

Elizabeth Line Delivery Group – Outcomes

Thursday 27 May 2021

Members: Andy Byford, TfL Commissioner (Chair) (AB), Mark Wild, Chief Executive, Crossrail, TfL (MW), Andy Lord, Managing Director, London Underground, TfL (AL), Rachel McLean, Chief Finance Officer, Crossrail, TfL (RM)

Attendees: Keith Sibley, Crossrail Mobilisation and Improvement Director (KS), Andy Pitt, Independent Expert Support (AP), Phil Gaffney, Independent Expert Support (PG), Carole Bardell-Wise, Health and Safety Director, Crossrail, TfL (CBW), Jim Crawford, Crossrail Programme Director, Crossrail, TfL (JC), Howard Smith, Chief Operations Officer, Elizabeth Line, TfL (HS), Stuart Westgate, Head of Crossrail Programme Assurance, TfL (SW), Nick Garland, Sponsor, TfL (NG), Dharmina Shah, Corporate Affairs Lead, TfL (secretariat) (DS), Nigel Holness, Managing Director, MTR Crossrail (NH), Howard Carter, General Counsel, TfL (HC), [REDACTED], Project Representative, Jacobs ([REDACTED])

Apologies: Tricia Wright, Chief People Officer, TfL (TW), Tim Ball, Director of Elizabeth Line, Network Rail (TB)

Item	Action	Owner	Due by
1 – Apologies, approval of previous minutes and actions	Members agreed minutes from previous ELDG on 29 April.	n/a	n/a
2 – Crossrail programme progress	<p>SAFETY</p> <p>CBW updated on incidents mentioned in the PI report. Two incidents in TVS at Whitechapel and Bond Street – programme-wide safe-pause on works at TVS areas. Discovered route cause of issues so are able to identify and undertake the necessary actions (procedural requirements and access planning). Action: CBW to circulate corrective action plans for visibility.</p> <p>Chair thanked Nigel Holness for the quality of his report given the tight timescales for return and the priority to resolve issues.</p> <p>Chair highlighted the pressing need to get safe access to rooms.</p>	CBW	4/6/21

Item	Action	Owner	Due by
	<p>PROGRAMME</p> <p>Key milestones were met to the [REDACTED], apart from start of Trial Running. JC explained the planning for blockades in June and August.</p> <p>JC highlighted the four areas of pressure in programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELR100: Siemens has hit short term recovery milestone. Meeting on 8 June will determine if blockade remains as per existing dates. • TVS is approx. two weeks delayed (mainly physical works), largely down to access issues. • Canary Wharf is approx. 6-8 weeks late, Bond St [REDACTED] is c. 4 weeks late. [REDACTED] likely completion date for meeting those milestones (2-4 weeks of schedule pressure). • No contingency on STT, need to build in 20 shifts of STT. Will have to decide if [REDACTED] target date is tenable. <p>JC noted that these four items plus less mileage at 12tph means [REDACTED] is under lot of stress. [REDACTED]</p> <p>Chair reiterated his overriding philosophy that although aiming to meet a number of target dates across the programme/schedule, this will not mean compromising safety or reliability.</p> <p>There was a discussion about what mitigation can be achieved by compressing Trial Operations, and by doing this concurrently with Trial Running. Chair reiterated that this was not a direction, instead he would like to see the benefits and challenges from this option.</p> <p>Mindful of the potential delay ahead of Trial Operations, members discussed the merits of a scenario B (as part of DCS 1.2 development) and contingency scenarios, that enable completion of construction work scheduled for second blockade and alternatives for system testing. It was mooted that reaching 12tph sooner would enable more time to stress test the system, and that stress testing is necessary before entering Trial Operations phase.</p>		

Item	Action	Owner	Due by
	<p>AL highlighted the need to give MTR certainty to help driver rosters and training. NH agreed that if the proposed blockade needed to change to w/c 15 June, this would give MTR enough time.</p> <p>Referring to the programme risk summary, SK asked how the [REDACTED] could be impacted by a potentially changing DCSI.2, and how might risks be affected. JC advised that the Exec has a more mature understanding of the risks and this enables the updated schedule to have greater certainty. Agreement to ensure undue optimism is not incorporated into the programme.</p> <p>SK reminded of the need to show how risks are being managed with maturity given potential for increased external scrutiny, now and in the future. [REDACTED]</p> <p>Members agreed for an update on Scope and Schedule to be provided for the June ELDG and Cost and Assurance at the July ELDG.</p>	JC	24/6
3 – Elizabeth line operational and IM readiness	<p>Maintenance readiness – a clear learning from Trial Running is the reminder of how constrained we are in the ability to scale up (technical and rules-based limitations). Need to focus on ability to drag additional resource in to deal with spikes of activity.</p> <p>KS outlined the PSSG slides and the RAG status of each workstream.</p> <p>Members debated the cut off point for [REDACTED]; HS indicated a minimum gap of [REDACTED] is required. NH updated that a workshop is scheduled next week on this topic.</p> <p>Action: Identify steering group and Chair to ensure stage 4 + 5 timetabling is achieved as planned. Agreed to be jointly set up by MTR and HS, with MTR in lead.</p>	24/6	NH, HS

Item	Action	Owner	Due by
4 – TfL Rail current operations	<p>Noted the updates on train service reliability, rolling stock and software, and statistical analysis of Trial Running which can be applied to other systems.</p> <p>Chair noted significant achievement with opening Ealing station on 27 June.</p>	n/a	n/a
5 – Finance and budget (slides 37 – 41)	<p>RM recounted the project’s funding status and explained that there are cost implications for DCS1.2 due to loss of time and production. Team is still evaluating scope items and their impact. The intention is to also validate cost estimates against those held by the supply chain, which will require some time.</p> <p>AFCDC position held as work is on-going.</p> <p>RM noted the NAO report is intended to be published on [REDACTED]. The draft report highlights that there remains work to do and uncertainty in programme.</p>	n/a	n/a
6 – Crossrail assurance reporting	<p>SW highlighted preoccupation with short term issues recently – e.g. ROGS, maintenance – and that this is likely to cause drift of the start of Trial Operations and potentially delay the start of revenue services.</p> <p>Confident that station handovers will happen at [REDACTED]. Chief Engineers group feel they can meet assurance targets. It is a risk that the team is unsure of stations’ readiness for Trial Operations.</p> <p>[REDACTED] (PRep) explained their areas of concern: loss productivity, complexities of new rule book, and insufficient control of safe access - which remains the greatest threat to deliverability and cost management.</p> <p>Chair agreed that Access issues must be fixed and the Executive needs to be look more strategically.</p>	n/a	n/a

Item	Action	Owner	Due by
	<p>Members discussed how to make assurance efforts purposeful, proportionate and target efforts where they are most needed (following the discussion at ELC on 20/5/21).</p> <p>HC: Need to ensure consistency between Lorraine Humphries' and SW's work, with RM. RM: Resolution of this underway.</p>	n/a	n/a
7 – Elizabeth Line Committee agenda	Noted the draft agenda.	n/a	n/a
8 – AOB including Forward Look	Members noted the Forward Look.	n/a	n/a