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10 May 2013

**Freightliner Group Limited**

3rd Floor, The Podium

1 Eversholt Street

LONDON

NW1 2FL

Tel: [redacted]

Dear Tony,

**Re Timetable Planning Rules, Disputes TTP371/513/514/570/571**

With reference to the Hearing Chair’s letter of 17 April 2013, this letter constitutes the requested sole reference document from Freightliner Group Limited [‘Freightliner’] (representing Freightliner Limited and Freightliner Heavy Haul Limited).

The correspondence regarding each item from Freightliner’s TPR response documents and NR’s replies are shown below each item.

We are continuing to work with Network Rail to avoid a dispute hearing; should any items listed below be resolved either before the directions hearing or the Timetable Panel hearing, I will of course advise as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely

Jason Bird

Track Access Manager

Freightliner Limited

**Preface**

**Link to Part D of the Network Code**

In general, the majority of items under dispute here relates to circumstances where change has been proposed, but in Freightliner's view, the supporting evidence for the need for change has been lacking or non-existent. Additionally, it has not been demonstrated by NR how revised TOR values have been deduced.

There is, however, the issue of admissibility - a thorough inspection of the Network Code and the national section of TPRs indicates that most, if not all, of the proposals should not have been included in TPRs at the time they were. Some of the older entries came under the previous version of Part D, but the general principles pertaining to them are no different.

To summarise the process inferred by Part D, NR should firstly consult with affected parties its proposals for change in advance of Version 1 of TPRs [the “Draft Rules”](D2.2.2). Following such consultation, Version 1 should only contain those previously-consulted items that NR wishes to pursue. Following affected parties' responses, Version 2 [the “Final Rules”] should only contain changes made in reaction to responses received and further representations made regarding them. (D2.2.5) Neither Version should contain any "surprises".

In reality, NR and, to be honest, the rest of the industry (including Freightliner) are not following that process. Practically, there is little, if any, consultation prior to Version 1, or between Versions 1 and 2. Typically, items are sent to affected parties at random times throughout the year for discussion (generally using a 10-day response period, aping the process in National TPRs (Section 3, pursuant to Part D3.4.3)), although this is not done consistently; often changes are only "consulted" by issue of the next available version of TPRs.

While this may facilitate a more even spread of workload and change through the course of the year, rather than having a concentration of consultation in the autumn, it is nevertheless not consistent with Part D. Freightliner is not specifically challenging past change proposals (outside the Part D process) on the basis that they be deemed technically inadmissible, but that that is the case should be drawn to the attention of the panel.

**Network Change**

There are two items (items 17 and 21) that relate to an associated Network Change. Freightliner's dispute is based solely in the fact that the proposed changes result only because of that Network Change, and are not necessitated for any other reason. As the Network Change has yet to be agreed, Freightliner considers it premature to include in TPRs instructions relating to it. The panel is therefore asked to rule that changes pertaining to a Network Change should not be included in TPRs until that Network Change has been established (as defined by Part G10), or, are at least unenforceable until establishment and that fact should be referenced against the TPR entry.

**Headways and junction margins**

Further items relate to headways and junction margins. It would appear that there is no defined way of calculating either: various methods are currently in operation, e.g. Railsys model, personal observation, opinion of signallers or other NR Route personnel, etc.. Freightliner considers that the calculation of headways and margins should at least be consistent, with a theoretical calculation being performed followed by real-time observation to back up the initial findings. While some of the methods employed in response to some of the issues raised here, e.g. use of Railsys, imply some technological application, that has not been accompanied by any explanation of what was measured, where or when.

Headways or margins cannot be set to any definitive value unless all interacting trains have the same performance characteristics; indeed the values shown in TPRs are cited as *minimum* values (our italics), which one would presume reflects the minimum margin between two consecutive non-stop trains of the best capability. To that extent, the quoted minimum should be a plain statement of fact resulting from the minimum separation plus a reasonable performance margin to allow for minor variations in train performance. If there is a requirement for a greater performance margin, that much should at least be understood and accepted by all those affected. In the cases shown below, Freightliner believes none of these processes have been applied and the proposed values are merely subjective evaluations based on little in the way of evidence.

While it is appropriate to have more than one headway value for a section of line to represent the different types of train that may interact with one another, or differing stopping patterns that result in a material difference, this is rarely the case other than on former Southern Region lines. As a result, best use of scarce capacity is not being made. Lowest common denominator headways can also result in sub-optimal timetables and not making efficient use of operator’s resources.

One item (item 8) refers to a combination of sectional running time (SRT) adjustments, junction margins and capacity. While Freightliner still believes NR has not adequately demonstrated the need for longer SRTs or junction margins, let alone how it has arrived at revised values, the issue of available capacity is also at stake. While it might prove necessary to increase the SRTs and margins, that might only be done at the expense of available capacity. Whilst performance is important, we do not believe to be the overriding consideration; a better understanding is required of the trade-off between ensuring the timetable performs adequately and the number of trains that need to be accommodated. While Freightliner’s Firm Contractual Rights have been satisfied, there has been no demonstration of the effect on capacity, nor how much is left for future growth before enhancements need to be planned.

**Item 1**

**East Anglia Section 5.2 Headways**

EA1310 Camden Road West Jn to Richmond

Relates to TTP513/514. The headways shown for the above section of line were revised to take into account the recent resignalling scheme. This actually resulted in some headways increasing, despite a considerable increase in the number of signals provided. A request was made to NR to substantiate the revised proposals; to date a spreadsheet has been provided showing some Railsys output, but no detail of how the figures shown had been calculated. Since 2012 v1.0, the headway figures have been changed, but still without and supporting detail.

Freightliner seeks to be provided with supporting evidence to show what headways are achievable, how they have been derived and the level of performance buffer that has been applied, in order that a mutually agreeable solution can be found.

**TPR response correspondence**

Freightliner will not accept increased headway values on his section (passenger or freight values). This was a condition of acceptance of the Network Change for the resignalling of this area.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.1, 2012 Timetable Version 1.0 response 26/11/10)*

**NR response 22/12/10:** “The headways which have been published in Version 1 of the 2012 Principal Timetable Planning Rules were taken from the Compendium which was last reissued on 09.02.10. The headway values would have been discussed at the North London Line Timetable Planning Group Meetings and your representative would have been Simon Barrett. The values which appear in the Compendium are being checked by the Project Developer Chris Grimes.”

