



a Genesee & Wyoming Company

TTP2320

Freightliner Response to Hearing Chair's Fifth Directions Letter

4. I can confirm Freightliner accepts it did not provide an access proposal/bid for 4050 as part of it's submission for this week to Network Rail.

As outlined in our SRD, this was due to the CPPP not requiring operators to bid for changes. Were Network Rail to require bids, the 'Structure for the Amended Train Plan' section of the CPPP entry should have confirmed this, as is typically the case, as per the example below:

At or Between	Lines Affected	Remarks
<p>Network Rail Western & Wales Route CPPP 2024/25, Period 02, Wk 08 Section B Data freeze: CPPP_2425_P02_102:</p>		
<p>GW500 GW5 A READING TO COGLOAD JN VIA WESTBURY & FROME A/LS - Continued</p> <p>ITEM 107 CONTINUED</p>		
<p>POSSESSION ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</p> <p>STRUCTURE FOR THE AMENDED TRAIN PLAN Network Rail require operators to prepare revised bid for retimings EAS, Section 5.</p> <p>TRACK MAINTENANCE Y05a TRACK RENEWALS SITE SURVEY</p> <p>Eng. Access Statement v4, Section 5 Possession Status : Agreed Disruptive : to passenger</p>		
<p>WEDNESDAY 22 MAY</p> <p>Ref. No. P2024/3766660 REPEATED ITEM Item 52 SEE FULL DETAILS UNDER GW105</p>		
<p>WEDNESDAY 22 TO THURSDAY 23 MAY</p> <p>Ref. No. P2024/3910415 Possession Manager Western Route Planning West</p>		
Item 108	Fairwood Jn and Blatchbridge Jn	Down Westbury/ Down Frome Avoiding Line Possession
	Blatchbridge Jn and Fairwood Jn	Up Frome Avoiding Line/Up Westbury Line Blockage (Between Trains)
		2245 to 0540 WED THU
		PL Stoneblowing 111m21ch and 116m6ch W2024/10503514[Cost][AP]
<p>PROTECTION LIMITS</p> <p>POSSESSION PROTECTION THROUGHOUT Down Westbury/Down Frome Avoiding: Beyond W902 points# to Approach W921B points#</p> <p>LINE BLOCKAGE [WHEN TAKEN] Up Frome Avoiding/Up Westbury: W920 points to W901C points</p>		
<p>TRAFFIC REMARKS</p> <p>SINGLE LINE WORKING OVER UP MAIN/UP WESTBURY BETWEEN WESTBURY SOUTH JN AND CLINK ROAD JN. ALL DOWN WESTBURY AVOIDING SERVICES TO DIVERT VIA WESTBURY STATION. ALL DOWN SERVICES TO DIVERT VIA FROME.</p> <p>SINGLE LINE WORKING TO COMMENCE AFTER PASSAGE OF 2V84.</p> <p>HANDSIGNALLER REQUIRED OPPOSITE W110</p>		
<p>STRUCTURE FOR THE AMENDED TRAIN PLAN Network Rail requires operators to prepare a revised bid with the additional allowances.</p> <p>Down services (travelling on Up) [13]</p> <p>[5] Pilot Brief [5] reduced speed allowances</p>		

This is different to the Traffic Remarks section of the CPPP entry, quoted by Network Rail in para 4.2.2 of it's SRD. Freightliner agree with Network Rail's interpretation of the Traffic Remarks.

Further, Network Rail have previously agreed with Freightliner that there is no requirement to submit a bid in these circumstances, as evidenced by the below email exchange (the full version can be supplied at the hearing):

From: John Sadler <SadlerJ@freightliner.co.uk>
Sent: 08 August 2019 09:42
To: James Rory <Rory.James@networkrail.co.uk>
Cc: Andrew Bramman <BrammanA@freightliner.co.uk>; Christian Prankitt <PrankittC@freightliner.co.uk>; David Smith <SmithD@freightliner.co.uk>; Mark Holt <HoltM@freightliner.co.uk>; EXTL: Lunham Mark <lunhamm@freightliner.co.uk>; James Thomas (MK) <Thomas.James2@networkrail.co.uk>; Bloye Stuart <Stuart.Bloye@networkrail.co.uk>
Subject: IT Meeting 7th August

Good morning Rory,

Following on from our meeting yesterday please see a summary of my recollection of what was discussed and agreed;

FLHH will submit a .PEX file in support of the TW18 bid commencing with the WK45 bid

A .PEX file will be submitted for;

Additional schedules

Amended schedules

Cancelled schedules

The above .PEX files will include schedules identified in TW22 data provided by Network Rail as 'Foul'.

Schedules identified in TW22 data provided by Network Rail as 'Weave' or 'SLW' will not be commented in the TW18 bid and FLHH expect Network Rail to amend running line[s] as appropriate, retaining operational stops where included in WTT schedule, and identify an acceptable path where trains are affected by SLW.

The additional and amended schedules included in the .PEX files will include route and operation stop requirements but not include any TPR allowance[s].

Where an SRT is missing for an additional or amended schedule the schedule will not be included in the .PEX file but a commentary will be included in the covering email.

The paper bid will include an additional column to flag schedules that have been included in any .PEX file.

Network Rail subsequently responded:

From: James Rory <Rory.James@networkrail.co.uk>
Sent: 08 August 2019 10:17
To: John Sadler <SadlerJ@freightliner.co.uk>
Cc: Andrew Bramman <BrammanA@freightliner.co.uk>; Christian Prankitt <PrankittC@freightliner.co.uk>; David Smith <SmithD@freightliner.co.uk>; Mark Holt <HoltM@freightliner.co.uk>; Mark Lunham <LunhamM@Freightliner.co.uk>; James Thomas (MK) <Thomas.James2@networkrail.co.uk>; Bloye Stuart <Stuart.Bloye@networkrail.co.uk>
Subject: RE: IT Meeting 7th August

Good Morning John,

I was just in the process of writing a similar email so thanks for sending this so promptly.

I agree with the below and am happy to agree with your summary.

In response to your below queries

- Clarification the TW02 Response and Formal Offer timescales.
- RSB Formal not highlighting instances when the schedule[s] is impacted by agreed possessions

The TW02 Response timescales we discussed are as follows;

We will send our TW02 checks across on a Tuesday preferably, with a response from yourselves on the Wednesday for the TW01 Friday and Saturday (but a whole response would always be the preference)
 We will then aim to have TW01 FO SO items back to yourselves by Thursday of TW02 with anything beyond the TW01 SO being completed and finalised by Wednesday of TW01. Hopefully this makes sense.(I have a crude timeline below as it isn't the easiest to follow!)

Freightliner believe, where such agreement has been made, and operators have not been requested to provide an access proposal, the process outlined in D3.4.12 is nullified.