Schedule - Amendments to the April 2025 Delay Attribution Principles and Rules

Key to "Exact details of the change proposed" field

- *Black Text in italics* is explanatory comment only which will not be incorporated within DAPR as part of any amendment.
- Text in standard black font represents pre-existing DAPR text (included for context)
- ~~Struck-through black text~~ represents pre-existing DAPR text that is to be removed as part of the Proposal for Change
- Red Text represents additional/amended text proposed within the original Proposal for Change, as submitted to industry for consultation.
- ~~Struck-through red text~~ represents text that was part of the original Proposal for Change submission but which the Board are have opted to exclude from the final proposal (again, this is shown for context only as such).
- Blue text represents additional/amended text to the proposal that have been made by the Board based on industry consultation feedback.

Note that, as and when proposed changes are approved, all revised text will be displayed in the document in red and all text to be removed will simply be deleted (i.e. use will not be made of blue font or strikethroughs within DAPR itself). Such formatting has been used in this document purely to highlight and track the changes that have been applied to proposals in consequence of the consultation and review process for ORR's benefit.

<table>
<tr><td>Originators Reference Code / No [For DAB input]</td><td>DAB P387</td></tr>
<tr><td>Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)/ point of contact</td><td>Delay Attribution Board

Contact Richard Ashley – Secretary

07720511912 – richard.ashley@networkrail.co.uk</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exact details of the change proposed</td><td>Add the following text at the beginning of Section S explaining the purpose of the section:

SECTION S: DELAY CODES

This Section provides a breakdown of all delay codes available for use in the TRUST system as at time of issue, listed by delay category type. A brief explanation of the cause they are intended to cover is provided alongside the abbreviated (up to 10-digit) description of the code as displayed within the TRUST system itself.

Note that the “Cause” descriptions are intended to provide a succinct and general overview of what each code is intended for but are not definitive statements on exactly what circumstances each code does and does not cover. Other sections of DAPR should be consulted for detail on specific code usage.

Also shorten the existing description of code JX as below

<table><tr><td>JX</td><td>Miscellaneous items on the track~~ or railhead, including litter, (not including leaves or the result of demonstrated vandalism, weather or fallen/thrown from trains)~~</td><td>MISC OBJCT</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Reason for the change</td><td>A number of the delay codes listed in Section S of DAPR (including but not limited to JX) contain guidance, caveats or other qualifying statements over usage. Whilst this is not “wrong” in itself, it is a deviation from the intended purpose of the Section, which is to provide a basic overview of live delay codes. It is emphatically not the purpose of Section S to stipulate correct/incorrect use of individual codes – other sections of DAPR exist to cover such principles.

In context of the above, a challenge recently arose over the description of code JX in Section S. Specifically, this implies that the code is not to be used in connection with leaves on the line, even although DAPR Section O2.2.s is explicit that this code is to be used for issues with points failing as a result of accumulated, compacted leaves obstructing the</td></tr>
</table>

	mechanism. The reference to JX "not including leaves" was intended to highlight that the code is not for use in relation to adhesion issues stemming from fallen leaves but, despite best intentions, the wording has proved more confusing than helpful. This instance has persuaded DAB that a clause is needed emphasising that Section S is not to be used for definitive guidance on code usage and is a quick-reference tool only. In that spirit, the current definition of JX has been subject to simplification on the basis that readers need to be referring to the relevant sections of DAPR for the actual principles of usage.

1. **Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?**

If yes;
For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.
For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

No

2. **If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.**

N/A

Industry Responses

Network Rail	A. **YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**
DAMG	A. **YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**

Secretary Note	N/A

Board Consultation	No comments had been forthcoming from the consultation, and with no further issues raised by members, the proposal was approved for referral to ORR as originally written.

<table>
<tr><td>Originators Reference Code / No [For DAB input]</td><td>DAB P388</td></tr>
<tr><td>Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)/ point of contact</td><td>Delay Attribution Board

Contact Richard Ashley – Secretary

07720511912 – richard.ashley@networkrail.co.uk</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exact details of the change proposed</td><td>Add wording to N4.1.c, as below, to clarify that this scenario does not relate to passengers who fall whilst in the process of boarding/alighting.
<table>
<tr><td>c</td><td>Illness or Non-malicious injury to passenger where there are no issues with passenger access to the platform and the only reason for delay is that the stricken person has encroached over/fallen off the platform edge or is deemed at risk of doing so (not including falls from a train doorway, which are covered by N.4.1.o).</td><td>XA</td><td>Network Rail (X##*)</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Reason for the change</td><td>New scenario N.4.1.o was added to DAPR wef April 2025 to emphasise that passengers falling from a train doorway onto a platform or track are 100% TOC responsibility issues.

