OFFICE OF RAIL REGULATION

Shaping Station Stewardship Measure

SSM Working Group Report

31st July 2013

FAITHFUL GOULD
CONSTRUCTIVE EXPERTISE

AUTHORISED FOR ISSUE

M D Carter

14 August 2013

Office of Rail Regulation   Date

CONTENTS   PAGE

1   Introduction

Background

The Station Stewardship Measure (SSM) is the regulatory measure for station asset condition for Control Period 4 (CP4). The SSM measures the asset condition of a station's building fabric and building services (including canopies, platforms and lighting).

The SSM was introduced in 2007, replacing the Station Condition Index (SCI) as a method of reflecting the condition of UK rail stations. The SSM evolved from the previous methodology and therefore retained some of its features such as weighting to reflective the relative importance of different assets within the station.

Within the SSM methodology and process, condition is first calculated at station level, where a score represents the average condition of all assets; following this the location level scores are averaged across all the stations of the same category in the network.

In the Final Determination for CP4 the Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) adopted the SSM as the measure of Network Rail's station asset performance in the period of 2009 to 2014.

The output framework for the 2013 Periodic Review (PR13) covering control period 5 (CP5), issued in August 2012, proposes to maintain the requirement for NR to deliver defined asset condition measured by SSM and to learn lessons from the West Coast franchise.

As part of the proposed West Coast franchise, responsibility for the condition of some stations was to be transferred from NR to the Train Operating Company (TOC) and a new station stewardship measure developed for the franchise stations.

Following cancellation of the competition to run trains on the West Coast Main Line in October 2013, progress on developing SSM was also halted. In order to maintain momentum ORR requested that an independent consultancy with experience of the SSM facilitate the phased development of SSM to provide a more robust measure for condition. The ORR is looking for the SSM to be developed in a collaborative way so invited selected parties from ATOC and Network Rail to form a collaborative working group to help shape a new station measure. This is in order to create a measure of station condition and station performance that can be used during CP5 and beyond.

Shaping SSM

Faithful+Gould was appointed in December 2012 by ORR to facilitate the initial 'Shaping' phase of this process; chair and record the findings of the working group and to provide a report outlining areas of improvements for ORR review and approval and to inform setting the terms of reference for the 'Testing & trialling' phase of the SSM development.

2   Executive Summary

The prime purpose of this report was to provide the ORR with recommendations for improving the current Station Stewardship Measure. The report recommendations resulted from a series of meetings that were facilitated by Faithful+Gould of collaborative working group of selected rail industry professionals that were carried out in accordance with our Terms of Reference for Shaping the SSM as detailed in Appendix 6.1.

The findings of the working group forum have been categorised as follows:

- Identified potential improvements to the current SSM measure and methodology
- Identified potential future wider station measures
- Key considerations to be resolved as part of the testing & trialling phase

Section 4 summarises specific improvements to the current SSM categorised into

4.1 Network Rail Asset Policy Improvements

4.2 Buildings Improvement Programme improvements

4.3 Enhancements to the current SSM

Recommendations

1. Improve condition data collection
2. Review Forecasting & WLCC Assessments
3. Guidance, Training & Competency Improvements
4. Compliance Monitoring of Surveys & OPAS Upgrades
5. ACR Band Review
6. Asset Weighting Review
7. SSM Aggregation Review
8. Asset Data Integration for Maintenance & Renewals
9. Investment Impact on SSM Score
10. Whole Life Cycle Costing Transparency
11. Efficiency Sharing Benefits
12. Communication Plan

Section 5 summarises the objectives for and the potential shape of 'future wider station measures' in terms of:

5.1 Wider performance

5.2 Customer experience

5.3 Sustainability

5.4 Funding & Investment

5.5 Ownership & Responsibility

5.6 Communicating Understanding of a Wider Measure

Recommendations

13. Fitness for Purpose of a Wider Stewardship Measure
14. Additional Assets
15. Station Standards
16. Disaggregation
17. Sustainability
18. Customer Experience
19. Funding & Investment
20. Ownership & Responsibility
21. Communication of a Wider Measure

Other key considerations that need to be resolved as part of a follow on terms of reference for the testing & trialling phase includes:

- What are we aiming to achieve from adopting wider station measures?
- What would be call a future wider station measure i.e. a title and definition that better reflects its purpose.
- What impact would the identified improvements have on future franchising?
- Who would be affected by the changes to SSM?
- What are the impacts on NR and TOC and other interested parties?
- What are the key risks and barriers?
- What is the best way forward for ORR?

