

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

GB Railfreight

55 Old Broad Street
London
EC2M 1RX
Telephone: 020 7983 5179
Mobile: 07715 696591
E-mail: jason.bird@gbrailfreight.com

Network Rail
The Quadrant
Elder Gate
Milton Keynes
MK9 1EN

23 February 2017

GB Railfreight's response to the 2018 Train Planning Rules version 1.0 – new items:

This document contains GBRf's comments on items in the 2018 version 2.0 rules. Items in red refer to items new to version 2.0; those rolled forward from previous versions are shown in black. A dispute has been lodged and all of the items contained in this document may be taken forward for a hearing.

NR has provided its comments of today's date, in italics, by way of mark-up to GBRf's Appendix E.

GBRf's Appendix E is a series of comments drawn from a longer letter dated 23 February 2017 from GBRf to NR, commenting on V2 of the Rules..

NR notes, as a global comment on each appealed revision made because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, that GBRf has declined to expand on the stated basis of objections made to V1 of the Rules.

Notably, unlike the examples cited in paragraph 5.12 or 5.13, GBRf has not sought to allege that any specific input or output of the underlying analysis is inaccurate or unrealistic, nor does it explain why the proposed revision would be inappropriate. In each case the appealed revision is appealed, it appears, simply on the basis a revision is informed by TRIP analysis.

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

Anglia

5.2 Headways

EA1160 - changes not agreed. The proposed change has yet to be substantiated by adequate evidence and leaves the section between Hackney Downs and Clapton Jn without a published headway. (v1.0 comment)

Further change still not agreed for the reasons outlined above. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

This change is an increase in headway values between Bethnal Green and Clapton Junction, together with a reduction in headway values. Both of these are supported by modelling.

EA 1160 BETHNAL GREEN EAST JUNCTION TO BISHOP'S STORTFORD			
TIMING POINTS INCLUDED	DOWN	UP	NOTES
Bethnal Green to Hackney Downs Clapton Jn	2	2	If two consecutive trains are timed at 2 minutes headway; the third consecutive train must be 2½ minutes headway behind the preceding train.
Clapton Junction Hackney Downs to Bishop's Stortford	2½*	2½*	* Trains may be planned to arrive/depart looped platforms at Broxbourne and Harlow Town with headway of 2 minutes if in front/following a non-stopping service

During consultation, as noted in green, NR agreed to extend the Bethnal Green – Hackney Downs headway to Bethnal Green – Clapton Junction. This removed GBRf's specific objection to the revision in V1 of the Rules.

The remaining objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

EA1210 - changes not agreed. The proposed change has yet to be substantiated by adequate evidence. (2018 v1.0 comment)

Network Rail's comments are noted, but the recommendations from the TRIP work provide no real evidence to support the change proposed, largely due to incorrect interpretation of the SPA reports, or the bogus methodology that is ODA. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

This change is a reduction in headway values – to reduce the headway between Broxbourne Junction and Hertford East in the down (away from London) direction only from 4 minutes to 3½ minutes.

EA 1210 BROXBOURNE JUNCTION TO HERTFORD EAST			
TIMING POINTS INCLUDED	DOWN	UP	NOTES
Broxbourne Junction to Hertford East	3½	3	

It has been supported by all other operators in the area including GBRf at the TPR forum of 10 October 2016). The objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

NR also notes that, despite GBRf's reference to ODA analysis for the proposal, ODA analysis has not been used to support this proposal.

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

EA1220 - changes not agreed. The proposed change has yet to be substantiated by adequate evidence. (2018 v1.0 comment)

Network Rail's comments are noted, but the recommendations from the TRIP work provide no real evidence to support the change proposed, largely due to incorrect interpretation of the SPA reports, or the bogus methodology that is ODA. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

This increases the headway between Stansted South Junction to Stansted East Junction in the down direction from 3 minutes to 4 minutes, and reduces the headway between Tye Green Junction and Stansted South Junction in the up direction from 3 minutes to 2½ minutes.

EA 1220 STANSTED SOUTH & NORTH JUNCTIONS TO STANSTED AIRPORT			
TIMING POINTS INCLUDED	DOWN	UP	NOTES
Stansted South Junction to Stansted East Junction	4	2½	
Stansted North Junction to Stansted East Junction			Single line. One train In Section
Stansted East Junction to Tye Green Junction	3	2½	
Tye Green Junction to Stansted Airport			Single line. One train In Section

It has been supported by all other operators in the area (and was expressly supported by all operators including GBRf at the TPR forum of 10 October 2016). GBRf's subsequent objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments. NR also notes that, despite GBRf's reference to ODA analysis for the proposal, ODA analysis has not been used to support this proposal.

