

31/01/14

Peter Lakhani
Network Rail
4th Floor
Kings Place
90 York Way
London, N1 9AG

Dear Peter,

Network Rail's CP5 Delivery Plan (draft)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on *Network Rail's Draft Delivery Plan for Control Period 5* (Dec 2013). CrossCountry Trains' (XCTL) response is divided into the following categories: system operator capability; performance; engineering outputs; key assumptions. This forms half of a two part response to the consultations issued on 18th December 2013 by Network Rail (NR). This response addresses the deliverability of NR's plans, whilst our other response addresses the results of CP5.

In general, XCTL feels that there is a severe lack of information within the report about how Network Rail (NR) expects to achieve these challenging targets over the course of CP5, especially given current performance figures and future personnel cuts.

1. System operator capability

NR states that it is "in discussion with train operators ... on the most appropriate framework" for this initiative. XCTL is not aware of being consulted about this. Given that XCTL runs over eight of NR's ten routes we regard our involvement in any monitoring framework that would have an impact on how we work with NR as critical. Can NR please supply details of how it believes this is currently taking place? The apparent lack of consultation on this subject would seem to be a key opportunity for NR to begin to engage on developing its 'customer service maturity' measurements (as per page 202) with XCTL.

2. Performance

- We welcome the introduction of comprehensive asset data quality, both as a proactive performance measure and as a way of enhancing assessment of engineering requirements.
- We expect to have the opportunity to comment on Table 21 (page 20) when it becomes available in March 2014.
- Please clarify *Cross-border service availability* (page 198). Is NR proposing to measure London-Scotland traffic as per TransportScotland's response to the ORR on 4th September 2013, or as any cross-border route (e.g. is it classed as 'shut' if XCTL can serve all our stations but EastCoast has problems further south)? If the former then please make that explicit in the title of the measurement.

- We welcome the introduction of the P3M3 programme (page 201) and would like more information on how it will work.

3. Engineering outputs

- Within the context of the second paragraph of this response, does NR have a robust plan in place to cope with the increase in outputs planned during the end of CP4 and the start of CP5?
- Having examined various tables in the document we believe that the extent to which work volumes vary on a year to year basis is not consistent with resolving some of the problems we have faced in CP4 as a major customer on eight of NR's ten routes.
- Specifically, can NR please explain how it will achieve such a large drop in the number of open work items (structures) with a risk score greater than or equal to 12 between 2013/14 and 2014/15 (page 25)?
- Can NR please explain why in Table 32 (page 33), *Network-wide civils renewal volumes*, Coastal and Estuary Defences more than double in 2015/16 before dropping dramatically in 2016/17. Is this for a specific committed scheme? Does NR have the resources to achieve this (see paragraph two, above)?
- Explanations, where they were provided were extremely beneficial. However, more could have been provided. For example, in Table 26 (page 27) the High Output figures for Automated Ballast Cleaning drop dramatically in the last two years of the Control Period and an explanatory note would have been useful to help the reader understand whether the figures are realistic. In future a note for any dramatic increase or decrease in figures should be explained. XCTL has found it extremely difficult to comment properly on this consultation due to the lack of transparent graphical or written aids to what are extremely dense, technical tables of volumes. We would therefore like to make it clear that we reserve the right to comment at a later date on the content of this report should aspects of it become clearer.

4. Key Assumptions

- **Supply chain:** it is manifestly not the case that NR's supply chain partners "have the required capacity and capability to deliver" NR's plans (page 206). Given the magnitude of this problem at the moment (end CP4) we are concerned that it was included as a key assumption. Specific examples of recent, severely disruptive, works lost include:

Project	Date	Reason
S&C work at Castle Bromwich	Christmas 2013	NR was unable to resource commissioning the new kit
Swindon 'B' Immunisation	Christmas 2013	Signal testers reallocated to

works		Gatwick
CASR Phase 3	Week 45 2014	Lack of signal testers to do pre-commissioning works

- Level of disruption:** XCTL is uncomfortable with the assumption that passengers will experience “broadly the same levels of disruption” at similar geographical locations. Whilst this might be true for areas such as Birmingham, it is not for those such as Cardiff. As the full CP5 picture has begun to emerge it seems that XCTL’s customers are facing unprecedented levels of disruption for little immediate (within CP5) benefit in comparison to other passengers. We urgently need to sit down with NR planning managers from all routes and discuss candidly how we will manage this logistical challenge whilst continuing to provide a reasonable level of service, retain efficient use of our crew and rolling stock and achieve all of the aspirations we have set out in our accompanying response to this round of consultation.

Should you have any queries about any of the above information please do not hesitate to get in touch. Please can NR supply a response to direct questions within one calendar month.

Kind regards,

Tamzin Cloke

Track Access and Possession Strategy Manager