, will allow more detailed analysis of reactionary delay and the individual drivers that contribute to this.

**Improvement**

Network Rail routes and operators work together to monitor the effectiveness of control and the operational plan to manage reactionary delay. This is carried out by reviewing data in relation to part cancellations, very late starts, right time departures from origin and the performance of the rolling stock and crew diagrams.

Over the course of CP6 there are many factors, set out in the SBP performance plan and part of wider industry activity, that will drive a reduction in reactionary delay including:

- planned timetable improvements
- better rolling stock
- remote condition monitoring for both infrastructure and fleet making fault diagnosis quicker
- Incident Management tool.

Many of these are likely to have an indirect impact on reactionary delay, for example, if general congestion is less we should see a reducing trend in reactionary delay. Routes will work with national functions to address issues where the drivers fall within their control.

At the same time, we expect change in our measurement and data capture systems, including the planned review of attribution led by ORR, which may change the context or the definition of reactionary delay. We plan to track these initiatives within our overall CP6 change tracking programme, with more detailed and focussed engagement expected at a route and operator level.
ANNEX B

B.1 Proposed Route Comparability Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURE</th>
<th>NPW % Weighting</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>ENI &amp; EM</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>LRW</th>
<th>Angle</th>
<th>Wessex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Incident Injury Frequency Rate (IIF)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Safety</td>
<td>Risk Management Maturity Model (RMM)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Safety</td>
<td>Train Accident Reduction Measure</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Crossing Risk Reduction</td>
<td>Top 50 Level Crossings to reduce level crossing rate</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Performance</td>
<td>Network Rail Trains Delays (NTM)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>Freight Delivery Metric (FDN)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Performance &amp; Investment</td>
<td>Total Efficiency Generated (TEG) including Enhancements</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Performance Measures (FPM1)</td>
<td>Enhancements only (Em)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Performance Measures (FPM2)</td>
<td>Cost Compliance Income &amp; Expenditure (TCIE)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10 Renewals &amp; Enhancement Milestones</td>
<td>Top 10 Investment Manager Milestones</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int Parts Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in service affecting failure</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network [C] Key voters</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Network Sustainability (TNS)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the Network</td>
<td>Passenger Travel Miles</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the Network</td>
<td>Freight Net Tonne Miles</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overall Passenger Satisfaction</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Satisfaction</td>
<td>Passenger Satisfaction at Managed Stations</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Based Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>