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

5.3 Junction Margins

EA1160 Broxbourne – changes not agreed as they are unnecessary and/or incorrect. (2018 v1.0 comment).

Reversion to previous rules noted with thanks, however the first margin should be “arrive/pass platform 1/4” as the first train could pass platform 4 en route to the Down Loop with the same margin. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

This is a substantially agreed revision. NR has made the additional proposed change in Version 3 of the Rules (which relates to the May 2018 timetable) and is minded to implement this under D2.2.7 for the December 2017 timetable, which would remove this item from the dispute as a whole.

Broxbourne		
Adjustments to Sectional Running Times		
Movement	Reason	Value
All Up trains departing from Platform 4	Via slow speed crossover	{½}
Dwell Time		1 AM/PM peak
Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Before divergence into Platform 1/4 Arrive platform 1/4	Pass platform 2/3	2
After merge from platform 1/4 Pass platform 2/3	Depart platform 1/4	2
Depart Platform 2 to Down Cambridge	Depart Platform 4 to Down Cambridge	2-14
Loop Lengths		
Down Passenger Loop		65 SLUs
Down Passenger Loop including Platform 4		92 SLUs
Up Goods Loop		65 SLUs
Up Passenger Loop		35 SLUs

EA1200 Chingford – junction margin of 4 minutes is not acceptable – please revert to 3 minutes. (2018 v1.0 comment)

NR Comment:

This is not a revision proposed in the 2018 Rules by NR; both V1 and V2 of the Rules are as expressly agreed to by GBRf in V2 of the 2017 Rules. There is no change to this entry in the 2018 TPRs, and NR does not consider this is a valid appeal under the Code.

Chingford		
Junction Margin		
All depart/arrive margins are to be planned at 4 minutes		
Platform Reoccupation	Platform 3 in opposite direction	3
Splitting and Coupling of trains permitted	In all Platforms	

Further, GBRf now asks NR to depart from this value without analysis or evidence. If GBRf wishes Network Rail to look at the values then GBRf should provide Network Rail with suitable evidence and a counter proposal.

GBRf's appeal is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

EA1220 Stansted East Jn – Up Airport to Cambridge Chord/Up Airport to Stansted Mountfitchet = 2 minutes is not agreed. (2018 v1.0 comment)

GBRf notes Network Rail's comments, but the TRIP work is clearly incorrect. The technical margin can be calculated by adding the time taken for the first train to pass and then clear the junction, the reset time and the time taken for the second train to get from the sighting point of L1198 to the junction. This is clearly more than 55 seconds.

NR Comment:

This is a reduction in junction margin value from three minutes to two minutes.

EA 1220 STANSTED SOUTH & NORTH JUNCTIONS TO STANSTED AIRPORT		
Stansted East Junction		
Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Up Airport to Cambridge Chord	Up Airport to Stansted Mountfitchet	2
Stansted Mountfitchet to Down Airport	Up Airport to Cambridge Chord	2

The modelling shows that the signal reset time for the diverging movement outlined above is 55 seconds to achieve a green aspect. The reason this reset time is so low is because of the positioning of various signals.

An initial proposal of 60 seconds was put forward for this rule as a result of modelling analysis, however based on feedback on operating knowledge for this area, it has been concluded that a proposal of 120 seconds would be more realistic for this move.

The change is supported by all other operators.

The fact that NR is proposing a more conservative revision (from 3 minutes to 2 minutes, rather than 3 minutes to 1 minute) than initially recommended by the modelling analysis does not undermine the analysis as a whole. GBRf's subsequent objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

Scotland

5.2 Headways

SC001 – changes agreed, but please indicate by use of “exclusive” and “inclusive” what headway applies at the timing points referenced. (2018 v1.0 comment)

GBRf notes Network Rail's comments, however they remain ambiguous and are at odds with the practice in other parts of the industry. Change is now not agreed. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

NR notes this revision, supported by ODA analysis, was initially largely agreed by GBRf following publication of V1 of the Rules.

