Delay Attribution Board Process and Guidance Document 9
Delay Allocation Managing Freight Services during Disruption (MFSdD)

To provide guidance and improve consistency in attribution, below are examples delay scenarios where misapplication or misinterpretation can occur, for both reference and briefing purposes. The examples are set out to demonstrate the principles of the application of Managing Freight Services during disruption, but as can be appreciated, not every variation can be shown and thus is not an exhaustive list of absolutes. These principles apply where the initiation of MFSdD has been agreed by the parties.

Scenario 1

4A01 is delayed 120’ by a signal failure. It arrives at destination 100’ late, at 1040 vice 0900. Its back working 6B02 is rescheduled under MFSdD from 1100 to 1200. 6B02 departs at 1200 and runs exactly on time in its new path to destination. The attributed delay to 6B02 is:

- Nil, as 6B02 is on time against its revised schedule

Scenario 2

4A01 is delayed 120’ by a signal failure. It arrives at destination 100’ late, at 1040 vice 0900. Its back working 6B02 is rescheduled under MFSdD from 1100 to 1200. 6B02 departs at 1210 and runs 10’ late in its new path to destination (10’ late start but no further delay). The attributed delay to 6B02 is:

- 10’ to FOC late start against its revised schedule as agreed retiming

Scenario 3

4A01 is delayed 120’ by a signal failure. It arrives at destination 100’ late, at 1040 vice 0900. Its back working 6B02 is rescheduled from 1100 to 1200. 6B02 departs at 1200 but suffers a 4 minute delay en-route, with no identifiable cause. It suffers no further delay and causes no delay to any other trains.
This additional 4’ delay to 6B02 is:

- 4’ to PN (being a delay of under 5’ to a VSTP train.)
Scenario 4

4A01 is delayed 120’ by a signal failure. It arrives at destination 100’ late, at 1040 vice 0900. Its back working 6B02 is rescheduled from 1100 to 1200. 6B02 departs at 1150 and runs 10’ early in its new path to destination, so suffers no delay. The attributed delay to 6B02 is:

- Nil

Scenario 5

4A01 is delayed 120’ by a signal failure. It arrives at destination 100’ late, at 1040 vice 0900. Its back working 6B02 is due away at 1100 but not rescheduled (by agreement) as it has layover time en-route and is still expected to achieve FDM. 6B02 departs at 1150. The 50’ late start delay to 6B02 is:

- 50’ to the original incident

Scenario 6

6B02 (that was rescheduled above due to a signal failure) should normally arrive at its destination at 1400. Its new schedule is shown to arrive at 1500. Its next working is 4C03, departing at 1600. NR do not reschedule 4C03, which departs 60’ late at 1700. The attributed delay to 4C03 is:

- To OD (Route Control of where signal failure occurred) for not rescheduling (or requesting rescheduling of) the return working

4C03 (above) running 60’ late then delays 1B45 by 5’ (which was on time). The attributed delay to 1B45 is:

- To the OD incident

Scenario 7

6B02 (rescheduled in example 1 above) is running exactly in its new MFSdD applied schedule but is then delayed 20’ by a loco fault, and is later regulated by 10’ due to loss of path. It also then causes a 5’ regulation delay to 2F76. The reactionary delay to 6B02 is:

- To the loco failure, being the only cause of delay to the revised 6B02.
Scenario 8

4G05 is delayed by a signal failure and arrives at destination 100’ late at 1240 vice 1100. Its back working, 6H06 at 1300, is retimed to 1430. It is actually turned round quicker than anticipated and departs at 1400, but then stands for 20 minutes on the network due to a broken rail, arriving at its destination on time to its new schedule. The delay to 6H06 caused by the broken rail is:

- Nil, as it simply reverts to ‘time’

If the ‘delay’ to 6H06 was 40 minutes due to the broken rail, the 10’ recorded delay (i.e. 30 mins delay took it back to right time) would be attributed to the broken rail.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Scenario 9