3   Methodology

3.1   Working Group

In consultation with the ORR a SSM Working Group was convened from a representative sample of selected rail industry professionals with an interest in station condition measures.

The SSM working group members are:

- Mervyn Carter   ORR   Civil Engineering Advisor & Sponsor
- Stephen Sutcliffe   Network Rail   Acting Head of Buildings & Architecture
- Alec McTavish   ATOC   Director of Policy & Operations
- Jonathan Chatfield   ATOC   Manager, Regulation
- Mike Kean   Abellio[1]   Bid Director
- Peter Strangeway   Abellio   Asset Management Specialist
- John Chappell   Gesynto   Director (ex Head of Asset Management NR)

The SSM working group is facilitated by:

- Adrian Wilkins, Andy Green & Julian Watts of Faithful+Gould.

3.2   Process for shaping SSM

Three collaborative working group meetings were held during the period January to March 2013.

At the first meeting held at ORR's offices on the 23rd January 2013, each representative was invited to outline their organisation's current position with SSM and suggest possible areas for improvement.

At the second meeting held at Faithful+Gould's offices on the 28th February 2013, the meeting reviewed the findings of the first meeting and mind maps were used to classify issues with the current SSM and suggested improvement areas.

At the third meeting held at Faithful+Gould's offices on the 18th March 2013, the meeting reviewed the findings of the second meeting reclassified issues with the current SSM and suggested improvement areas and mapped them against overriding objectives.

The identified improvements areas were categorised under different themes as follows:

- Station stewardship measure
  - Network Rail Improvements currently being implemented (In Hand)
  - Enhancement to SSM (as identified and recommended by working group)
- Future Wider Station Measure
  - Identified scope of future wider station measures (identified by WG)

This draft report summarises the findings and recommendations from the SSM working group meetings.

---

[1] Abellio were invited to be part of the SSM working group because of their experience of asset management under a licensing arrangement on the Greater Anglia franchise.

4   SSM Improvements

Network Rail is currently undertaking various improvements that impact on the SSM as part of its submission for PR13 through its asset policy and Buildings Improvement Programme. These were shared with the working group and are summarised below:

4.1   Network Rail Asset Policy Improvements

Network Rail's Asset Policy which was published on the 7th January 2013 identifies specific areas of improvement relating to OPAS Functionality that will help to improve, both directly and indirectly, the accuracy of SSM. These were summarised to the working group as:

- A forecasting capacity to better understand condition of assets & enable Whole Life Cycle Costing (WLCC) assessments to be calculated through high-level modelling enabling the evaluation of applying different policy scenarios to optimise outcomes.

- In-house surveying capability to support surveys undertaken through the Civil Engineering Framework Agreement (CEFA) contract.

- Incorporating PPM & Minor Emerging Works activities to allow full visibility of all asset interventions

- Improved system access to external stakeholders to facilitate better reporting and condition data visibility

Network Rail's commitment to delivering the above improvements to the OPAS system functionality will significantly improve the accuracy, consistency, completeness of the condition date collection. Through the use of in-house resources to support the CEFA contract, will capture local knowledge and help reduce the time-lag in the current 5-year rolling condition survey programme.

Also it will give NR the ability to model the effect on asset condition of proposed interventions. This will allow OPAS outputs such as SSM to become useful 'lead' as well as 'lag' indicators and assist in optimum asset management decision making.

> **Recommendation 1** – Improve condition data collection
>
> NR fully implements the asset policy improvement initiatives outlined above to realise the improvements in the robustness and accuracy of asset condition data.
>
> **Recommendation 2** – Review Forecasting & WLCC Assessments
>
> Explore during the SSM 'testing & trialling' stage, how the forecasting & whole life cycle costing assessments enable high-level modelling.