The original point is restated: Freightliner will not accept increased headways. Attendance of Freightliner representatives at the NLL meetings did not involve agreement of amended headways. Another increase is noted in Version 2. This is also not acceptable.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.2, 2012 Timetable Version 2.0 response 25/02/11)*

**NR response 31/03/11:** “Network Rail is aware of and acknowledges your concern with this issue.”

Freightliner welcomes the reductions in headway shown in Version 2.1. However, the original point above is restated and no supporting evidence has been supplied as to how the revised headways have been calculated, or why they are, in Network Rail’s consideration, thought to be appropriate.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “FL requires reasoning behind headway reductions. NR produced Railsys output for FL’s consideration.”

Meeting to discuss this still to be arranged.

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR are willing to work with FL to sort through this and will discuss with the Upminster Shift Signalling Managers.”

Meeting to discuss this still to be arranged.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Further previous comments NR are willing to work with operators to sort through and therefore will seek to revisit and supply findings at a later date once December 12 base timetable work has been completed.”

Numerous inspections of running from TRUST would suggest that a 3-minute headway for all types of traffic is attainable from Camden Road through to Gunnersbury. See example below. Numerous other examples can be found.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “We are aware of your requests to implement reduced headways on this route and will work with you to reach a mutually satisfactory conclusion to this issue.“

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Will seek further guidance regards this piece of work and advise FL accordingly.”

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**In order to make progress on all the outstanding headway issues our operational Planning Project Specialist – David Fletcher and his team are carrying out a review of the headways on this route. You are welcome to contact David directly if you wish to discuss this with him.”

Contact made with David Fletcher. Item remains pending resolution.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a review in 2010 and have not yet had a demonstration to explain how the figures have been derived. NR to discuss with FLR.”

Trains at GOSPELOAK for KENSGJNLL

Selected trains from 00:01 to 24:00 on 11/05/12

Lc Arr Dep Wttid Origin TRUST report

09:02 09:03 2Y25 STRATFORD 08:36 Departed GOSPELOAK 09:01 2 min early

09:07 09:08 2N25 STRATFORD 08:42 Departed GOSPELOAK 09:11 3 min late

PASS 09:12 4M51 TILBURYCT 07:16 Passed GOSPELOAK 09:13 1 min late

09:16 09:16 2Y27 STRATFORD 08:50 Departed GOSPELOAK 09:16 on time

09:22 09:22 2N27 STRATFORD 08:57 Departed GOSPELOAK 09:22 on time

09:27 09:27 2Y29 STRATFORD 09:03 Departed GOSPELOAK 09:27 on time

09:40 09:40 2N29 STRATFORD 09:15 Departed GOSPELOAK 09:42 2 min late

PASS 09:45 5Y31 STRATFORD 09:23 Passed GOSPELOAK 09:44 1 min early

09:51 09:51 2N31 STRATFORD 09:26 Departed GOSPELOAK 09:50 1 min early

Trains at KENSGJNLL from GOSPELOAK

Selected trains from 00:01 to 24:00 on 11/05/12

Lc Arr Dep Wttid Origin TRUST report

PASS 09:16 2Y25 STRATFORD 08:36 Passed KENSGJNLL 09:14 2 min early

PASS 09:20 2N25 STRATFORD 08:42 Passed KENSGJNLL 09:25 5 min late

PASS 09:25 4M51 TILBURYCT 07:16 No pass report for this train\*

PASS 09:29 2Y27 STRATFORD 08:50 Passed KENSGJNLL 09:31 2 min late

PASS 09:35 2N27 STRATFORD 08:57 Passed KENSGJNLL 09:35 on time

PASS 09:40 2Y29 STRATFORD 09:03 Passed KENSGJNLL 09:41 1 min late

PASS 09:53 2N29 STRATFORD 09:15 Passed KENSGJNLL 09:56 3 min late

PASS 09:58 5Y31 STRATFORD 09:23 Passed KENSGJNLL 09:58 on time

PASS 10:04 2N31 STRATFORD 09:26 Passed KENSGJNLL 10:04 on time

\*passed 09/28

**Item 2**

**East Anglia Section 5.2 Headways**

EA1320 Camden Road West Jn to Stratford

Relates to TTP513/514. The headways shown for the above section of line were revised to take into account the recent resignalling scheme. This actually resulted in some headways increasing, despite a considerable increase in the number of signals provided. A request was made to NR to substantiate the revised proposals; to date a spreadsheet has been provided showing some Railsys output, but no detail of how the figures shown had been calculated. Since 2012 v1.0, the headway figures have been changed, but still without and supporting detail.

Freightliner seeks to be provided with supporting evidence to show what headways are achievable, how they have been derived and the level of performance buffer that has been applied, in order that a mutually agreeable solution can be found.

**TPR response correspondence**

Freightliner will not accept increased headway values on his section (passenger or freight values). This was a condition of acceptance of the Network Change for the resignalling of this area.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.1, 2012 Timetable Version 1.0 response 26/11/10)*

**NR response 22/12/10:** “The headways which have been published in Version 1 of the 2012 Principal Timetable Planning Rules were taken from the Compendium which was last reissued on 09.02.10. The headway values would have been discussed at the North London Line Timetable Planning Group Meetings and your representative would have been Simon Barrett. The values which appear in the Compendium are being checked by the Project Developer Chris Grimes.”

The original point is restated: Freightliner will not accept increased headways. Attendance of Freightliner representatives at the NLL meetings did not involve agreement of amended headways.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.2, 2012 Timetable Version 2.0 response 25/02/11)*

**NR response 31/03/11:** “Network Rail is aware of and acknowledges your concern with this issue.”

Freightliner welcomes the reductions in headway shown in Version 2.1. However, the original point above is restated and no supporting evidence has been supplied as to how the revised headways have been calculated, or why they are, in Network Rail’s consideration, thought to be appropriate.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “FL require reasoning behind headway reductions. NR will produce Railsys output for FL’s consideration.”

Meeting to discuss this still to be arranged.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR are willing to work with FL to sort through this and will discuss with the Upminster Shift Signalling Managers.”

Meeting to discuss this still to be arranged.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Further to previous comments NR are willing to work with operators to sort through and therefore will seek to revisit and supply findings at a later date once December 12 base timetable work has been completed.”

Numerous inspections of running from TRUST would suggest that a 3-minute headway for all types of traffic is attainable from Camden Road through to Gunnersbury. See example below. Numerous other examples can be found.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “We are aware of your requests to implement reduced headways on this route and will work with you to reach a mutually satisfactory conclusion to this issue.”

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Will seek further guidance regards this piece of work and advise FL accordingly.”

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**In order to make progress on all the outstanding headway issues our operational Planning Project Specialist – David Fletcher and his team are carrying out a review of the headways on this route. You are welcome to contact David directly if you wish to discuss this with him.”