Following GBRF's comments on V1 of the Rules, NR responded as follows:

"Network Rail disagree with 'wrong wording' of not including inclusive and exclusive for headways, this would be inconsistent to the other headway's wording and also you cannot have that wording as the headway is different depending on what direction you are going in. Planners are taught to plan to the headway based on what section the train is going into next. For example a down train at Law Jn would be planned on a 2 ½ minute headway as this is the next section that train will be going into.

NR supplied headway value calculations to GBRf in Excel Document named 'SC001 Headway'."

NR has also carried out and supplied to GBRf an impact assessment report.

GBRf has not sought to comment on the substance of NR's response, nor the calculations or impact assessment report provided. GBRf's subsequent withdrawal of its agreement and appeal of this revision is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis (in this case, ODA analysis), and NR repeats its global comments.

5.3 Junction Margins

SC001 Cambuslang: change not agreed – platform reoccupation is higher than the headway, which makes no logical sense. (2018 v1.0 comment)

NR Comment:

Following GBRF's comments on V1 of the Rules, Headway & Reoccupation value calculations were supplied to GBRf in Excel Document named 'SC001 Headway'.

NR has also carried out and supplied to GBRf an impact assessment report.

GBRf has not sought to comment on the substance of NR's response, nor the calculations or impact assessment report provided. GBRf's appeal of this revision is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis (in this case, ODA analysis), and NR repeats its global comments.

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

LNW

NR Global LNW Comment:

These were recommendations produced from the TRIP programme and previously shared with the industry, including at forums on 5 May 2016, 7 June 2016, 23 August 2016, 20 September 2016 and 18 October 2016. While GBRf had not actively supported those recommendations at no stage prior to its comments on V1 of the Rules, or indeed after, did GBRf indicate its specific concerns with the TRIP modelling, or provide a counter-proposal or contrary evidence.

5.2 Headways

MD105 changes not agreed – insufficient evidence provided to justify them. (2018 v1.0 comment)
We do not need to provide evidence as we have not made any counter-proposal. The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

As communicated by NR with V1 of the Rules, these are headway exceptions following (i) freight at Northampton and (ii) Up freight departure from DIRFT..

MD105 HANSLOPE JN TO RUGBY (VIA NORTHAMPTON)			
TIMING POINT	DOWN	UP	NOTES
Hanslope Jn to Rugby via Northampton	4	4	
Exceptions:			
Headway following freight at Northampton			
First Movement	Second Movement		Value
Freight train passes Northampton in the Down direction	Any train passes or departing Northampton in the Down direction to Long Buckby		5
Freight train passes or departs Northampton in the Up direction	Any train passes or departing Northampton in the Up direction		5
Headway following Up freight departure from DIRFT			
First Movement	Second Movement		Value
Up departure from DIRFT passing Daventy South Jn	Any train passing Daventry North Jn in the Up direction		6

Following GBRF's comments on V1 of the Rules, NR responded as follows on 30 December 2016:

"MD105 Hanslope Jn to Rugby (via Northampton)

Thank you for your comments regarding the headway proposals on route MD105. We would welcome any evidence that you have which supports an alternative proposal. This can be in the form of OTMR data, on-train or on-site observations or computer modelling in accordance with the Procedure for amending the Values in the Timetable Planning Rules (section 6 of the National Timetable Planning Rules 2018, version 1). Any evidence should be submitted at the earliest opportunity to allow full consideration and review by Network Rail."

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

No evidence was provided and the change was included in V2 of the Rules.

GBRf's objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

5.3 Junction Margins

MD301 Coventry: the following changes are not agreed due to insufficient evidence being provided:

- Up freight pass to Gibbet Hill Jn/Down train from Rugby;
- Up passenger pass to Gibbet Hill Jn/Down train from Rugby;
- Down freight pass to Coundon Road/Up arrive from Berkswell;
- Up arrive from Berkswell/Down freight pass to Coundon Road; and
- Up arrive from Berkswell/Down passenger depart or pass to Coundon Road.

(2018 v1.0 comment)

We do not need to provide evidence as we have not made any counter-proposal. The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

As communicated by NR with V1 of the Rules, "Junction margins amended for conflicting moves at Coventry, shown between London end and Birmingham end. These are indicative values."