In the SBP submission, Network Rail has also proposed that Urgent Reactive Faults and Percentage Asset Remaining Life (PARL) data are used as indicators for robustness and sustainability respectively.

4.2   Buildings Improvement Programme

The working group was advised that following a number of Arup/ORR data audits, Network Rail's SSM asset data was found to be generally at an acceptably robust level. However a number of suggested recommendations were made by Arup/ORR to further improve data quality. NR has advised that the principal recommendations were accepted and are currently being delivered under their *Buildings Improvement Programme* as follows:

- **Asset Performance Measurements** – Arup/ORR have asked NR to provide an explanation of how Asset Life Expectancy (ALE) is derived in the associated guidance & remove any discrepancies. NR advised that they have updated all associated guidance documentation and reissued to all surveyors delivering property inspections/examinations.

- **Training & Competence** - Arup/ORR have sought an improvement in consistency of Asset Remaining Life (ARL) scoring. NR has advised that they are updating the visual assessment documentation (Fabric & M&E Assessment Manuals) for reissue in September 2013.

- **Task List Compliance & Planning -** Arup/ORR recommended that NR plan and ensures high level of survey audits. NR advised that they have introduced national management and recording system for RAM audits across the routes.

- **OPAS & Asset Information** - Arup/ORR made three improvement recommendations relating to asset data, these were: 1. Exclusion of other than 5 year exam results from SSM scoring. NR has not accepted this recommendation as it is felt to be counter-intuitive in terms of improving the accuracy and currency of condition scoring. There is therefore an agreement to continue to update data at annual visits and at adhoc intervals following significant works. 2. Review OPAS system to allow more than one defect per element. NR has advised that has been implemented. 3. Specific auditing of stations following significant investment. NR has advised that this is currently being implemented via improved handover/ hand back guidance/methodology.

The review identified that the Building Improvement initiatives outlined above will result in greater accuracy, consistency and completeness of the condition data collected and therefore improve the accuracy of SSM scoring overall.

Recommendation 3   Guidance, Training & Competency Improvements

NR fully implements the Buildings Improvement Programme initiatives outlined above to up-skill the surveyors and improve consistency of the asset life expectancy (ALE) in the system and asset remaining life (ARL) scoring.

Recommendation 4   Compliance Monitoring of Surveys & OPAS Upgrades

During the testing and trialling phase assess the effectiveness of the introduction of the national management and recording system for RAM audits and OPAS upgrades

---

4.3 Enhancements to Current SSM

Following the three working group meetings the forum identified the following areas of enhancement to the current SSM:

4.3.1 ACR Band Review

Currently the SSM logic is based on Percentage Asset Remaining Life (PARL) of an asset. This is calculated from the Asset Remaining Life (ARL) from the latest survey information divided by the Asset Life Expectancy (ALE) and then multiplying it by 100 to give PARL.

The PARL score is then mapped to an Asset Condition Rating (ACR) which has an index of 1-5, with 1 representing 'as installed' and 5 as no longer serviceable or 'life expired'. The ACR bands widths currently are:

PARL (%)	ACR Band
<1	5
1-15	4
16-45	3
46-75	2
>or = 76	1

The working group noted that there is non-linear relationship between percentage remaining life and ACR band. The ACR band widths mean that assets generally have a rating of 3 or above and for an asset to have an ACR of 5 its PARL would be less than 1% i.e. the asset would be totally non-functional.

Further it was noted that the same ACR band widths are applied to all different asset types irrespective of relative asset degradation curves.

Recommendation 5   ACR Band Review

During the SSM trialling and testing phase, the PARL methodology should be reviewed considering whether (i) the ACR component could be removed from the SSM algorithm altogether, (ii) it is appropriate to apply different band widths to different asset elements, features and attributes.

4.3.2 Weighting

The current SSM calculation incorporates an Asset Weighting Factor (AWF) for each asset that is designed to reflect the relative importance of each asset on the basis of providing safe and efficient operation use of the station. Within the measure each asset is assigned an AWF rating on a scale of 1 to 5 where:

- **1**   Insignificant item – minimal impact on measure

- **5**   Very significant item – may have immediate impact on a station and would have long term liabilities

To some degree the weighting featuring within SSM also reflects the relative cost of repair and renewals to the asset and does add a linkage between investment levels and SSM scores.