Contact made with David Fletcher. Item remains pending resolution.

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a review in 2010 and have not yet had a demonstration to explain how the figures have been derived. NR to discuss with FLR.”

Trains at GOSPELOAK for CAMDEN RD

Selected trains from 00:01 to 24:00 on 10/05/12

Lc Arr Dep Wttid Origin TRUST report

22:20 22:20 2L78 CLAPHAMJN 21:45 Departed GOSPELOAK 22:28 8 min late

22:30 22:30 2N28 RICHMNDNL 21:56 Departed GOSPELOAK 22:31 1 min late

PASS 22:36 5N62 RICHMNDNL 22:08 Passed GOSPELOAK 22:33 3 min early

Trains at CANONBYWJ from CAMDNRDEJ

Selected trains from 00:01 to 24:00 on 10/05/12

Lc Arr Dep Wttid Origin TRUST report

PASS 22:33 2L78 CLAPHAMJN 21:45 Passed CANONBYWJ 22:39 6 min late

PASS 22:43 2N28 RICHMNDNL 21:56 Passed CANONBYWJ 22:42 1 min early

PASS 22:48 4L43 HAMSHLFLT 19:50 Passed CANONBYWJ 22:44 4 min early

PASS 22:53 4L73 LAWLYSFLT 19:00 Passed CANONBYWJ 22:47 6 min early

Trains at NAVRORDJN from CANONBYWJ

Selected trains from 22:00 on 10/05/12 to 02:00 on 11/05/12

Lc Arr Dep Wttid Origin TRUST report

PASS 22:37 2L78 CLAPHAMJN 21:45 Passed NAVRORDJN 22:43 6 min late

PASS 22:47 2N28 RICHMNDNL 21:56 Passed NAVRORDJN 22:47 on time

PASS 22:52 4L43 HAMSHLFLT 19:50 Passed NAVRORDJN 22:49 3 min early

PASS 22:57 4L73 LAWLYSFLT 19:00 Passed NAVRORDJN 22:52 5 min early

**Item 3**

**East Anglia Section 5.2 Headways**

EA1330 South Acton Jn to Old Kew/New Kew Jns

Relates to TTP570/571. The headways on the above section were reduced (without supporting reasoning or evidence as to how the revised values had been derived). Freightliner has requested a return to the status quo ante, but this has yet to be actioned.

**TPR response correspondence**

2½ minutes is not a sustainable headway for these lines. South Acton Jn to Kew East Jn, Kew East Jn to Old Kew Jn and Kew East Jn to New Kew Jn are all one section each, with 3-aspect signalling. Headway should therefore remain AB (+2 minutes).

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a review in 2010 and have not yet had a demonstration to explain how the figures have been derived. NR to discuss with FLR.”

***A revised wording is currently under discussion which would solve this item.***

**Item 4**

**East Anglia Section 5.2 Headways**

EA1410 Upminster to West Thurrock Jn

Relates to TTP513/514. A request was made to clarify the headways on the above line, but unfortunately the response has been unsatisfactory. Freightliner would like NR to undertake a proper review of the headways on this line. While this does not follow on from a change proposal from NR (or any other party), Freightliner does not believe it to be reasonable that a request be left unanswered for over two years. The current headway is stated as follows:

**Upminster (excl) to Ockendon (excl):** Single line. Normally operated as one train in Section. If required a second train can enter the single line in the same direction as the previous train when the signal controlling entry to the single line section has cleared.

**Ockendon (excl) to West Thurrock Junction:** Single line. Normally operated as one train in Section. If required a second train can enter the single line in the same direction as the previous train when the signal controlling entry to the single line section has cleared.

Freightliner believes the signalling to be a little better than this (there are additional signals at Chafford Hundred and on the approach to Ockendon, in both directions), hence the request for a review.

**TPR response correspondence**

Please could you check and revise the headway values for this line? The signalling permits more than one train in section.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.1, 2012 Timetable Version 1.0 response 26/11/10)*

**NR response 22/12/10**: “The headways on this line have been checked by the Local Operations Manager and it has been confirmed that for timetable planning purposes ‘Single Line. One train in section’ is the value that needs to be applied to produce a robust timetable.”

Please provide details of how this assessment was made.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.2, 2012 Timetable Version 2.0 response 25/02/11)*

**NR response 31/03/11:** “The assessment was made by the Local Operations Manager –Tony Pogmore who possesses detailed knowledge of the capacity and capability of the single line sections which comprise the route EA 1410. The length of the loop at Ockendon is insufficient to allow container trains to pass at this location. More details of the capacity of this route are contained in ‘Network Rail Southeast Territory (East Anglia) Emergency Plan –Upminster to West Thurrock Jn’. Freightliner are welcome to study this document which will be provided if requested. Please send your request to [redacted].”

Please forward this document to me at the email address shown above. The length of the loop at Ockendon is not relevant to the question of headway.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “The document referred to does not seem to exist, thus NR will need to review this items again.”

No change in Version 1.0.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR maintain that the current wording will remain as this needs to apply for the purposes of constructing the timetable plan.”

Item will remain until this issue is addressed.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Further to previous comments NR are willing to work with operators to sort through and therefore will seek to revisit and supply findings at a later date once December 12 base timetable work has been completed.”

Noted.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Will seek further guidance regards this piece of work and advise FL accordingly.”

New comments in section 5.2 clarify that it is possible to have more than one following train in each single line section, but not what the minimum headway is for this.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**In order to make progress on all the outstanding headway issues our operational Planning Project Specialist – David Fletcher and his team are carrying out a review of the headways on this route. You are welcome to contact David directly if you wish to discuss this with him.”

Contact made with David Fletcher. Item remains pending resolution.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13:** “FLR say that the TPR entry says ‘Single Line’ which is meaningless. NR/FLR Discussion required.**”**

**Item 5**

**East Anglia Section 5.2 Headways**

EA1530 Coldham Lane Jn to Haughley Jn

Relates to TTP513/514. NR originally increased the headway in the Down direction (eastbound) between Bury St Edmunds and Haughley Jn from 5 to 6 minutes, without any reasonable explanation as to why this was necessary or how the revised value had been derived. Since then, further unsatisfactory changes have been made. Freightliner has since undertaken its own basic study, which indicates that there is no appropriate headway value; the signalling is largely 2-aspect and trains on the route have widely differing performance capabilities. Freightliner seeks that the headways are changes to ‘AB’ with additional timing points.