MD301 RUGBY TRENT VALLEY JN TO PENKRIDGE (VIA BIRMINGHAM)		
Coventry		
Dwell Time		
Class 390	1½ for pick up or set down.	
DMU/EMU	1	
LH/HST	1½	
Junction Margins – London End		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Up Freight passing towards Gibbet Hill Jn	Down train from Rugby Trent Valley Jn arrives platforms 3 or 4	5
Up passenger departing or passing towards Gibbet Hill Jn	Down train from Rugby Trent Valley Jn arrives platforms 3 or 4	4
Down train from Rugby Trent Valley Jn arrives platforms 3 or 4	Up train departing or passing towards Gibbet Hill Jn	1
Junction Margins – Birmingham End		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Down Freight passing towards Coundon Road	Up train from Berkswell arrives platforms 1 or 2	4
Up train from Berkswell arrives platforms 1 or 2	Down Freight passing towards Coundon Road	2
Down passenger departing or passing towards Coundon Road	Up train from Berkswell arrives platforms 1 or 2	3
Up train from Berkswell arrives platforms 1 or 2	Down passenger departing or passing towards Coundon Road	1
Platform End Conflicts		
Trains may arrive into Platform 4 from the direction of Birmingham International 1 minute before a departure from Platform 3 in the direction of Birmingham International. Other platform end conflicts trains may arrive 2 minutes before or 3 minutes after a departure.		

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

MD301 RUGBY TRENT VALLEY JN TO PENKRIDGE (VIA BIRMINGHAM)	
Coventry	
Preferred platform usage	
Platform 1 Up Virgin West Coast trains	
Turnround allowance	
10 Except: 5 All London Midland services	

Following GBRF's comments on V1 of the Rules, NR responded as follows on 30 December 2016:

"Thank you for your comments regarding the junction margins and planning rules proposals on route MD301. Network Rail is currently undertaking a timetable impact study to understand the effect of the changes proposed on the current timetable. This work will be completed in January 2017 and shared with all affected operators ahead of publication of version 2 of the 2018 Timetable Planning Rules.

Network Rail would welcome any evidence that you have which would assist in the timetable impact study. This can be in the form of OTMR data, on-train or on-site observations or computer modelling in accordance with the Procedure for amending the Values in the Timetable Planning Rules (section 6 of the National Timetable Planning Rules 2018, version 1). Any evidence should be submitted at the earliest opportunity to allow full consideration and review by Network Rail.

No evidence was provided and the change was included in V2 of the Rules.

GBRf's objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

MD301 Birmingham New Street – platform reoccupations and simultaneous moves not permitted are not agreed due to insufficient evidence being provided. (2018 v1.0 comment)

We do not need to provide evidence as we have not made any counter-proposal. The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

Additional impact assessments have resulted in a changed version of these rules being included in Version 3 of the Rules. NR has made the additional proposed change in Version 3 of the Rules (which relates to the May 2018 timetable) and is minded to implement this under D2.2.7 for the December 2017 timetable, which would remove this item from the dispute as a whole.

Birmingham New Street	
Attachment/Detachment	
Standard value unless requested from train operator and agreed with Capacity Planning.	
Connectional Allowance	12
Dwell Time	
Standard including 22X/390	3 but maybe 2 for DMU/EMU trains where 1 minute performance allowance applies on approach to New Street
HST/Loco Hauled Coaching Stock	3
EMU formations to/from Soho LMD	
Soho EMUD can only accept trains that consist of no more than 2 Class 350 or 2 Class 323 Units.	
Platform End Conflicts	
Trains may arrive 1 minute before a departure or 3 minutes after a departure	
Platforming Maximum Length Trains:	
Two trains of maximum length must not be planned to share the same platform face simultaneously. Maximum length is Class 390, 15 Mk.2/13 Mk.3 vehicles and one loco or other type of stock of similar length.	
Platform 5B can only accommodate either a light locomotive or a single Class 153 unit between the platform end and NS202 signal if the train arrives from either the Soho South Jn direction or Selly Oak direction.	
Platform Reoccupation	
Platform	Margin
Same direction	3
Opposite direction	See table for platform end margin
Platforms 1, 2 and 3 (opposite direction)	4½ Where the first train is departing to the Up Stour line 5½ Where the first train consists of 8 cars or above or a locomotive hauled train
Platforms 7, 8 and 9 (opposite direction)	4½ Where the first train is departing to the Up Derby line 5½ Where the first train consists of 8 cars or above or a locomotive hauled train
Platforms 4, 5, 10, 11 and 12 (opposite direction)	4 5 Where the first train consists of 7 or more vehicles
All through platforms—same direction	3 5 Where the first train consists of 7 or more vehicles
Platform 4C (Bay)	4 3
Planning Restriction	
Class 172 DMUs are prohibited from using platforms 9 and 11 due to signal sighting issues	