The working group identified that currently the AWF, and therefore the SSM, is biased towards structural integrity assets and may not properly reflect the relative importance of station fabric assets or finishes.

Recommendation 6   Asset Weighting Review

The weightings for all assets are reviewed and if appropriate revised so that the SSM provides an overall condition measure for a station that better reflects the condition of all elements especially fabric and finishes. In considering this the value of the linkage between investment and the SSM score should assessed.

4.3.3   Aggregation Logic

The working group forum identified that the SSM has inherited some of the underlying logic from the previous Station Condition Index (SCI) calculation that was the method in place before CP4. The current SSM for each station is derived by aggregating the sum of all the WACR divided by the sum of all the AWF at a location to produce an average ACR score the station. The SSM site scores are then averaged across all stations in the same Station Category to give the score.

The calculation of location level condition can mask poorer condition assets (with possibly higher risk profiles) by averaging them with better condition assets at the same station.

Recommendation 7   SSM Aggregation Review

The level of aggregation within the measure is reviewed and if deemed appropriate revised so that the SSM for the station location is not a simple location average. Also it is recommended that the mechanism for deriving the SSM score by station Route, as well station Category, is tested and trialled in the next phase.

4.3.4   Asset Data Standards

The review identified the need for full integration of asset data standards in order to facilitate the capture condition from operational maintenance as well as from asset surveys and inspections.

Recommendation 8   Asset Data Integration for Maintenance & Renewals

Evolve the current NR rules of measurement to ensure full integration of operational PPM maintenance regimes with the inspections, condition surveying and asset renewal planning.

4.3.5   Investment Impact on SSM Score

The working group found that that currently the SSM score for a station is influenced by other forms of investment and not just asset renewals and repairs. As such the SSM does not differentiate the source of funding for different types of station investment.

Recommendation 9   Investment Impact on SSM Score

Consider methods of identifying the impact of significant investment on the SSM score from different types of investment so that their effect is measurable and more transparent.

4.3.6   Whole Life Cycle Costing Decision Making

Network Rail advised the working group that their system improvements to OPAS enable Whole Life Cycle Costing (WLCC) assessments to be modelled through high-level modelling. Currently this methodology and modelling is not available to other potential stakeholders.

Recommendation 10   Whole Life Cycle Costing Transparency

Network Rail should consider and provide more transparency as to how Whole Life Cycle Costing (WLCC) assessments are modelled and possibly make this functionality available to other stakeholders.

4.3.7   Efficiency Sharing Benefits

NR's Building Fabric Policy improvements states that efficiency sharing benefits should be included in the SSM score calculation. However the working group concluded that there was a need to make this more clearly signposted.

Recommendation 11   Efficiency Sharing Benefits

Clearly define and understand the implications of initiating the efficiency sharing benefits on the SSM score – during the testing & trialling phase.

4.3.8   Better Communication of SSM Measure

The working group debated the merits of better communicating the limited parameters behind the current SSM to all stakeholders, including the general public. The SSM measure is currently published with Network Rail's Annual Return and the forum concluded that to publish further information at the moment without enhancing the SSM would be counterproductive.

Recommendation 12   Communication Plan

Defer further communication on the current SSM until there is clarity on future improvements and the wider station measure(s) to be implemented.

It was also noted by the working group that further improvements to SMM will come from the Train Operating Companies (TOCs) as mandated through the DfT's Franchising Invitation to Tender (ITT) process. The direction is likely to build on asset condition monitoring and customer perception of the measure though these developments will be dependent on the DfT policy and franchising programme.

5   Future Wider Station Measure(s)

The current Station Stewardship Measure (SSM) is a measure of existing asset condition and does not cover possible wider station performance such as: - suitability, sufficiency or effectiveness of the assets or station facilities.

