***Template Format (with advisory annotations) for a Sole Reference by a Claimant to a Timetabling Panel in accordance with the provisions of Chapter H of the Metro ADR Rules***

*This template, as required by Metro ADR Rule H21(b), is to be used by the Claimant Dispute Party to prepare a Submission for a Timetabling Panel hearing. Within the template, text in italics is advisory and should, once taken into account, be deleted from the final document.*

### *Preamble*

*The detailed management and determination of each individual dispute heard by a Timetabling Panel shall be subject to the direction of the Hearing Chair. ADR Rule H20 provides that, “Upon appointment the Hearing Chair may give directions as to any or all aspects of the procedures to be followed. The Hearing Chair shall have the power at any time to make or amend the procedure to be followed by the parties in the TTP. The directions shall be in accordance with the Principles and this Chapter H and with any mandatory time requirements.”*

*Given that many Timetabling Disputes are subject to the time constraints of the timetabling process, template formats are provided in order that the Parties shall be prompted to ensure that all material relevant to their respective arguments is available in a timely manner*

* *to the other Dispute Party/Parties*
* *to the Timetabling Panel in good time for the hearing, and*
* *to be published on the ADC website;*

*always bearing in mind that “an oral hearing lasting no more than one day shall be conducted.” (ADR Rule H21(d)) , and that* *“The length of every reference and response shall be in proportion to the nature and complexity of the dispute. Unless otherwise agreed by the Hearing Chair, the maximum length of submissions shall be as follows: … (b) a sole reference or response shall be no longer than 10 pages.” (ADR Rule H23).*

*THE TEMPLATE*

1. **DETAILS OF PARTIES**
	1. The names and addresses of the parties to the reference are as follows:-
		1. *[[Full Company name* Limited*]* (Company number *xxxxxxxxxx*) whose Registered Office is at *[Full address] ("[insert short form or abbreviation for Company name]"* ("the Claimant")); and
		2. *[Full company name* Limited*]* (Company number *xxxxxxxxxx*) whose Registered Office is at *[Full address] ("[insert short form or abbreviation for Company name]"* ("the Defendant")).
		3. *Include correspondence address, contact details and e-mail address if different.*
	2. *Where the Claimant is aware that any third party may be affected by the Chair finding in any of the ways sought in this sole reference, it should ensure that this information is conveyed to the Secretary of the ADC at the earliest possible opportunity, and the names of the relevant parties recorded here. The affected Parties should seek the guidance of the Hearing Chair (via the secretary) as to any format to be used in respect of their representations.*
2. **THE CLAIMANT’S’ RIGHT TO BRING THIS REFERENCE**
	1. This matter is referred to a Timetabling Panel ("the Panel") for determination in accordance with Condition [*xxx*] of the [*Metro Network Code*]*.*

*The Claimant needs to make explicitly clear what provisions of its contract entitle, or direct, it to bring its dispute before a Timetabling Panel.*

1. **CONTENTS OF REFERENCE**

This Sole Reference includes:-

* + 1. The subject matter of the dispute in Section 4;
		2. A detailed explanation of the issues in dispute in Section 5;
		3. In Section 6, the decisions sought from the Chair in respect of
			1. legal entitlement, and
			2. remedies;
		4. Appendices and other supporting material.
1. **SUBJECT MATTER OF DISPUTE**
	1. *Initially provide very brief details of the dispute.* *For example*:

*“This is a dispute regarding the allocation of capacity during a restriction of use.”*

* 1. *Then provide details of the Condition in Part D of the Metro Network Code, or the relevant provisions of the Track Access Contract that the dispute relates to, or is associated with.*  *For example*:-

*This dispute arises over the interpretation of Condition ● of the Metro Network Code /section ●/Schedule ● of the Track Access Contract*

4.3 *Then set out such relevant background information as is necessary to ensure a common level of understanding of all members of the Panel, including any further details of the contractual framework surrounding the obligations of the Parties in relation to the dispute.*

*If, in the contract, there is a relevant process with defined stages (e.g. consultation, responses within a set timescale, decision with reason), these need to be stated and evidence given about the extent to which these requirements have been complied with.*

* 1. *Ensure that a copy of the relevant extract(s) from the document(s) referred to above is/are provided as Appendices.*

*NOTE: It can be assumed that Timetabling Panel Members will have access to a current edition of the Metro Network Code. However,*

* *if the dispute derives from actions taken (or not taken) before the date of introduction of the relevant pages of the current Metro Network Code the Claimant should ensure that the Panel is supplied with the relevant pages of the applicable version*
* *the Claimant should not assume that Panel Members have personal copies or knowledge of the relevant parts (in particular any Schedules) of the specific access agreements whether or not governed by Model Clauses. The Committee Secretariat is available to give advice.*
	1. *Provide details of any other documents that are relevant to the dispute. The relevant parts must also be copied and annexed to this submission document.*
1. **EXPLANATION OF EACH ISSUE IN DISPUTE AND THE CLAIMANT’S ARGUMENTS TO SUPPORT ITS CASE**
	1. *Issue 1*
	2. *Issue 2*
	3. *etc., etc.*