**TPR response correspondence**

Please could advise the reason for the headway increase, and how it was calculated? Freightliner is not prepared to accept an increase in value without good reason or mitigating measures.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.1, 2012 Timetable Version 1.0 response 26/11/10)*

**NR response 22/12/10:** “The headway value in the Down direction only between Bury St Edmunds and Haughley Junction was increased from 5 minutes to 6 minutes. This was done to mitigate delays which had been occurring on this section of line and were identified on further investigation to have been caused by insufficient headway. It is intended to arrange for the headways between Bury St Edmunds and Haughley Junction to be modelled and details of the modelling will be provided for you.”

Comments noted and further details are awaited. Item will remain as a potential dispute item in the meantime.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.2, 2012 Timetable Version 2.0 response 25/02/11)*

**NR response 31/03/11:** “Network Rail have not yet carried out any modelling in connection with this item. You are welcome to contact Elaine Folwell [address redacted] to discuss this item.”

Item remains under dispute.

Version 2.1 now contains a change to the Chippenham Jn to Bury St Edmunds section in connection with the resignalling scheme later this year. This is not acceptable; although the values shown match those in the associated Network Change documentation, they are based on two consecutive freight trains of a specific type. This is not referenced in the notes, nor are the values appropriate to instances where a passenger service is being followed. As Kennett remains a timing point, and the new signalling replicates the existing arrangements at that location, the headway values shown are again inappropriate. Continuing to time trains as per ‘AB’ principles between Chippenham Jn and Kennett is the best option here.

Freightliner also requests that the new intermediate block sections become mandatory timing points, in order that the capacity of the line is properly utilised. Headway values are not suitable for application in areas with two-aspect signalling and mixed traffic types. This principle also ought to be applied between Bury St Edmunds and Haughley Jn as a way of solving the original issue raised in Version 1.0.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “FL state that if these times are to increase then there is a request to add additional mandatory timing points to protect capacity and reduce performance risks. NR to send the consultation with Fiona Rose (NR) to FL to consider.”

Additional information received from Elaine Folwell. This reinforces Freightliner’s view that additional mandatory timing points are necessary. This should include Elmswell and Thurston, in additional to the new IB signals.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR are willing to work with FL to sort through this.”

Change to headways made on all sections between Chippenham Jn and Haughley Jn, which are still incorrect and inappropriate. **This continues to be a dispute item**; Freightliner suggests that NR makes urgent contact to discuss this issue.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Further to previous comments NR are willing to work with operators to sort through. The Chippenham to Kennet headway has been amended to state ‘One train in section’ with the Kennett to Haughley Junction showing ‘Subject to review’. NR has taken on board FL request and will therefore be looking to increase the mandatory timing points requested for December 2013 timetable.”

Noted – we await further proposals.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**No NR response**

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Will seek further guidance regards this piece of work and advise FL accordingly.”

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**In order to make progress on all the outstanding headway issues our operational Planning Project Specialist – David Fletcher and his team are carrying out a review of the headways on this route. You are welcome to contact David directly if you wish to discuss this with him.”

Contact made with David Fletcher. Item remains pending resolution.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13:** “FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. Proposed NR headway values are too optimistic. 2 aspect signalling – should headway be AB + 2 minutes? NR to discuss with FLR.**”**

***A revised proposal has been circulated and is now under discussion between both parties.***

**Item 6**

**East Anglia Section 5.2 Headways**

EA1540 Chippenham Jn to Ely Dock Jn

Relates to TTP371. A request was made to clarify the headways on the above line, but unfortunately the response has been unsatisfactory. Freightliner would like NR to undertake a proper review of the headways on this line. . While this does not follow on from a change proposal from NR (or any other party), Freightliner does not believe it to be reasonable that a request be left unanswered for over two years. The current headway is stated as follows:

**Chippenham Junction to Soham:** 8 minutes

**Soham to Ely Dock Junction:** Single line. One train in Section

Between Chippenham Jn and Soham, the line is largely one section in the down direction, but there is an Intermediate Block Signal [IBS] near Snailwell in the Up direction. Running times between the two locations are 6½ minutes (passenger) and 6½-9 minutes (freight), so we believe 8 minutes to be inaccurate in all circumstances.

Between Soham and Ely Dock Jn, the single line is largely one section in the down direction, but there is an IBS in the Up direction. One train in section is relatively meaningless in terms of a headway; it does not define the separation between following services - i.e. can one train pass Soham at the same time as the previous one has passed Ely Dock Jn, or does there need to be greater (or lesser) separation when the positioning of the signalling is taken into account? Clearly “One train in section” is inappropriate if there is an IBS.

**TPR response correspondence**

Please could you review the headways for this section of line, as they do not reflect the capability of the route? In the Down direction, it would be more appropriate to use the transit time plus 1 minute. In the Up direction, there is an intermediate signal (CA498) on the single line section between Ambrose’s and Blockmore UWCs, and also another signal at Snailwell (CA486).

*(2010 Timetable Version 4.4, 2011 Timetable Version 4.0 response 30/07/10)*

**NR response 29/10/10:** “The headways on this route will be reviewed and you will be informed of proposed amendments in advance of the publication of Version 2 of the 2012 Rules of the Plan.”

Will await NR’s proposal. Please ensure this includes details of the calculation used to derive amended values.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.1, 2012 Timetable Version 1.0 response 26/11/10)*

**NR response 22/12/10:** “Modelling has not yet been carried out. Full details will be provided once the modelling has been carried out.”

Comments noted and further details are awaited.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.2, 2012 Timetable Version 2.0 response 25/02/11)*

**NR response 31/03/11:** “Network Rail has not yet carried out any modelling in connection with this item. You are welcome to contact Elaine Folwell [address redacted] to discuss this item.”

Please advise when you are likely to start and complete this work.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “FL require reasoning behind headway amendments. NR will produce output from Railsys for FL’s consideration.”

Railsys output indicates that a reduction in headway can be sustained.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR are willing to work with FL to sort through this.”

No change noted in Version 2.0.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Further to the above NR will continue to work this through and are proposing to introduce revisions with the December 2013 timetable.”

Noted – we await further proposals.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**No NR response**

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Will seek further guidance regards this piece of work and advise FL accordingly.”

Please advise a completion date for this.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**In order to make progress on all the outstanding headway issues our operational Planning Project Specialist – David Fletcher and his team are carrying out a review of the headways on this route. You are welcome to contact David directly if you wish to discuss this with him.”

Contact made with David Fletcher. Item remains pending resolution.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. NR to discuss with FLR.”

**Item 7**

**East Anglia Section 5.2 Headways**

EA1580 Ely North Jn to Trowse Jn

Relates to TTP513/514. The headways were revised by NR in connection with the recent resignalling of the lines. Again, this in unsatisfactory in Freightliner’s opinion. Alternative suggestions have been made but with no meaningful response. Freightliner would like NR to undertake a proper review of the headways on this line.