The consensus of the working group was that before attempting to consider wider station measures there is a need to agree what the underlying objectives are and what might be achieved by these measures. The forum subsequently agreed the following objectives for having wider station measures:

Objectives

1   Better reflect condition of station(s) & impact of investment
2   Create common approach to station outcomes
3   Support local incentive regimes between NR & TOCs
4   Support local devolution involving Local Authorities
5   Supports greater devolution of accountability for outputs & costs to route directors
6   Economically sustainable and meets the sustainable development objectives
7   Help customers and the public understand meaning of measures and better reflect their experience at stations

The working group forum identified a number of potential future station measures which were subsequently mapped to the objectives above. – see Matrix included in Appendix 6.2.

The conclusion of the mapping has informed the grouping of potential future station measures as follows:

- Robustness

- Sustainability

- Customer Experience

Also to be taken into account is the impact of future DfT franchising model which will effect:

- Funding & Investment

- Ownership & Responsibility

5.1   Robustness

One of the current tests ORR use to assess the effectiveness of asset policies is robustness.

ORR's definition of robustness is: Is it reasonable to believe that the policy can deliver the required outputs, for England, Wales and Scotland? In testing the robustness of the policy ORR will consider whether the policy and plans have been demonstrated to be capable of delivering the outputs required for CP5 (2014-2019).

5.1.1 Fitness for Purpose

The working group advised that in addition to the current SSM, there was a requirement for a wider measure of station performance that was fit for purpose. The working group identified that the wider measure would need to run in parallel with the existing SSM for a period of time to provide continuity and consistency through CP5.

The working group did not decide on a new title for the wider measure but recognised that any title would need to reflect performance of a station in its entirety.

Recommendation 13   Fitness for Purpose of a Wider Stewardship Measure

The working group recommended that the process of progressing a wider stewardship measure should feature mapping against the overarching objectives to allow it to meet the objectives of all stakeholders involved.

5.1.2 Additional Assets

The working group identified that the wider measure would require a common and consistent approach to capturing all asset types and their attributes. This will include surface finishes that will have an impact on visual appearance and other assets such as CIS and ticket windows that are not currently included in SSM by Network Rail.

In addition work on the wider measure should consider ways to reflect inadequate provision of an asset at a station whilst not compromising the scores at locations where fewer assets are appropriate due to the relative usage or location of the station type.

Recommendation 14   Additional Assets

Recommend that assets in the SSM are compared against typical assets within each station category to identify assets that are not currently included in the SSM and add them to the future wider measure.

Recommendation 15   Station Standards

Establish minimum asset standards for each station category and station type, so that the wider station measure properly reflects minimum standards of asset provision within a particular station type.

5.1.3 Disaggregate at group & level

The working group agreed that the future wider station measure would need to be capable of reporting station performance by group, locale, route, and different levels ownership and responsibility.

Recommendation 16   Disaggregation

The working group recommended that an appropriate level of disaggregation and granularity is required so that any reporting of future wider SM can be achieved at levels of group, local, route, ownership and responsibility levels.

5.2   Sustainability

One of the current tests ORR use to assess the effectiveness of asset policies is sustainability.

ORR's definition of sustainability is: If demand on the network were to remain steady, would application of the asset policy continue to deliver the outputs specified indefinitely? A sustainable asset policy is one which delivers (at least) the agreed outputs for the final year of the control period in the long term (to at least end of CP11) if demand on the system remains within the capacity limits of the current network and any enhancement schemes already committed to by industry. (This test is to ensure that, in managing within CP5 funding; Network Rail is making genuine efficiencies and is not deferring essential work at the cost of inefficiently higher expenditure in later control periods.)

The working group identified the following potential aspects of sustainability issues that could be incorporated into a future wider station measure:

- Energy Efficiency

- Carbon Reduction Commitments

- Economic Sustainability to Deliver

- Long term viability (i.e. Is the station sustainable in the longer-term)

Recommendation 17   Sustainability

The working group recommended that potential sustainability measures should be reviewed in the testing & trialling phase.

5.3   Customer Experience

Currently the SSM does not directly reflect customer experience though it was recognised that development in this direction is likely to come through Network Rail's alliance working or mandated as part of the DfT franchise process.

The working group identified the following potential aspects that could be evolved into a customer experience measure:

- Meeting Targets of Better Rail Stations

- Customer Satisfaction via NPS or TOC measure

- CIS/Way-finding

- CIS Accuracy/Frequency

- Passenger Environment or Ambiance

Recommendation 18   Customer Experience

The working group recommended that potential customer experience measures should be reviewed in the testing & trialling phase.