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

Birmingham New Street		
Platform End Margin		
Simultaneous Moves Not Permitted		
Trains may arrive 1 minute before a departure or 3 minutes after a departure. Exceptions, see below table:		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Train arrives at A or B end of platform from any route	Train arrives at the same platform but at opposite end	4
Trains departing from A end of platform towards Five Ways or Soho Road	Any conflicting arrival	4
Trains departing from B end of platform towards Proof House Jn	Any Conflicting arrival	4
Train consist of 7 or more vehicles departing any platform	Any conflicting arrival	4
Train departing via DEL line platforms from 7,8,9 & 10	Train arriving via DEL line platforms 7,8 & 9	4
Train departing via DEL line platforms from 11 & 12	Train arriving via DEL line	4
Train departing via DEL line from platform 10	Train arriving via DEL line platform 10	4
Train arrives in platform 10 via WL from Proof House Jn	Train departs platforms 8 or 9 towards Proof House Jn via DEL lines	4
Train departs platform 1 towards Soho South Jn	Arrival into any platform from Up Stour	5
Train departs towards Proof House Jn	Train arrives into platforms 1, 2 or 3 from Proof House Jn via F route	4-5
Train departs platforms 5, 6, 7 or 8 towards Selly Oak direction	Arrival into platforms 5 to 12 from the Selly Oak direction	4-5
Train departing towards Soho South Jn from all platforms except platform 1	Trains arriving onto platforms 10, 11 & 12 from Soho South Jn	4
Station Working Requirements		
Access to Platforms		
All Platforms	Up and Down Stour to/from Soho South Jn	
Platforms 1 to 10	Up and Down Stour to/from Proof House Jn	
Platforms 5 to 12	Up and Down Main to/from Selly Oak	
Platforms 7 to 12	Up and Down Derby to/from Proof House Jn	

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

MD301 Soho North Jn: margin "freight pass from Soho East/conflicting Up train pass Galton" not agreed – there are three signal sections between Galton Jn and Soho North Jn. (2018 v1.0 comment)
We do not need to provide evidence as we have not made any counter-proposal. The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

As communicated by NR with V1 of the Rules, "Deleted note referring to MD330. The restrictions for Soho North Jn are shown at this location under this line of route. Junction Margins are shown. These are recommendations from TRIP programme which have been discussed and agreed with industry. "

Soho North Jn		
Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Freight from Soho East Jn crossing to Down Stour at Soho North Jn	Any train passing Soho South Jn from Birmingham New Street towards Galton Jn	3½
Freight from Soho East Jn crossing to Down Stour at Soho North Jn	Any conflicting Up train passing Galton Jn	2
Restriction If it is necessary to time a train to stop at Soho North Jn to await a path, due to limited standage and signalling constraints either: a) Time the train to stand at Soho East Jn; or b) Time the train to arrive a minimum of 4 minutes before the passage of any train on either the Up or Down Stour. When it is not possible to time a train to stand at Soho East Jn be aware that the maximum standage is only 35 SLUs/224 metres		

Following GBRf's comments on V1 of the Rules, NR responded as follows on 30 December 2016:

"Thank you for your comments regarding the junction margin proposals on route MD301 in respect of Freight from Soho East Jn crossing to Down Stour at Soho North Jn/Any train passing Soho South Jn from Birmingham New Street towards Galton Jn. Network Rail is currently undertaking a timetable impact study to understand the effect of the changes proposed on the current timetable. This work will be completed in January 2017 and shared with all affected operators ahead of publication of version 2 of the 2018 Timetable Planning Rules.

Network Rail would welcome any evidence that you have which would assist in the timetable impact study. This can be in the form of OTMR data, on-train or on-site observations or computer modelling in accordance with the Procedure for amending the Values in the Timetable Planning Rules (section 6 of the National Timetable Planning Rules 2018, version 1). Any evidence should be submitted at the earliest opportunity to allow full consideration and review by Network Rail.