As a consequence of this, however, some potential for confusing this scenario with the existing N4.1.c, which states that issues with a passenger falling from a platform onto the track (or being at risk of doing so) is NR responsibility, was identified.

It is felt this can easily be addressed by adding a minor caveat to N4.1.c, stating that it does not apply with falls from a train doorway in the station and adding a cross-reference to the relevant scenario N4.1.o.</td></tr>
</table>

3. Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?

If yes;
For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.

For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

No – clarification of existing principle only.

4. If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.

N/A

Industry Responses

Network Rail	**A. YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**
DAMG	**A. YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**

Secretary Note	N/A

Board Consultation	No comments had been forthcoming from the consultation, and with no further issues raised by members, the proposal was approved for referral to ORR as originally written.

Originators Reference Code / No [For DAB input]	**DAB P389**
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)/ point of contact	Delay Attribution Board Contact Richard Ashley – Secretary 07720511912 – richard.ashley@networkrail.co.uk
Exact details of the change proposed	*Fully rewrite DAPR Section B7.3 on reactionary delay as below:* **B7.3 Reactionary Delay** A Reactionary Delay is a delay to a train that has been impacted as an indirect result of an ~~i~~Incident, usually in consequence of late or diverted running due to an earlier event. B7.3.1 Upon attribution, reactionary delays are to be explained with a code in the Y* series. Each different Y-code – as listed in Section S - indicates the nature of the reaction that has occurred. The ID of the other train that was previously delayed or has interacted with the delayed train should be detailed as part of this. B7.3.2 It follows that TRUST Incidents cannot be created with a Y* Delay Code – since Y*-codes exist purely to explain the wider impact of an incident on individual trains. B7.3.3 Where a train is diverted from its scheduled line or platform and causes a delay, Reactionary Delay is allocated to the prime incident that caused the diversion, irrespective of the lateness of the diverted train. Any excessive delay incurred to the diverted train within the diversion should be investigated as a potential new prime incident. Where the diverted train is delayed by a new prime incident the further delay should be allocated to the new prime incident and not the reason for the diversion. B7.3.4 Trains in a queue (meaning that they are at a stand and unable to proceed due to the presence of an ongoing line blocking incident, including those behind at least one other train) are treated as a direct consequence of the blockage and are not treated as reactionary to the train in front. Further detail on the attribution of trains in a queue can be found in Process and Guidance Document PGD11 – “Queue of trains delay allocation”. B7.3.5 Reactionary delays (Y*) must not be used against P-coded incidents; a fresh incident must be created in accordance with Sections O18 and P2

B7.3.6 Readers wishing to learn more about reactionary delay codes are recommended to refer to Process and Guidance Document PGD03 – "Y-Code application". This provides a breakdown of every reactionary code in the Y-series along with scenarios and explanations of when each one should be used.

[Pre-existing Section replicated below for context/comparison purposes]

B7.3 Reactionary Delay

A Reactionary Delay is a delay to a train that is as a result of an incident that indirectly delays the train concerned, i.e the delay to that train is the result of a prior delay to the same or any other train. Reactionary Delay should be attributed to the Responsible Train utilising the relevant Y* Code.

B7.3.1 Section D5 provides an example of attribution of a series of delays occurring to a Plymouth to York train. In the example given, trains held behind the Plymouth to York train held approaching Derby should be attributed to the signal failure as a Primary Delay until the Plymouth to York train has passed the next Recording Point, from which point, normal Reactionary Delay rules apply. For further guidance on allocation of delays to trains in a queue please refer to Process Guide PGD11 – Queue of Trains Delay Allocation.

B7.3.2 All Delay Minutes and Reliability Events explained under paragraphs B5.3, B5.4, B5.5 or B5.7 can then be attributed to the 'prime' incident. This includes the Y* Reactionary Delays which describe Delay Minutes caused, normally away from the immediate vicinity of the incident, due to the consequential late running of one or more trains that have been delayed by it. The reporting number of the other train involved in the Reactionary Delay should be shown in the free format delay text field. Minutes Delay requiring explanation as per paragraph B5.4 can be allocated to an existing Incident if they are incurred in the vicinity of its occurrence (i.e. not a Reactionary Delay), once investigation has shown no other incident has occurred, in which case they pick up the same Delay Code as the Incident. Reactionary delays (Y*) must not be used against P-coded incidents;