5.4   Funding & Investment

The following issues were grouped under investment for incorporation in a future wider station measure:

- Source of funding
- Local level Investment
- Targeting Policy
- Value of Doing Investments/Improvements
- Skew

Recommendation 19   Funding & Investment

The working group recommended that there should be clarity as to the source of funding for different maintenance & renewal interventions so that the future wider SSM will still work for the different funding scenarios. This should be assessed in the following testing & trialling stage.

5.5   Ownership & Responsibility

The working group identified the following ownership and responsibility issues should be incorporated in any future wider station measure:

- Responsibility for collecting data
- DfT Franchising
- Licensing based approach
- Mandate under licence agreement?

Recommendation 20   Ownership & Responsibility

The working group recommended that the future wider SSM measure needs to reflect the different contractual arrangements for the DfT's franchising programme as well as existing Network Rail & TOC licences.

5.6   Communicating understanding of a Wider Measure

The working group recognised that the SSM is a relatively obscure measure and that the name of any future wider measure has to give an indication of its function and definition of subject in clear plain English. The measure should explain the background to the numbers and manage expectations in relation to funding arrangements and value for money. When the wider measure comes it was foreseen that there will be a need to communicate the change nature & scope of the wider measure.

Recommendation 21   Communication of a Wider Measure

The working group recommends that when wider future station measure has been agreed, it should be appropriately communicated in plain English to all key stakeholders and other interested parties in with an interest in station stewardship.

6   Appendices

6.1   Terms of Reference Shaping SSM Review (Proposal 09.12.12)

Our proposed approach and scope of services for the 'shaping' phase of the development of SSM+ is as follows:

Approach

A phased approach to developing the SSM is proposed as follows:

- Phase 1 – Shaping
- Phase 2 – Methodology & Trial
- Phase 3 – Roll- Out

Our approach is to work collaboratively with all parties whilst providing independent and impartial advice and support to ORR in the development of SSM+.

We propose that a SSM+ working group (WG) is established from key representatives of the industry with an interest in the on-going performance of rail stations and the use of the SSM. Whilst the working group should be representative of the members of ATOC and the industry we believe that in order for the group to make progress it should be formed from a maximum of say 6 people other than ORR and Faithful+Gould.

We recognise that some of the TOCs will have confidential information and have their own commercially sensitive approaches to the SSM+. We confirm that we will maintain confidences and confidential information whenever requested.

We propose to collaboratively identify key areas for improvement that we will then independently work up and model improvements to the SSM for and on behalf of the working group.

Only two or three representatives from Faithful+Gould would attend each of the working group meetings which we will host. We suggest that the working group meetings should last 2/ 3 hours.

Initial Meetings & Review of SSM Information

ORR meeting

- Attend initial meeting with ORR to confirm scope, agree programme, deliverables and key drivers
- Establish names of selected interested parties from ATOC and Network Rail that are to form SSM+ working group

Review Available SSM Information

- Contact representatives of SMM+ working group
- Undertake an initial review of available information including findings from recent ORR consultation on output measures

Initial ½ day Workshop with SSM+ Working Group

- Host and facilitate an initial workshop with the SSM+ working group
- Facilitate presentation & discussion of possible SSM improvement areas

- Summarise outcomes of the initial working group workshop

Development of SMM+ and Subsequent Working Group Workshops

Review Improvement Areas

- Review improvement areas identified in initial workshop and prioritise areas for improvement

2nd ½ day Workshop with SSM+ Working Group

- Host and facilitate second workshop with the SSM+ working group
- Present the prioritised areas for improvement
- Establish and agree 3 areas for improvement
- Summarise outcomes of the 2nd working group workshop

Develop SSM+

- Define in detail the changes required to implement each of the 3 areas for improvement

3rd ½ day Workshop with SSM+ Working Group

- Host and facilitate third workshop with the SSM+ working group
- Present proposed methods and changes required to implement the 3 areas for improvement
- Summarise outcomes of the 3rd working group workshop

Develop SSM+

- Re-work methodologies for the 3 areas for improvement following WG workshop 3
- Provide detailed report to ORR for supporting SSM+ development during the Phase 2 - Methodology & Trial in financial year 2013/14