Headways are currently stated as:

**Ely North Junction (Excl) to Shippea Hill:** One train in Section.

**Shippea Hill to Lakenheath:** One train in Section.

**Lakenheath to Brandon:** One train in Section.

**Brandon to Thetford**: One train in Section.

**Thetford to Harling Road**: One train in Section.

**Harling Road to Eccles Road**: One train in Section.

**Eccles Road to Attleborough:** One train in Section.

**Attleborough to Spooner Row:** One train in Section.

**Spooner Row to Wymondham**: One train in Section.

**Wymondham to Trowse Junction(Excl):** One train in Section.

One train in section is relatively meaningless in terms of a headway; it does not define the separation between following services - i.e. can one train pass the location x at the same time as the previous one has passed location y, or does there need to be greater (or lesser) separation when the positioning of the signalling is taken into account? In this instance, Freightliner believes a greater separation is needed on sections between Shippea Hill and Wymondham to take into account the second train sighting the distant signal at location x at green, following the first train clearing the overlap at location y. “One train in section” is inappropriate between Ely North Jn and Shippea Hill, and also between Wymondham and Trowse Jn as there are additional signals which would permit a better headway.

**TPR response correspondence**

The headways need to remain as they are (with the exception of Wymondham to Trowse Jn), as the new signalling does not allow any improvement.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**No NR response**

Amended to being “One train in section” – this should be further revised:

A headway value is required between Ely North Jn and signal CA803/804

AB + 2 minutes should apply between signals CA803/804 and Trowse Jn, as this is the maximum the signalling permits, except that there is an Up direction IBS at 80m08ch approx., and also IBSs between Wymondham and Trowse Jn.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**In order to make progress on all the outstanding headway issues our operational Planning Project Specialist – David Fletcher and his team are carrying out a review of the headways on this route. You are welcome to contact David directly if you wish to discuss this with him.”

Contact made with David Fletcher. Item remains pending resolution.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. NR to discuss with FLR.”

***A revised proposal is currently under discussion between both parties.***

**Item 8**

**East Anglia Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

EA1010 Liverpool Street to Seven Kings: Stratford

Relates to TTP513/514. Network Rail proposed to increase junction margins at Stratford in connection with freight trains, together with additional allowances for approach control. This was apparently done in response to delay minutes being accrued. Again, no detailed justification for the changes has been provided, and Freightliner is not convinced that the root cause of any delay has been adequately investigated. Although it has proved possible to accommodate Freightliner’s Firm Contractual Rights in respect of the current Working Timetable, we still have concerns that the timetable pattern that was devised in December 2010 is no longer sustainable and that spare capacity for freight services has been eroded. In the absence of Strategic Paths on this route, it is not clear how much capacity remains. Freightliner would like the changes to be reversed and discussions renewed once a capacity exercise has been undertaken. Please also see the comments in the preface.

**TPR response correspondence**

Freightliner cannot accept the increased margins shown – the timetable is not currently designed to accommodate 4 minute margins and will need to be redesigned to satisfy the Firm Contractual Rights of all operators on this section of line. This work needs to be undertaken in advance of a rules change proposal. Freightliner is willing to assist in this process, although we believe that 3 minutes is in fact adequate.

The addition of {2} for certain moves needs to be refined (there are different levels of approach control depending on routeing) and done in conjunction with an SRT review for the area; many SRTs already include an approach control allowance. Again this needs to be considered alongside a timetable rewrite to ensure that all FCRs are met.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR will be willing to work with FL and other operators to sort through the current base LTP plan in the Stratford area, ahead of the 2013 timetable offer in June, due to ongoing daily delay incidents caused by the inadequate SRT values. Trains from the Ilford direction appear to be losing between 2 and 3 minutes on top of the SRT between Forest Gate Jn and Stratford/Channelsea Jn which is also impacting on conflicting down services and further knock on delays. Services from the Woodgrange Park direction are also losing further minutes and can take between 6 and 8 minutes to undertake this movement through Stratford.”

While Freightliner notes Network Rail’s comments, these changes are not agreed until timetable development work has been undertaken and concluded; it is not appropriate to undertake this in the normal planning cycles without understanding the implications. **This is a dispute item.** Freightliner expects all of its Firm Contractual Rights to be met.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Further to previous comments NR are willing to work with operators to sort this through during the validation work for the December 12 base timetable.”

Item remains under dispute until after the December 2012 offer and satisfactory conclusion of any issues arising.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “We want to avoid Dispute Items wherever possible and we await your response to the December 2012 offer.”

Item will remain pending satisfactory conclusion of any issues arising.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that this change has decimated capacity and the SRT changes have not been agreed. To remove the dispute, FLR ask NR to remove all these items from the TPRs. A broader discussion is required. NR to discuss with FLR.”

**Item 9**

**East Anglia Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

EA1011 Seven Kings to Ipswich: Manningtree

Relates to TTP371. A new allowance for trains from Ipswich Griffin Wharf was included in TPRs which Freightliner feels to be excessive and therefore unduly restricts capacity in this area. No details of how this allowance was calculated has been provided. Freightliner seeks the removal of this allowance until a mutually acceptable solution can be agreed.

**TPR response correspondence**

The new allowance is excessive. No more than 3 minutes is required, depending on timing load. This instruction should appear under Halifax Jn, as it should also apply to trains routed towards the Harwich branch.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “Earlier in the year certain services lost 5 minutes and thus and added 5 mins allowance has been added. FL has requested the TINs to substantiate this.”

No further correspondence.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR are willing to work with FL to sort through the reasoning for this and will endeavour to obtain any previous delay incidents prior to the value having been added to previous and current schedules departing Ipswich Griffin Wharf.”

No further correspondence.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

No further correspondence. It is noted from observation of CCF that departing trains stop at Halifax Jn in order to give up the train staff. Start to pass timings for Halifax Jn to Manningtree are typically in the region of 13-14 minutes.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 19/06/12: “**The existing allowance will remain in Version 4. Currently the Griffin Wharf branch is served by trains operated by DB Schenker and there has been no indication of dissatisfaction with the 5 minute allowance from that FOC.”

The satisfaction or otherwise of another FOC is of no interest. **This is now a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Will seek further guidance regards this item and advise FL accordingly.”

Item remains in dispute.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**Discussions concerning the allowance took place at a meeting between Jason Bird and David Beadle/John Blundell on 6th December 2012. The reasons for retaining the current allowance were explained.”

Item remains in dispute.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. NR to discuss with FLR.”