Thank you for your additional comments regarding Birmingham New Street resignalling which will include alterations at Soho North Jn. We are in discussions with the project to understand how these changes will impact the timetable. Network Rail will share with GBRf and other affected operators any proposed changes to the Rules at the earliest opportunity."

No evidence was provided and the change was included in V2 of the Rules following completion of the timetable impact study. GBRf's objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

MD320 Bescot Stadium – new margin not agreed – excessive. (2018 v1.0 comment)

We do not need to provide evidence, as we have not made any counter-proposal. The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

As communicated by NR with V1 of the Rules,

"New entry for this location. Junction margin shown for train departing the Up Goods Loop following a train departing or passing Bescot Stadium. Recommendation from TRIP programme discussed and agreed with the industry. "

Bescot Stadium		
Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Train depart/pass Bescot Stadium in Down direction	Train depart Bescot Up Goods Loop via Bescot Middle Jn towards Bescot Stadium	2½

Following GBRF's comments on V1 of the Rules, NR responded as follows on 30 December 2016:

"Network Rail notes that GBRf disagrees with the proposal at Bescot Stadium for a new junction margin. We would welcome any evidence that you have which supports an alternative proposal. This can be in the form of OTMR data, on-train or on-site observations or computer modelling in accordance with the Procedure for amending the Values in the Timetable Planning Rules (section 6 of the National Timetable Planning Rules 2018, version 1). Any evidence should be submitted at the earliest opportunity to allow full consideration and review by Network Rail."

No evidence was provided and the change was included in V2 of the Rules.

GBRf's comment that the margin is excessive is simply an unevidenced assertion. GBRf's objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRf APPENDIX E

Western & Wales

5.2 Headways

GW103 change not agreed – TRIP conclusions are not accurate. At the last TRIP meeting, it was stated that some change was appropriate, but not the figures shown here. 2½ minutes would be appropriate when following non-stop passenger trains, but following stopping passenger trains will require a headway of at least 3½ minutes in the London area. Following freight headways will be reviewed once the TRIP documentation is re-supplied. (2018 v1.0 comment)

NR Comment:

NR have not proposed any revision to stopping passenger services. This appeal is in that regard similar to EA1200 Chingford - there is no change to this entry in the 2018 TPRs, and NR does not consider this is a valid appeal under the Code.

Further, if GBRf wishes NR to look at these values then GBRf should provide suitable evidence. GBRf's objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

5.3 Junction Margins

GW103 Reading West Jn – new 3½-minute margin not agreed. Due to the proximity of Reading station, this could only apply if the second train were passing Reading. (2018 v1.0 comment)

NR Comment:

This is an increase in the junction margin from 3 minutes to 3.5 minutes, supported by modelling. The modelling shows that for the following movement; up relief freight crossing over to the up Reading west curve followed by down relief passenger stock has a reset time of 204 seconds. The modelling shows that the reset time exceeds the current planning value [of 180 seconds]. This is due to a 50mph line speed and train 1 decelerating due to the reduced line speed. This increase in margin will facilitate performance and a more robust timetable. NR does not accept GBRf's comment in relation to the proximity of Reading – it notes that the majority of trains stop (rather than pass) Reading, and that, the proposed junction margin is considered appropriate for performance and robustness of both stopping and passing trains.

GW103 Didcot East Jn – two new margins not agreed pending further investigation. (2018 v1.0 comment)

NR Comment:

These are junction margin increases, from 3 minutes to 4 minutes following freight, and from 2.5 minutes to 4.5 minutes, in both cases supported by modelling.

NR notes that GBRf's unexplained assertion has not been supported by further comments or the result of any 'investigation'.

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

Wessex

5.3 Junction Margins

NR Global Wessex Comments:

The following comments from NR apply to each of GBRf's objections under this head. NR hereby gives its general response which is also a particular response to each objection.

These proposals are based on modelling analysis which has been extensively consulted with industry from as early as December 2015.

Following GBRf's comments on V1 of the Rules, NR responded in relation to each of the items below in terms as follows:

"Thank you for your commentary and feedback on Wessex V1 feedback. With regard to your thoughts on the TRIP Wessex proposals would you be able to please elaborate on why you think the values are excessive? As you are aware the modelling and underpinning data that supports these proposals has a high degree of accuracy which feeds in to the associated proposals. GB Railfreight LTD have been present at each of our TPR forums used to consult the modelling and have not challenged these specific values before."