Deliverables

The two key deliverables during the 'shaping' phase are:

Outline Business Plan

- Provide outline business plan to ORR at end of December 2012 / beginning of January 2013 to support SSM+ development during the Phase 2 - Methodology & Trial in financial year 2013/14

Report

- Provide report to ORR in March 2013 detailing our approach, findings and proposed methods for developing SSM+

6.2 Matrix Mapping to Objectives

Matrix Mapping Objectives to Future Wider Station Measure(s)
22.03.13

No.	Themes	Issue	Over-arching Objectives							Implementation			
			1. Better reflect condition of station(s) & impact of investment	2. Create common approach to station outcomes	3. Support local incentive regimes between NR & TOCs	4. Support local devolution involving LAs	5. Supports greater devolution of accountability for outputs & costs to route directors	6. Helps customer understand meaning of measure & better reflects their experience at stations	7. Economically sustainable and meets the sustainable development objectives	Timing	Data Available	Data Source/Measure	How easy to deliver
	Enhancements	Title - What is the wider measure called						✓					
		What is its purpose	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓					
		Fit for Purpose	✓	✓									
		Add additional assets through common approach	✓							2	Y		
		Evolve SSM logic to include visual appearance (ambiance)	✓					✓					
		Data Standards	✓	✓						2	Y	but data will need to be reworked	
		Reporting outputs	✓		✓		✓			2 or 3		Consultation with DfT	
		Disaggregate at group and local level			✓	✓	✓			1, 2, 3			
		Explain what measures do						✓					
	Customer Experience	CIS/way-finding	✓					✓		2 or 3	N	May get from Customer satisfaction	
		CIS accuracy/frequency						✓		2	Y	Darwin	
		Customer satisfaction						✓		2	Y	NPS but only partially asked/answered currently	
		Passenger environment or ambiance						✓		2			
		Meeting targets of Better Rail Stations	✓	✓					✓				
	Sustainability	Energy							✓	2	Y	Bill payers	
		Carbon							✓	3 or 4	N		
		Economic sustainability to deliver							✓	2 or 3		Not currently pulled into measure	
		Robustness - longevity of station to perform							✓	2			
	Investment	Source of funding for improvements			✓		✓			2	Y		
		Local level investment		✓	✓	✓				2			
		Targeting policy	✓	✓						3	N	Consultation with DfT	
		Value of doing investments/improvements	✓							3			
		How do you take account of skew	✓							2			
	Ownership & Responsibility	Responsibility			✓	✓	✓	✓		2	Y		
		DfT Franchising			✓		✓						
		Licensing based approach Mandate under licence agreement			✓		✓						

✓ (box) Meets objective

WLC   Deemed to be wider issue that is outside the wider SSM improvements

6.3   Information Reviewed

Network Rail Asset Reporting Manual Reporting procedure for Station Stewardship Measure NR/ARM/M17PR dated 8th October 2010

Presentation on SSM to ATOC by Network Rail on 15th May 2012

Assessing the condition of our rail stations – is it improving and what's next? – Gesynto Consulting Ltd

ORR - Network Rail's Output Framework for 2014-19 – August 2012

Consultation of Network Rail's Output Framework for 2014-19

6.4   Working Group Presentations & Mind Maps

Faithful+Gould Shaping SSM+ for ORR – 23.01.13

SSM+ Shaping & Development - Consultation of Network Rail's Output Framework for 2014-19 Presentation – Faithful+Gould 23.01.13

ORR SSM Measure – Abellio View of Issues with SSM – 23.01.13

Improvements to OPAS and SSM Data Presentation – Network Rail 28.02.13

SSM and LMDSM CP5 Forecasts - Network Rail 28.02.13

Mind-map of SSM Improvements – Faithful+Gould 18.03.13

Adrian Wilkins

Adrian.wilkins@fgould.com

Faithful+Gould

Euston Tower

286 Euston Road

London

NW1 3AT

Telephone: +44(0)20 7121 2121

Fax: +44(0)20 7121 2020

CONSTRUCTIVE EXPERTISE

FGOULD.COM