***A revised proposal is under discussion between the parties.***

**Item 10**

**East Anglia Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

EA1011 Seven Kings to Ipswich: Ipswich Yard

Relates to TTP513/514. A new margin for trains from Ipswich Yard was included in TPRs which Freightliner feels to be incorrect and therefore unduly restricts capacity in this area. No details of how this allowance was calculated have been provided. Freightliner seeks this allowance to be removed from TPRs until a mutually acceptable solution can be agreed.

**TPR response correspondence**

Please advise the reason for this new margin and how it has been calculated. This entry should also appear under EA1012 Ipswich to Trowse Jn.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “NR state that these margins have come from Ipsyrd. FL have had sight of this and will consider”.

No correspondence on this matter has been located. Please supply.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Further to the above NR are willing to work with FL to sort through this. Due to signalling constraints of Ipswich Yard and the main line these figures have come from discussions with the Colchester Shift Signalling Managers.”

No further correspondence.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

No further correspondence.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12: “**NR do not have anything to add to the Response dated 22/12/11.”

**This is a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Will seek further guidance regards this item and advise FL accordingly.”

Item remains in dispute.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**Discussions concerning the allowances for Conflicting movements took place at a meeting between Jason Bird and David Beadle/John Blundell on 6th December 2012. The reasons for retaining the 3 minute allowances were explained.”

Item remains in dispute.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. NR to discuss with FLR.”

***A revised proposal is under discussion between the parties.***

**Item 11**

**East Anglia Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

EA1161 Bishop’s Stortford to Ely North Jn: Cambridge

Relates to TTP513/514. New and revised allowances for trains at Cambridge were included in TPRs which Freightliner feels to be excessive and therefore unduly restrict capacity in this area. No detail of how these allowances were calculated has been provided. Freightliner seeks a proper review of this allowance in order to come to a mutually acceptable solution.

**TPR response correspondence**

New margins not agreed – many are excessive and are headways rather than junction margins.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**No NR response.**

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Further work is required. Need to discuss this with FL.”

Now a dispute item.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**There are a number of issues which apply to route EA 1161 concerning entries from Shepreth Branch Junction to Cambridge. Therefore our operational Planning project Specialist – David Fletcher and his team are carrying out a review of the margins and allowances on this section of the Network.”

Revised margins not agreed – there are a number of excessive margins for consecutive services.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. NR to discuss with FLR.”

**Item 12**

**East Anglia Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

EA1161 Bishop’s Stortford to Ely North Jn: Ely

Relates to TTP570/571. The dwell time for passenger services at Ely was increased. Give the criticality of capacity in the Ely area, Freightliner seeks some real justification for this, as we feel there is a danger that freight capacity will be compromised. Freightliner seeks a reversal of this change pending a proper review.

**TPR response correspondence**

Please withdraw the item relating to minimum dwell time – this will impinge on Freightliner’s ability to path freight services through the Ely area, and also potentially on the King’s Lynn branch.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**The 1 minute dwell time will remain in Version 2. The note ‘These values are subject to review and agreement between Network Rail and all train operators’ will remain. There will be an opportunity to discuss this item at the Cambridge Area Planning Meeting to be held on 18th January 2013.”

We do not recall an invite to this meeting. Item remains not agreed.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. NR to discuss with FLR.”

***Further discussion has taken place and Freightliner is assessing the information provided by NR.***

**Item 13**

**East Anglia Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

EA1162 Ely North Jn to King’s Lynn

**Item closed – a re-worded entry has been agreed.**

**Item 14**

**East Anglia Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

EA1440 Westerfield Jn to Felixstowe Town

EA1460 Felixstowe Beach Jn to Felixstowe Beach

Relates to TTP513/514. New junction margins and adjustments were included in TPRs. No detail of how these margins and allowances were derived has been supplied. Freightliner seeks these additional entries to be removed until a proper review has been undertaken and agreed.

**TPR response correspondence**

The new entries are not agreed. No details have been supplied as to how these values have been calculated. **This is a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Further previous comments NR are willing to work with operators to sort this through during validation work for December 12 base timetable.”

Item remains under dispute until after the December 2012 offer and satisfactory conclusion of any issues arising.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “We want to avoid Dispute Items wherever possible and we await your response to the December 2012 offer.”

Item will remain pending satisfactory conclusion of any issues arising.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**FLR say that they asked for a response to explain how the figures have been derived, which has not yet been received. NR to discuss with FLR.”

**Item 15**

**Western Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

GW105 Fordgate to Penzance

Relates to TTP513/514. New adjustments were included in TPRs. No detail of how these margins and allowances were derived has been supplied. Freightliner believes that a variety of allowances pertaining to each timing load is the only appropriate way of making best use of scarce capacity, and would like the adjustments removed until a mutually acceptable solution can be found.

**TPR response correspondence**

*Whiteball Tunnel*

{½} or {2} allowance for acceleration is too simplistic and needs to be adjusted to reflect various timing loads.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Work in progress.”

Item remains pending review.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12: “**Revision will be proposed for inclusion in v2.”

No change noted in v2.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**Item 16**

**Western Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

GW200 Didcot to Heyford

Relates to TTP513/514. New adjustments were included in TPRs. No detail of how these margins and allowances were derived has been supplied. Freightliner believes that a variety of allowances pertaining to each timing load is the only appropriate way of making best use of scarce capacity, and would like the adjustments removed until a mutually acceptable solution can be found.

**TPR response correspondence**

*Kennington Jn*

Freightliner has previously requested that {2} allowance for trains from Didcot TC to Kennington Jn should be amended to a range between {½} and {2} deepening on timing load, and that the same allowance should apply for trains from Didcot station and also Foxhall Jn. Freightliner also requested that the {3} allowance for trains from Didcot TC to Kennington Jn should be amended to a range between {1½} and {3} deepening on timing load, and that the same allowance should apply for trains from Didcot station and also Foxhall.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.2, 2012 Timetable Version 2.0 response 25/02/11)*

**NR response 31/03/11:** “Noted. This will need to be modelled through Railsys.”

Noted – will wait for further details.

*(2011 Timetable Version 4.3, 2012 Timetable Version 2.1 response 14/07/11)*

**NR response 29/07/11:** “NR to provide FL with Railsys output for consideration.”

No further correspondence received.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Will be updated / included in Version 2.”

No change in Version 2.0. **This is now a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Apologies - Still being looked at and should be amended / included in Version 4.”

Noted.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12: “**Intended to have amended in Version 4, but if misses deadline then Version 1 2014.”

Noted – please note we will not accept this being delayed any longer.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**NR response 01/10/12:** “Noted – work in progress to correct.”

No update.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 21/12/12:** TRATIM tables being examined – work in progress.

