

## DRAFT Elizabeth Line Delivery Group – Outcomes

Thursday 16 September 2021

**Members:** Andy Byford, TfL Commissioner (Chair) (AB); Mark Wild, Chief Executive, Crossrail, TfL (MW); Andy Lord, Managing Director, London Underground (AL); Tricia Wright, Chief People Officer, TfL (TW); Simon Kilonback, Chief Finance Officer, TfL (SK), Howard Smith, Chief Operations Officer, Elizabeth Line (HS), Rachel McLean, Chief Finance Officer, Crossrail (RM)

**Attendees:** Andy Pitt, Independent Expert Support (AP), Carole Bardell-Wise, Health and Safety Director, Crossrail (CBW), Rob Carr, Director, Transition & Readiness, Crossrail (RC), ██████████, Project Representative, Jacobs (SH), Nigel Holness, Managing Director, MTR Crossrail (NH), Tim Ball, Director, Elizabeth Line, Network Rail (TB) Nicola Cox, Head of Corporate Finance, TfL (NC), Justine Curry, Head of Commercial Law, TfL (JC), Nduka Ezediuno, Chief of Staff to CEO Crossrail NE, Stephen Hawkes, Senior Assurance Manager, TfL (SH), Lorraine Humphrey, Director of Risk and Assurance, TfL (LH), Dharmina Shah, Corporate Affairs Lead, TfL (DS), Keith Sibley, Crossrail Mobilisation and Improvement Director (KS), Stuart Westgate Head of Crossrail Programme Assurance, TfL (SW), Vicky Morley, Elizabeth Line Strategic Comms Lead, TfL (VM), Laurie Jacobs, Corporate Affairs Manager, TfL (LJ)

**Observers:** ██████████, KPMG, ██████████, KPMG

**Apologies:** Jim Crawford, Chief Programme Officer, Crossrail, TfL, Richard Schofield, Infrastructure Director, RfLI, Howard Carter, General Counsel, TfL, Phil Gaffney, Independent Expert Support, Alex Batey, Director, Investment Delivery Planning, TfL

Item	Action	Owner	Due by
1 – Apologies, approval of previous minutes and actions	<p>Two observers from KPMG were introduced, attending to support work towards the Crossrail quarterly cost review.</p> <p>The minutes from the previous meeting were approved with no objections and the apologies were noted. The actions from the previous meeting were agreed to be covered off by the subsequent agenda.</p>		
2 – Crossrail programme progress	<p>HEALTH AND SAFETY</p> <p>Noted encouraging position on safety and harm, with P5 being a green period with 0 significant incidents reported – there has not been a significant injury reported for five consecutive periods. However, recent performance in P6 has seen two injuries resulting in lost time and a high potential near miss at Bond Street.</p>		

Major focus on safety issues surrounding demobilisation of sites, with 'Stepping Up Week' – a week with a H&S focus – due to begin 27 September. Will be a specific focus in the week on how to demobilise safely. AB agreed that need to demobilise is clear but it must be done in a safe manner, and changing physical environment needs to be closely managed.

PROGRAMME UPDATE

- Noted programme update, including adoption of DCS1.2, which incorporates J7 Staging Access plan for Trial Running and refreshed Stage 5 commissioning programme.
- Confirmed deterministic/p50/p80 dates support opening of line in first half of 2022. Slight improvement in p50 and p80 dates, in particular on Trial Ops, emerging from mitigation to enable assurance risk and the CESAC to be split for entry into and exit from Trial Ops.
- Confirmed Abbey Wood on target for 30 September with Canary Wharf on target for [REDACTED].
- One failed TVS test at Canary Wharf, working up plans to mitigate and will provide options at meeting on 28 Sep.
- Overall good progress on schedule and then aligning that schedule with costs.
- Risks – top risk to programme is safety assurance volume, mitigation review conducted by Colin Brown and presented to PSSG. Main operations risk around service reliability.

DISCUSSION:

AB asked why the model assumes that any delay to TO beyond Nov [REDACTED] automatically pushes back P50 + P80 to a far greater degree. MW responded that the p50 and p80 are a balanced machine view, and not binary, but are a basket of risks that consider number of factors and have been accurate so far.

SK asked the extent to which the p50 and p80 dates adequately reflected the number of red risks currently on the programme. MW responded that the amount of red risks was to be expected with project of this size/complexity and are narrowed down to the most challenging issues. Risks also have generally been stable and the programme is not