NR also offered additional comments specific to certain of the revisions proposed in V1, which were removed in V2 where noted below, in each case because of a "negative impact on the delivery of the Track Access Agreement between Network Rail and Timetable Participant". These removed items are not in dispute. One revision within SW105 Weymouth was also in this category but was not removed in V2, this will be consulted and removed under 2.2.7.

NR also responded to other comments provided by GBRf, where the proposed revisions have been removed or agreed.

Despite this prior consultation and express requests for further evidence, for the proposed revisions now appealed, GBRf has provided no evidence to support its challenges, and provided no counter-proposals, and the changes below were included in V2 of the Rules. GBRf's V2.0 objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.

SW105 Worting Jn – new margins not agreed as they appear to have excessive values. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all Diverging movements except as below		3
Down Slow line passing train	Down Slow Line passing train routed towards Andover Stopping at Basingstoke	4
Between all Converging movements except as below		4
Up Slow line Freight passing train from Winchester	Up Slow line Freight passing train from Andover	4½

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

SW105 Northam Jn – new margin not agreed as it appears to be excessive. (2018 v1.0 comment)
The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all movements		2
Up Fast line train routed from Southampton Eastern Docks	Down Slow to Down main train	3½

SW105 Weymouth – new margins not agreed as they appear to be excessive. (2018 v1.0 comment)
The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. In his case, a margin containing a half-minute has been proposed for a terminal station, which is impossible to achieve in practice. (2018 v2.0)

Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all movements except as below		3
Down Main Line arrival	Up train crossing behind	1
Up train departure	Down Main Line arrival crossing behind	4½
Up Main Line departure from Platforms 2/3	Down Sidings arrival to Platforms 3/2	3½

NR Comment: The revision "Up train departure / Down Main Line arrival crossing behind" will be consulted and removed under 2.2.7, as noted above.

SW110 Guildford – new margins not agreed as they appear to be excessive. (2018 v1.0 comment)
The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all movements except as below		3-4
Departure platform 5 towards Woking Junction	Down platform 6 arrival from Woking Junction	4½
Down train departing platforms 6, 8	Up arrival platforms 5, 6 & 8	4½
Up departure platform 1/3 towards Effingham Junction	Down arrival platform 2/3 from Effingham Junction	5
Down trains departing Platforms 3, 5, 6, & 8	Up trains arriving behind	4
All arrivals	Departures crossing behind	1*
Up Line diverging movements (South End)		2½
Down Line converging movements (South End)		3½
Up Line converging movements (routed towards London road only)		5

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

SW110 Haslemere – new margins are unnecessary as they are the same as the headway. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

Haslemere		
Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all movements except as below		3
All arrivals	Departures crossing behind	1
Down Departure from 1 or 2	Down Departure from alternate Platform	3 ½
Up Departure from 2 or 3	Up Departure from alternate Platform	3 ½

SW110 Portsmouth & Southsea – new entries not agreed as they are unclear in meaning and in some cases appear to be excessive. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

Portsmouth & Southsea		
Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all movements except as below		3
Down arrival	Up departure crossing behind	1
Down Main Line arrival on Platform 2	Arrival on Platform 4 from Back Road	4
Up Departure Platform 1 to Up Main	Arrival at Platform 3 or 4	4
Up Departure Platform 1 to Up Main	Up arrival I Up Main	4
Up Departure Platform 3 to Up Main	Down Main arrival on Platform 4	3 ½
Up Departure Platform 4 to Back Road	Down Main arrival on Platform 2	4
Up departure platform 1 to Up Main Line	Up departure Platform 3 or 4 to UP main Line	3*
Up departure platform 4	Up departure platform 3	2 ½ *

SW115 Salisbury Tunnel Jn – new margin not agreed as this appears to be excessive. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

Salisbury Tunnel Junction		
Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all movements except as below		3 *\$
Passing Down Mainline train	Passing Romsey bound train	1½
Passing Romsey bound Freight train	Passing Down Main line train	3½
* If a down train is signalled via Laverstock Loop then a train signalled from Salisbury to the Romsey direction must be held at signal SY40 until the train which has traversed Laverstock Loop has cleared signal SY34.		
\$ If a train is signalled from the Romsey direction via Laverstock Loop to the Up Main Line then trains bound for the Romsey line must be held at signal SY40 until the train has cleared Laverstock South Junction		