Please advise as soon as possible – this item has now been live for 2 years.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**Item 17**

**Scotland Section 3.3 Areas with non-standard electrification**

Relates to TTP570/571. A new section was included in TPRs, relating to a Network Change proposal. As the Network Change has yet to be established, Freightliner believes this section should be removed from TPS pending the conclusion of the Network Change process.

**TPR response correspondence**

New entry not agreed – the associated Network Change has not been established. The proposed method of gaining access for trains other than those formed of ScotRail EMU stock is not as shown.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**No NR response.**

**This is now a dispute item.**

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**It is our understanding that the following issues are still outstanding regarding the non-standard electrification of Paisley Canal:

* Maintenance possession strategy
* Special instructions were to be amended to remove any reference to non passenger traffic running with an X headcode
* Draft update of Sectional Appendix pages will be provided.

These points are being handled by The Network Change Co-ordinator for Scotland and we await a mutually satisfactory response.”

**Item 18**

**Scotland Section 5.2 Headway Values**

SC011 Law Jn to Uddingston Jn via Holytown

Relates to TTP513/514. The headway on this line was increased by NR without any details of how the revised value was calculated, or any reason why it was in fact necessary and applicable to all “HAW” trains. The headway was changed in response to a Short Term Network Change, which expires on 31 March 2014. Freightliner believes that this restriction should be removed from the 2014 Subsidiary Rules, as the STNC will have expired by then, and should be end-dated 31 March 2014 in previous Rules once the need for it is adequately demonstrated.

**TPR response correspondence**

Increase to 6 mins following HAW freight not agreed.  This line is RA10, therefore HAW cannot apply.  Individual wagon types are subject to RT3973 conditions, but this is by no means universal and is constantly subject to change.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**No NR response.**

**This is now a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Consulted by e-mail 19/12/11.”

**Item remains in dispute.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12: “**These values have been checked with Railsys and Motherwell PSB. They were proposed to industry timescales ie T-59. No FLHH trains have been Rejected or Flexed when validating December 2012 timetable. Due process has been followed. 6 minutes to remain as published.”

This is a dispute item and will be the subject of an Access Dispute Adjudication unless a suitable revised proposal is received by 31/08/12.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**No NR response.**

Will now proceed to dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 04/01/13:** “Further to our meeting in December with Jason Bird, we understand that the 6 minutes in question should apply to specific trains rather than a blanket cover. We would be grateful if Mr Bird could supply his suggested wording for this rule in order that this can be reviewed. Train specific headways can lead to manual error and misinterpretation of the rules hence the blanket cover will remain in place at this stage. As mentioned in entry of 21st June these values have been checked and established by Railsys which is an industry wide accepted tool.”

Item will remain pending dispute hearing. Suggested wording for the Notes column should read “6 minutes if following a freight train subject to additional speed restrictions at Marshall Street and Glencairn Avenue bridges.” However, the associated Network Change expires on 31 March 2014, so there will be no need for a longer headway beyond that date.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR Response 05/04/13: “**We agree that this issue should be put on hold until the Network Change for this is issued.”

**Item 19**

**Scotland Section 5.2 Headway Values**

SC023 Motherwell to Newton via Hamilton

Relates to TTP513/514. The headway on this line was amended by NR without any details of how the revised value was calculated, nor any reason why it was in fact necessary. Freightliner seeks this revision to be removed pending a proper review of the headway on this line.

**TPR as currently shown in 2014 TPR v3.0**

| **SC023 MOTHERWELL TO NEWTON JN (VIA HAMILTON)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timing Point** | **Down** | **Up** | **Notes** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Motherwell – Haughhead Jn | 3 | 4½ |  |
| Haughhead Jn – Hamilton Central | Single Line | | TCB |
| Hamilton Central - Newton | 6 | 4½ |  |

**TPR as previously shown in 2012 TPR v2.1**

| **SC023 MOTHERWELL TO NEWTON JN AND LARKHALL BRANCH** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timing Point** | **Down** | **Up** | **Notes** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Motherwell – Airbles | TCB | TCB | Plan as AB sections due to signalling |
| Airbles – Haughhead Jn | TCB | TCB |  |
| Haughhead Jn – Hamilton Central | Single Line | | TCB controlled by Motherwell SC |
| Hamilton Central – Hamilton West | TCB | TCB | Plan as AB sections due to signalling |
| Hamilton West – Blantyre | TCB | TCB |  |
| Blantyre – Newton | TCB | TCB |  |
| Larkhall – Allanton Loop | Single Line | | TCB controlled by Motherwell SC |
| Allanton Loo = Haughhead Jn | Single Line | | TCB controlled by Motherwell SC |

**TPR response correspondence**

Increase to 6 minutes not agreed - the signalling permits better than this.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**No NR response.**

**This is now a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

NR response 17/04/12: “Consulted by e-mail 19/12/11.”

**Item remains in dispute.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “These values have been checked with Railsys and Motherwell PSB. They were proposed to industry timescales ie T-59. No FLHH trains have been Rejected or Flexed when validating December 2012 timetable. Due process has been followed. 6 minutes to remain as published.”

**This is a dispute item and will be the subject of an Access Dispute Adjudication unless a suitable revised proposal is received by 31/08/12.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**No NR response.**

Will now proceed to dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 04/01/13:** “The headway between Motherwell and Haughead Junction was originally proposed as 6” but Railsys computer modelling shows 3” for Down trains and 4.5” for Up Trains. The headway between Hamilton Central and Newton originally proposed as 6” has been confirmed by Railsys to be 6” for Down trains and 4.5” for Up. These values are reflected in the TPRs and will stand.”

Item will remain pending dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**Further to recent email correspondence regarding the relevance of Railsys, NR would be grateful if Mr Bird could supply detailed and robust evidence which would support this dispute and his own findings.”

**Item 20**

**Scotland Section 5.2 Headway Values**

SC099 Whifflet to Rutherglen East Jn

Relates to TTP513/514. The headway on this line was increased by NR without any details of how the revised value was calculated, nor any reason why it was in fact necessary. Freightliner seeks this revision to be removed pending a proper review of the headway on this line.