	<p>encountering unexpected new risks as had previously been the case. AP agreed and confirmed difference to previous years is that granularity and detail of risks much higher, and joint working across teams much improved.</p> <p>SW gave view from Assurance that the deterministic dates are unlikely to be achieved given amount of complex items still to be completed before ■ November, and that the p80 date does not fully encompass all of the complex works and risks – but acknowledged the assurance work being done to pull those together.</p> <p>MW and RC brought proposed schedule baseline changes for approval, reflecting the CTG workshop activity and the revised targets for the Tier 1’s demobilisation and contract completion dates. <b>These dates were approved.</b></p>		
<p>3 – Elizabeth line operational and IM readiness</p>	<p>Noted the updated PSSG dashboards, including focus on red items of assuring the Routeway, general assurance, with good work underway but with tight timelines, and reliability growth, which will be red until confirmation by Reliability Board. Confirmed mitigations for those items. Noted the success of the evacuation exercise this week.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AL asked if it was clearly defined what minimum cumulative mileage and minimum accepted reliability was in place. KS responded that there is not a specific red line. HS added that there is a basket of measures, including mileage and punctuality, and there is a trajectory for those that leads to where we need to be for passenger service. NH added that this was an area of great caution, and there was a huge dependency on other items such as ELR100 and reliability growth on the trains that will need to be confirmed before revenue service begins.</li> </ul> <p>Noted update on maintenance readiness, with focus on asset data – good progress but work still to be done, and on operational readiness.</p> <p>It was agreed to not table the Organisation Design paper at the meeting, and to be brought back at future ELDG when necessary offline discussions have taken place, though the work necessary would not be held up by this. <b>Action: internal discussions on org design to take</b></p>		

	place before next ELDG and paper to be brought back at a future ELDG.	HS, RM	14 October
4 – TfL Rail current operations	<p>Noted update on performance, including p5 performance improving to 95.6%, the second best in the industry behind MerseyRail. Key reliability issues noted as train control software. AB and HS agreed to keep pressure on Alstom wherever possible. Also noted update on trial running, with weekly figures showing a noticeable rise, with plan that allows us to get the most out of software in place – software updates principally being looked as the methods to drive performance. Ilford and Romford stations due in February. Also confirmed good progress with Abbey Wood ahead of 30 September, and good progress on timetable bids for later phases.</p>		
5 - Finance and budget	<p>Noted update on P5, which followed well established trend of spend decreasing, and a good month in terms of actual spend compared with milestones and work delivered. Banked a net ██████ in the AFCDC as a result of delivering Cost To Go opportunities, and have identified a further ██████ at p50 and a further ██████ of potential reduction to the scope gap provision, which could be key to hitting the £825m. Very little increase in recommended AFCDC vs p4, which is very encouraging.</p> <p>New weekly meeting set up on ██████ scope with TfL/RFLI/Crossrail representatives, AL attending the next session. Focus this week on streamlining process of ██████ scope and getting escalation from teams on anything that is stuck.</p> <p>AB added that whilst the trend suggests costs will be more than £825m, in parallel there is work happening to stay as close to the £825m value, and to be clear the need for additional funding has yet to be determined.</p>		

	<p>P&amp;PA PAPER</p> <p>The P&amp;PA paper was introduced, which is seeking draw down P&amp;PA to cover additional requirements for indirect costs to secure resources to the DCS I.2 end dates.</p> <p>SK asked why it was such a high figure for indirect costs, and if there was any restocking of risks as part of this request. RM responded that Indirect costs are still around ██████ a period, and that this is all to fund contract extensions of consultants and Team Crossrail, with no restocking of risk.</p> <p>MW explained the criticality approval of the paper – lots of colleagues within Crossrail are in London on short term tenancies, and there have been a number of colleagues within the past 6 or 7 weeks who have taken jobs elsewhere, in particular with HS2, given more security/certainty. Extending contracts to the deterministic date needs to be done ASAP.</p> <p><b>The P&amp;PA paper was approved.</b></p>		
6 – Assurance	<p>Noted update of Assurance view – including view that deterministic date for commencement of Trial Operations not realistically achievable, with associate knock on for revenue service, and concern around p80 date moving beyond June. Also highlighted concern that pursuit to hit deterministic date results in a revenue service that is not up to a minimum standard of service that is required, and that if systems were not fully mature that can result in unforeseen problems.</p> <p>Also highlighted challenges around delivering below £825m target, as well as specific challenges with organisation transition as CRL team reduces in number, and difficulties in ██████ ██████ with still a significant amount of work left to complete on the project.</p> <p>RM responded that work was underway to ██████ scope through existing delivery vehicles within TfL and RFLI at pace. AL added that there was no expectation that RFLI would have its own dedicated procurement support, resource would need to be provided within TfL.</p> <p>AB thanked ██████ + SW for their assurance work, while noting that he had a more positive view on likely adherence to schedule.</p>		

7 – Communications	<p>Noted update on comms activities including the Whitechapel handover activity, and work with NR comms around Southall, Hayes and Harlington stations. Also highlighted ongoing work with marketing and design teams around what can be done with maps, given success with NLE project.</p> <p>Focus on potential opportunities with advertising – have fantastic digital assets as part of the Line, activity to begin promoting these assets and engaging with advertisers through Global to begin now. AB agreed that opportunities need to be lined up imminently and stated the need to balance requirement to allow potential customers to see the assets that they will be advertising on without interfering with operations and maintenance.</p>		
8 – ELC agenda	Nothing to note on ELC agenda.		
8 – AOB	AB invited KPMG observers to ask any questions or clarifications. None were required.		