	a fresh incident should be created in accordance with Sections O18 and P2 B7.3.3 It follows that TRUST Incidents must not have a Y* Delay Code. The analysis of Reactionary Delays in a particular area (irrespective of the Incident) allows identification of delays resulting from managerial procedures. On the other hand the full effect of particular Incidents (both prime cause and reactionary) can be measured by extraction of Incident information. B7.3.4 Where a train diverted from its scheduled line or platform causes a delay, Reactionary Delay is allocated to the prime incident that caused the diversion, irrespective of the lateness of the diverted train. Any excessive delay incurred to the diverted train within the diversion should be investigated as a potential new prime incident. Where the diverted train is delayed by a new prime incident the further delay should be allocated to the new prime incident and not the reason for the diversion. B7.3.5 Readers wishing to learn more about reactionary delay codes are recommended to refer to Process and Guidance Document PGD03 – "Y-Code application". This provides a breakdown of every reactionary code in the Y-series along with scenarios and explanations of when each one should be used.
Reason for the change	It is believed that DAPR Section B7.3 on reactionary delay would benefit from a refresh and simplification. Particularly, existing clause B7.3.1 on trains in a queue (which is intended to state that such delays are not classed as reactionary but are instead allocated as a direct consequence of the incident that is preventing trains from proceeding) has been flagged as misleading – specifically as it attempts to utilise a scenario in a subsequent Section of DAPR [Section D] to illustrate the point when a straightforward statement of the principle would suffice. However, in more general terms, the current section is felt to be unnecessarily lengthy and detailed. For example, the commentary on downstream analysis of reactionary delay in existing Section B7.3.3 adds no clarity on the attribution principles and rules associated with reactionary delays; and there is no obvious benefit in retaining it.

	It will be noted that a minority of the pre-existing wording has been retained for this revised entry (particularly within the new sub-clauses 7.3.3. and 7.3.6). Even this has been subject to reformatting/re-ordering, however, hence the proposal has been explained and presented as a full section rewrite.

5. Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?

If yes;
For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.
For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

No – Clarification only

6. If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.

N/A

Industry Responses

Network Rail	**A. YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**
DAMG	**B. YES, BUT AMENDMENT(S) TO THE PROPOSAL ARE RECOMMENDED** **B**7.3 should be **I**ncident, capital letter B7.3.1, references interacted train, however where the train is delayed due to late inwards, this isn't an interaction. [Instead of] *The ID of the other train that has interacted with the delayed train should be detailed as part of this* Use *The ID of the other train that was previously delayed or interacted with the delayed train should be detailed as part of this*

Secretary Note	Re: the recommendations made by DAMG, it is accepted that there is a mix of capitalised and non-capitalised references to "Incident/incident" in the proposal (although this is an issue with the pre-existing entry too). It would be helpful for members to clarify what they believe the correct naming convention to be to allow for consistency. The DAMG definition of an "interaction" is not consistent with my own, as I would have considered a late start caused by inward working to be a form of interaction (albeit obviously not "regulation" or "conflict") in attribution terms. That said, I see no reason not to adopt the suggested amendment to the wording on the other train involved in reactionary delay if members feel that it does not detract from the explanation of the principle.

Board Consultation	The Board agreed with the Secretary's comments on the recommended changes provided by DAMG i.e. • The one reference to the uncapitalised word "incident" should be amended to "Incident" for consistency. • The amended wording referencing the ID of other trains involved in a reactionary delay should be adopted aside from retention of the word "has", which was deleted from the DAMG wording [entry will read "*The ID of the other train that was previously delayed or has interacted with the delayed train should be detailed as part of this"]* The proposal was approved for submission to ORR subject to that application of these amendments.

Originators Reference Code / No [For DAB input]	**NR P239**
Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)/ point of contact	Network Rail Contact Alex Kenney – Head of Performance Measurement Systems 07767 672583 – alex.kenney@networkrail.co.uk
Exact details of the change proposed	*Replace the text of Paragraph B6.17.a, on the use of the "Network Rail Manager Code" for incidents relating to events at a known location, as below:* ~~A. Incident with a known location~~ ~~• A train is delayed or held on Route or management area 'A' due to an asset failure that has occurred at an identified location on Route or management area 'B'. The delay should be attributed to an incident with the Network Rail Manager code of Route or Area 'B'.~~ A. Incident with a known location • An incident occurs on Network Rail Management Area 'A'. Trains on Area 'B' are held back to limit congestion at the affected location. Delays/cancellations should be attributed to an incident with the Network Rail Manager code for Area 'A' – The incident has occurred specifically on that area even although the impact on trains is more widespread. (NB. See Scenario G below for an example of where an underlying infrastructure fault on one area directly affects asset functionality on another area)
Reason for the change	Misinterpretation of the above clause, and a perceived conflict with existing clause B.6.17.g in particular, has been highlighted within Network Rail. Specifically, the reference within B.6.17.a to an "asset failure" that has impacted the running of trains on other areas has been taken to mean that the clause relates to instances where an asset is compromised on one area as a direct consequence of an underlying infrastructure fault on another one. This is not the intention of this clause – it is simply intended to highlight that, when trains are held on one area to limit congestion in respect of an incident occurring on another one, the Network Rail Manager Code used should reflect where the

	incident has occurred and not where the trains happen to have been held back. The above is distinct from the scenario (covered by B.6.17.g) where the infrastructure on one area is actively compromised by an underlying fault on another area. As that clause states, the Network Rail Manager Code for such an incident should relate to the area where the fault was manifesting itself. The proposed new wording for B.6.17.a, including a cross-reference with B6.17.g to highlight that the two clauses cover distinctly different principles, should clarify this point.

7. Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?

If yes;
For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.
For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

No – Clarification of existing principles only.

8. If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.

N/A

Industry Responses

Network Rail	**A. YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**
DAMG	**A. YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**

Secretary Note	N/A

Board Consultation	No comments had been forthcoming from the consultation, and with no further issues raised by members, the proposal was approved for referral to ORR as originally written.

<table>
<tr><td>Originators Reference Code / No [For DAB input]</td><td>NR P241</td></tr>
<tr><td>Name of the original sponsoring organisation(s)/ point of contact</td><td>Network Rail

Contact Alex Kenney – Head of Performance Measurement Systems

07767 672583 – alex.kenney@networkrail.co.uk</td></tr>
<tr><td>Exact details of the change proposed</td><td>Amend entry O9.1.g on incidents relating to OHLE and Third Rail to exclude balloons and kites, as below.

<table>
<tr><td>g</td><td>Obstruction / tripping due to weather including items excluding balloons and kites blown onto the infrastructure (but not originating from the infrastructure)</td><td>XW</td><td>Network Rail (XQ**)</td></tr>
</table>

Add a new Scenario O9.1.h to cover the separate coding for such items:

<table>
<tr><td>h</td><td>Obstruction / tripping due to balloons or kites on the infrastructure</td><td>XO</td><td>Network Rail (XQ**)</td></tr>
</table>

Renumber existing clauses O9.1.h-l to become O9.1.i-m to accommodate the new entry.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Reason for the change</td><td>Network Rail believe that the existing entry O9.1.g is intended to relate to obstructions on the OHLE by items that are not normally considered as airborne and have only landed on the infrastructure as the result of significantly windy conditions (this with reference to the fact that the definition of code XW is “High winds affecting infrastructure the responsibility of Network Rail including objects on the line due to the effect of weather”).

Kites and, particularly, balloons, which can end up on the infrastructure due to a combination of human negligence and relatively light air currents, are not considered to fit naturally into this definition and have traditionally been allocated to code XO by Network Rail as a “miscellaneous object” impacting the infrastructure from an external source. However, it is acknowledged that this is not stated explicitly in DAPR at present.

It is appreciated that this is very much an internal Network Rail coding consideration, but the issue has elicited sufficient discussion and</td></tr>
</table>

	disagreement that formal confirmation of it in DAPR is felt to be necessary.

9. Do you perceive that this proposal will have a wider impact (including commercial impact) on your business or the business of any other industry parties?

If yes;
For Network Rail – Please provide an impact assessment indicating the impact of the proposal on all affected industry parties.
For Train Operator – Please provide an impact assessment on your own business.

No

10. If you have provided an impact assessment as per question 1 above, please provide a proposed solution to neutralise any financial effect of the proposal.

N/A

Industry Responses

Network Rail	**A. YES, PROPOSAL IS AGREED WITH AS WRITTEN.**
DAMG	**B. YES, BUT AMENDMENT(S) TO THE PROPOSAL ARE RECOMMENDED** Whilst noting the context provided in the PFC and that proposal does not change accountability, we do understand the necessity or value of this change, as it appears to represent a root cause, rather than prime cause when targeted specifically at Kites or balloons. What about other flying items such as Sky lanterns or remote control vehicles such as drones. Suggest rewording to G: Obstruction / tripping due to weather, including items blown onto the infrastructure (but not originating from the infrastructure) e.g. trampolines H: Obstruction / tripping due to items flown onto the infrastructure (but not originating from the infrastructure) e.g. balloons

Secretary Note	Seeing as this proposal is purely a matter of internal Network Rail-responsiblity allocation, it is probably primarily for the Network Rail members to decide whether to adopt DAMG's suggested amended wording (noting that this has only been offered as a suggested change). Only suggestion is that the DAMG wording in for scenario H relating to items that have "flown" onto the infrastructure could be deemed misleading. Believe it is intended to cover "naturally airborne items" but some could take it to include the likes of plastic bags.

Board Consultation	The Board took the view that the proposed wording suggested by DAMG could leave more scope from misinterpretation that it solved. Specifically, the wording did not include any defintion of the difference between an item that had been "blown" onto the infrastructure and one that had "flown" there. It was felt that a kite, by way of example, could be deemed to have done either or both of these things depending on interpretation. It was therefore agreed that the proposal should be referred for ORR approval as originally written.