**TPR as currently shown in 2014 TPR v3.0**

| **SC099 WHIFFLET NORTH JN TO RUTHERGLEN EAST JN** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timing Point** | **Down** | **Up** | **Notes** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Whifflet – Carmyle | 5 | 7 |  |
| Carmyle – Rutherglen East Jn | 5 | 4½ |  |

**TPR as previously shown in 2012 TPR v2.1**

| **SC001 GRETNA JN TO GLASGOW CENTRAL VIA BEATTOCK** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timing Point** | **Down** | **Up** | **Notes** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Standard Headway | 4 | 4 |  |
| **Exceptions:** | | | |
| Law Jn – Newton | 3 | 3 |  |
| Newton – Central | 2 | 2 | 3 minutes at Newton in Up direction and at Rutherglen East Jn in Down direction following a train booked to call at Cambuslang |
| Langloan Jn – Carmyle | 6 | 6 |  |
| Carmyle – Rutherglen East Jn | 4 | 4 |  |

**TPR response correspondence**

Changes not agreed - headways as previously shown for this line under SC001 should apply.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**NR response 22/12/11:** “Railsys will be utilised to check figures but they are currently believed to be robust.”

Original comments stand. **This is now a dispute item.** Please note that Freightliner does not accept the use of Railsys as a modelling tool to determine headways and junction margins where freight is concerned, as the algorithms contained in Railsys do not produce accurate results.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 27/02/12**: “Need to understand why the challenge on Railsys and any proposal for going forward.”

**Item remains in dispute.** Railsys has consistently been producing incorrect results for freight where calculations have been made for headways, junction margins and SRTs. This is because the algorithms it uses to determine freight performance have not been validated. There is also the issue of the geography used in Railsys (and ITPS), in that the timing locations the program assumes do not necessarily match any foregoing practice, and in some instances are at considerable variance with reality. This can directly impinge on train performance if Railsys output is used without prior validation.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “These values have been checked with Railsys and Motherwell PSB. They were proposed to industry timescales ie T-59. No FLHH trains have been Rejected or Flexed when validating December 2012 timetable. Due process has been followed. Values to remain as published.”

**This is a dispute item and will be the subject of an Access Dispute Adjudication unless a suitable revised proposal is received by 31/08/12.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**No NR response.**

Will now proceed to dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 04/01/13:** “Timings produced on 6th February 2012 and Railsys computer modelling confirms that the initially proposed 5” for Down and 7” for up trains is relevant between Whifflet and Carmyle but can be reduced between Carmyle and Rutherglen East to 4.5” for Up trains. Although we appreciate your concerns surrounding the algorithms used by Railsys, this is the recognised modelling tool and we believe these to be robust.”

Item will remain pending dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**Further to recent email correspondence regarding the relevance of Railsys, NR would be grateful if Mr Bird could supply detailed and robust evidence which would support this dispute and his own findings.”

**Item 21**

**Scotland Section 5.2.2 General Capacity Constraints**

Relates to TTP570/571. A new section was included in TPRs, relating to a Network Change proposal. As the Network Change has yet to be established, Freightliner believes this section should be removed from TPRs pending the conclusion of the Network Change process.

**TPR response correspondence**

New entry regarding SC061 not agreed – the associated Network Change has not been established. The proposed method of gaining access for trains other than those formed of ScotRail EMU stock is not as shown.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**No NR response.**

**This is now a dispute item.**

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 05/04/13: “**It is our understanding that the following issues are still outstanding regarding the non-standard electrification of Paisley Canal:

* Maintenance possession strategy
* Special instructions were to be amended to remove any reference to non passenger traffic running with an X headcode
* Draft update of Sectional Appendix pages will be provided.

These points are being handled by The Network Change Co-ordinator for Scotland and we await a mutually satisfactory response.”

**Item 22**

**Scotland Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

SC003 Carstairs South Jn to Haymarket East Jn

Relates to TTP513/514. Additional allowances were included in TPRs at Midcalder Jn and Slateford Jn, which Freightliner believes to be incorrect and/or appropriate. No details have been provided as to how the suggested values were derived. Freightliner seeks the removal of these allowances until a proper review is undertaken.

**TPR response correspondence**

*Midcalder Jn*

Adjustment ex Goods of {3} not agreed.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**No NR response.**

**This is now a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Consulted by e-mail 19/12/11.”

**Item remains in dispute.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “These values have been recked with Railsys and Edinburgh PSB. They were proposed to industry timescales ie T-59. No FLHH trains have been Rejected or Flexed when validating December 2012 timetable. Due process has been followed. Values to remain as published.”

**This is a dispute item and will be the subject of an Access Dispute Adjudication unless a suitable revised proposal is received by 31/08/12.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**No NR response.**

Will now proceed to dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 04/01/13:** “Upon review, the figure of acceleration figure of {3} can be reduced to {2}.”

Item will remain pending dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 01/03/13: “**This has been actioned as per 04/01/13. Please confirm why this point is still in dispute. NR would be grateful if Mr Bird could supply detailed and robust evidence which would support this dispute and his own findings if still required.”

***Due to subsequent changes resulting from a Network Change, it is now likely that an allowance is not necessary.***

*Slateford Jn*

Approach control allowance of {3} for freight and acceleration allowances not agreed.

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.2, 2013 Timetable Version 1.0 response 25/11/11)*

**No NR response.**

**This is now a dispute item.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.3, 2013 Timetable Version 2.0 response 24/02/12)*

**NR response 17/04/12:** “Consulted by e-mail 19/12/11.”

**Item remains in dispute.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.4, 2013 Timetable Version 3.0 response 18/05/12)*

**NR response 21/06/12:** “These values have been recked with Railsys and Edinburgh PSB. They were proposed to industry timescales ie T-59. No FLHH trains have been Rejected or Flexed when validating December 2012 timetable. Due process has been followed. Values to remain as published.”

**This is a dispute item and will be the subject of an Access Dispute Adjudication unless a suitable revised proposal is received by 31/08/12.**

*(2012 Timetable Version 2.5, 2013 Timetable Version 4.0 response 27/07/12)*

**No NR response.**

Will now proceed to dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.1, 2014 Timetable Version 1.0 response 23/11/12)*

**NR response 04/01/2013:** “Upon review, the figure of approach control of {3} can be reduced to {2}. In addition the acceleration of {1.5} can be reduced to {1}.”

Item will remain pending dispute hearing.

*(2013 Timetable Version 4.2, 2014 Timetable Version 2.0 response 22/02/13)*

**NR response 01/03/13: “**This has been actioned as per 04/01/13. Please confirm why this point is still in dispute. NR would be grateful if Mr Bird could supply detailed and robust evidence which would support this dispute and his own findings if still required.”

**Item 23**

**Kent Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

SO310 Hither Green to Rochester Bridge Jn via Sidcup: Gravesend

**Item closed – NR undertakes to revise the disputed margins.**

**Item 24**

**Kent Section 5.3 Junction Margins and Station Planning Rules**

SO310 Hither Green to Rochester Bridge Jn via Sidcup: Strood

**Item closed – NR undertakes to remove the disputed entry.**