4G05 is delayed by a signal failure and arrives destination 100’ late at 1240 vice 1100. Its back working, 6H06 at 1300, is retimed to 1430. This departs at 1430, but in doing so causes 6J07, the 1435 departure from that same terminal but of another operator, to depart 10’ late at 1445. The delay to 6J07 is:

- A new late start attributed to its own FOC (if off Network Rail network)
- A schedule clash if in a network yard

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Scenario 10

6H06 (in example 8 above) departs at 1430, and remains on time to its new schedule which is 90’ later than the base schedule. But it is then regulated for 30’ late running passenger train 1S45 (which had earlier been delayed by its own unit fault) and 6H06 suffers a 10’ delay as a result. The new 10’ delay to 6H06 is:

- 10’ to the 1S45 fleet incident, being the largest single cause of the delay to 1S45 (6H06 being so far on time on its new schedule).
Scenario 11

6H06 (in example 8 above) departs at 1430, and remains on time to its new schedule. En-route there is booked driver relief and the driver off 6H06 then works 6S94 (another freight train of the same FOC but unrelated to any NR incidents and running on time in a normal schedule). 6S94 is thus delayed 60’ waiting this driver. The delay to 6S94 is:

- 60’ to a new FE incident attributed to the FOC, for waiting driver

6S94 then causes 10’ regulation delay to passenger train 2T12 (which was so far on time). The delay to 2T12 is:

- 10’ to the FE incident, being the cause of 6S94 late running.

Scenario 12

An emergency possession requires 4K09, the 2200 departure, to depart at 2100 to beat the possession. It is rescheduled to 2100, with the destination time becoming 0300 vice 0400. It departs at 2100, but the destination terminal cannot accept it until 0330, so it stands in a loop for 30’, arriving destination at 0330. The 30’ delay to 4K09 is

- 30’ coded AA to the FOC, awaiting acceptance into a freight terminal.

Scenario 13

In scenario 12 above, while 4K09 is slowing down for its entry into the loop (which is unplanned) it delays the following train, 2L68 (which was so far on time) by 3 minutes. The delay to 2L68 is:

- 3’ YB to the AA FOC incident.
Summary

Where a freight train is retimed under MFSdD then all attribution should be made against that revised schedule as the agreed ‘plan’ for that train.

Where a return working (of a previous MFSdD amended train) is not retimed (not agreed) then the responsibility should sit with the instigating Route of the inward MFSdD train schedule

Where a return working is not retimed by agreement of both parties then:-

- Expected late start should go to the original causal incident
- Additional late start delay should go the Operator of the train
- Related crew workings should be the responsibility of the FOC (e.g. crew relief)

For the associated operational procedures reference should be made to the National Control Instructions – Section 9.1 ‘Managing Freight Services during Disruption’
APPENDIX 1

FLOW DIAGRAM OF ATTRIBUTION PRINCIPLES

Delay to train in relation to MFSdD ‘plan’

- Is train incurring delay retimed under MFSdD?
  - Yes
  - Is Schedule correct (i.e. no errors)?
    - Yes
    - Delay incurred attributed to cause of that delay (as prime or reactionary) NOT the original MFSdD incident
    - No
    - VSTP error (QN)
  - No
    - Is the train incurring delay a subsequent stock working of an MFSdD altered working?
      - Yes
      - Was it agreed not to retime the train schedule?
        - Yes
        - Late start delay to Route Control that initiated MFSdD and retimed inward
        - No
        - Delay incurred to initial causal incident (why MFSdD implemented)
      - No
      - Standard attribution rules apply

Delay relating to crew workings / relief per normal attribution rules

Trains retimed (robustly) under MFSdD should be treated as the ‘applicable’ schedule for delay attribution (i.e. the retiming has mitigated the initial incident)

DAG References:
Sections 4.7.1 and 4.7.2
4.9.1.2 to 4.9.1.4 & 4.9.1.7
4.9.2.4 / 4.9.2.5 / 4.9.2.6

For further information on any of the Process Guide Documents or to provide feedback to aid improvements or suggestion for the development of others please contact the DAB Secretary at: DABOffice@networkrail.co.uk