*the Claimant should keep in mind that the Panel needs to be given*

* *a clear and logical exposition of the sequence of factors that support the Claimant’s position. Where the argument requires reference to any contractual provision, the precise extract should be quoted verbatim;*
* *a clear statement of each point where the Claimant is in dispute, such that the extent of the differences between the Parties can be clearly appreciated;*
* *clarification in respect of each point of difference as to whether the issue is primarily one of principle or of quantification in respect of a specific instance or instances;*
* *a clear summary of the practical implications of the dispute (e.g. numbers of trains potentially affected, ditto passengers or freight customers, order of magnitude of any financial impact); even in cases of “principle”, the Panel is reasonably entitled to know how much business is affected by any possible outcome of the dispute, as a factor potentially influencing its determination.*
* *guidance as to any aspects of the dispute that could be contentious, but which the Parties do not wish the Panel to address. This could include instances where, for example, the Parties have agreed to test a matter of principle, after which they will themselves negotiate a settlement of quantum.*
1. **DECISION SOUGHT FROM THE CHAIR**
	1. *The Claimant should set out the outcome it is seeking from the Chair’s determination, differentiating between*
		1. *the matters of principle*
		2. *specific conclusions deriving from those matters of principle.*

*In all its arguments and representations, the Claimant should remember that the Chair is constrained by Metro ADR Rule A5 which states, “Each and every Forum shall reach its determination on the basis of the legal entitlements of the Dispute Parties and* ***upon no other basis****. Each and every Forum shall act in accordance with the law; and all its decisions, including its determinations and decisions on procedure, shall be in accordance with the law.”*

*Each Dispute Party will have a clear reason why it has not already settled the dispute, and the result that each wishes the Chair to deliver. There is a need therefore for each Dispute Party to set down clearly what it wants the Chair to find in its favour.*

*Logically, when preparing the submission, the decision sought from the Chair should be the first thing finalised, and each Dispute Party then marshals its arguments to support that case. That said, Parties should be satisfied that the decision sought is one that a Chair can give.*

* *Pleas such as “that party X exceeded its rights/ did not comply with its obligations under Para y of z”, or “party Q has not acted reasonably in relation to the discretions it is empowered to exercise by the relevant contracts;” are matters of entitlement and do accordingly fall within the Chair’s jurisdiction.*
* *By contrast, a Chair will not support any contention that asks them, for example, to give a ruling that a contract is unfair and/or needs to be changed, because any such determination would not derive from either the Access Dispute Resolution Rules or an effective individual Access contract and would therefore be beyond the Chair’s powers.*
	1. *List any specific remedies. For example “as a result of the decided principle(s) above, the Defendant is to pay £X to the Claimant”.*

*Remedy is what the aggrieved Party contends it should be granted if the Chair finds in its favour. This should be considered carefully because access agreements are frequently prescriptive about such matters, and there are no benefits to be won from advancing arguments for remedies that lie outside the Chair’s powers. If requesting that the Chair substitute its own decision for one under appeal, the Claimant should specify whether, and how, “exceptional circumstances” (Metro Network Code, Part D5.3.1(c)) apply. The Chair’s powers which are governed by* ***Metro ADR Rule******A6****, which states:*

*“Each and every Forum shall:*

*(a) where the Access Conditions or Underlying Contract require that a specific remedy be granted, grant that remedy accordingly; or*

*(b) Where a specific remedy is provided for at law, grant that remedy accordingly; or*

*(c) where the choice of remedy is not a matter of entitlement but is a question properly falling within the discretion of the Forum, exercise that discretion in accordance with any requirements and criteria set out in the Access Conditions and Underlying Contract after due consideration of all remedies and orders that could properly be made.”*

*Where a Claimant wishes to argue for an exercise of “discretion” as in (c) above, it must consider whether the Chair has such discretion given the provisions of (a) and (b).*

* 1. *Clarify whether you wish the Hearing Chair to decide other issues – such as ordering costs.*
1. **APPENDICES**

The Claimant confirms that it has complied with Access Dispute Resolution Rule H21 *[which requires that “copies of the following Documents … shall be annexed and cross referenced to the reference: (a) the relevant extracts of contractual Documents containing the provision(s) under which the referral to the Timetabling Panel arises and/or provision(s) associated with the substance of the dispute; and (b) [the relevant extracts of] any other Documents referred to in the reference”*

*Note: It is undesirable for complete documents to be provided to the Panel – relevant extracts which demonstrate the Parties’ respective positions are sufficient.*

Extracts of Access Conditions/the Metro Network Code are included where the dispute relates to previous (i.e. no longer current) versions of these documents.

All appendices are bound into the submission and consecutively page numbered. To assist the Panel, in each Appendix

* the heading states which Dispute Party has requested that the particular appendix be placed before the Panel; and
* quotations or references that are cited in the formal submission are highlighted (or side-lined) so that the context of the quotation or reference is apparent.

Any information only made available after the main submission has been submitted to the Panel will be consecutively numbered so as to follow on at the conclusion of the previous submission.

1. **SIGNATURE**

| For and on behalf of *xxxxxxxxxxxxxx* Limited\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Signed-----------------------------------------------------------Print Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Position\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| --- |

*This is a control mechanism; it provides the Panel with assurance that the dispute has been referred to with the knowledge and understanding of the disputing corporate body. This is important, as engaging in formal dispute resolution implies a commitment to accepting the outcome of that process.*

*In this context, the Claimant is reminded that in sending representatives to argue its case before the Panel,* ***“****it shall … ensure that (a) the competencies, skills and knowledge of any chosen representative are appropriate to the issues involved in the dispute (content, subject and value)” [Metro ADR Rule A19]*

*Now provide the Appendices* (“**The Appendices***”) using a page break. A covering list of Appendices will be helpful. Bear in mind that the Panel and Chair will need to read everything submitted; only include material that will genuinely be helpful to the Panel, for example, do not append entire Network Code Chapters or entire policy documents - the relevant extracts will suffice.*