NR's RESPONSE TO HEADS A AND B ISSUES – APPENDIX 5
NR'S RESPONSE TO THE SUBSTANTIVE PARTS OF THE GBRf SRD

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

SW115 Salisbury – new margin not agreed as this appears to be excessive. (2018 v1.0 comment)
The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

Salisbury		
105Junction Margins		
First Movement	Second Movement	Margin
Between all movements except as below		3
Up train arrival at Platform 3	Down train arrival at Platform 4	2
Up train arrival at Platform 4	Down train arrival at Platform 3	2
All arrivals	Departures crossing behind	1
Down train depart/passing Platforms 3 & 4	Up train arrival Platforms 3 & 4	4

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

Kent

2.1 Planning Geography

SO310 Greenhithe – change to mandatory not agreed. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comment:

This revision has been withdrawn following V2 and is no longer in issue.

5.2 Headways

SO130 changes have not come out as agreed at the TRIP forum, detailed below:

SO130 LONDON CHARING CROSS TO DOVER PRIORY (VIA TONBRIDGE)			
TIMING POINT	DOWN	UP	NOTES
London Charing Cross - Grove Park	2 Fast 2½ Slow	2 Fast 2½ Slow	
Grove Park - Sevenoaks	2 Fast 3 Slow	2 Fast 3 Slow	
Sevenoaks – Tonbridge Archcliffe Junction	2½ Fast 3½ Slow	2½ Fast 3½ Slow	
Tonbridge – Paddock Wood	2 Fast* 3 Slow	2 Fast* 3 Slow	*3 minutes following freight
Paddock Wood – Saltwood Junction	2 Fast* 3 Slow	2 Fast* 3 Slow	*3 minutes following freight
Saltwood Junction - Archcliffe Junction Dover Priory	3	3	

NR Comment:

This has now been agreed following V2, and is no longer in issue.

SO290 changes not agreed – insufficient evidence has been provided to support a change. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

SO300 changes not agreed – insufficient evidence has been provided to support a change. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

SO310 changes not agreed – insufficient evidence has been provided to support a change. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

ANNEX – NR COMMENTS ON GBRF APPENDIX E

5.3 Junction Margins

S0290 Slade Green – changes not agreed. “Up direction non-stop services from Barnehurst/Up arrivals routed from Crayford Creek Jn = 2½” - the proposed margin is higher than the fast headway. “Up direction non-stop Freight from Crayford Creek Jn/Up direction non-stop service from Barnehurst = 3½” - this is higher than even the proposed Up following freight headway, despite the fact that the second train will be restricted to 20mph off the Erith Loop. (2018 v1.0 comment)

The comment remains that insufficient evidence has been provided to make the change shown in Version 1.0 as the TRIP reports have significant defects in them due to inappropriate methodology. (2018 v2.0)

NR Comments:

NR does not understand these comments, in circumstances where each of the proposed changes as to both headway and junction margin were agreed by GBRf at a TPR forum on 22 July 2016 and are supported by the relevant TRIP (SPA) analysis.

Following GBRf's comments on V1 of the Rules, NR responded on 27 January 2017 in the following terms:

"...this was discussed and agreed in principle. Please detail your objections with reference a) to the perceived impact on current and future capacity; b) to specific elements of the report which you believe require further detail; and c) those elements of the modelling methodology which you believe to be unsuitable in arriving at the proposed values. Please do this in respect of each disputed item."

In relation to each of the S0290, S0300 and S0310 Headway values, NR responded in the following, materially identical terms:

"The new headways for route S0290/S0300/S0310 are confirmed in line with TRIP report recommendations which demonstrate variable headway requirement along this line of route. In doing so Network Rail seeks to maintain and improve train service performance (decision criteria Network Code Part D Section 4.6.2 (c)). The attached TRIP reports include the specific detail supporting the proposed changes."

In relation to the S0290 Slade Green junction margin NR responded in the following terms:

"The new Junction table for Slade Green is confirmed. in line with TRIP report recommendations which demonstrate the need for increased margins for these movements. The attached TRIP reports include the specific detail supporting the proposed changes."

GBRf has provided no evidence to support its challenges, provided no comments on the relevant SPA reports, and provided no counter-proposals. These changes were included in V2 of the Rules. GBRf's objection is, it appears, simply because the change is informed by TRIP analysis, and NR repeats its global comments.