

TTP2388

GB Railfreight and Network Rail

Second Directions Letter to both Parties

Terms used

“ADC” means The Access Disputes Committee

“GBRf” means GB Railfreight

“NR” means Network Rail

To enable the Panel to fully understand and deal fairly with the issues raised or likely to be raised by the Parties, can each party please address the following matters as addressed to each:

For NR

The Panel understands, from NR’s Directions response, that NR access planners manually checked train planning systems on 08 February 2024, and consulted NR’s Supply Chain Operations team, Charter Team and the passenger train operator SWR. Did NR access planners give consideration to contacting the ‘Day A for Day C’ Team? If not, why not?

NR did check the Train Planning Systems on 12th February to ensure there were not trains planned in the system (either in the WTT or planned at short notice).

As the system did not show any trains, the possession was decisioned, as the possession was deemed non disruptive and entered into PPS as such.

The route team did not directly contact the A for C team, as once TPS had been checked the possession was set to agreed and would have been seen in TPS (Train Planning System) and in the Possession Planning System – PPS.

GBRf state they sent the bid on 8th March 2024, the services bid were for week 52 (in the bid title) 25-29th March 2024. The actual bid dates were 18-22 March 2024 so 3.3.6 (g) would apply and its timescales.

As soon as EAP became aware that there was an aspiration to run trains, this was 15th February the EAP team, contacted the A for C team to inform them that we had a possession on this route.

On the 16th February NR A for C team advised GBRf they still required the SoC but also that there was a possession at the location.

7. Was GBRf’s bid received electronically by NR? If so, when was it uploaded into TPS? Was this before, or after, NR says it checked TPS?

Yes, the bid was received electronically on 8th February 2024 and uploaded into TPS on 9th February 2024. Correspondence then followed between NR and GBRf that the bid would not be processed (made live in TPS) as there wasn’t a valid SoC.

8. Can NR please confirm: the Panel understands that NR Appendix Q2 is how NR would have applied the Decision Criteria had it been aware of GBRf's aspirations for the test trains at the time of making the access decision. Is this understanding correct

Appendix Q2 is an amendment of the original decision criteria once Network Rail Planning team were aware of the aspirations of GBRf to run services, it was then amended again, once GBRf advised their updated aspirational services had changed to 2 x days and 4 x services.

Network Rail Wessex route have taken on board advice from previous TTP's and training with regards to reviewing their Decision Criteria when new information is provided.

The Panel's current understanding of the SoC and TOVR (Network Code Condition D3.3) processes is that a SoC needs to be in place in order for that train to be classed as Specified Equipment with permission to operate under the relevant Track Access Contract, but not necessarily in place for a TOVR to be processed by NR. Does this match your company's understanding? If not, please point to any authority requiring an SoC to be in place before a TOVR can be actioned.

NR would not process a TOVR without an accurate SoC in place to cover the traffic being bid for and to be offered back. The SoC is still outstanding.

The Network Code objective 4.6.1 is the 'safe running of passengers and goods...' in TTP2318/2320 there was observations and guidance provided that "all timetable planning (is) governed by the Objective..."

Planners need to ensure that rolling stock will fit, so an SoC would be a critical document along with the standard checks of SRTS in TPS for the Train Model. In this case the planners could not ensure that the rolling stock would fit (safe to run) as the SoC had not been provided.