Timeline

Pre-Knowledge of the Blockade

* Network Rail first became aware of P2018/2294514 at the beginning of the year. This block is known from previous years. Identifying and allocation capacity on the diversionary routes (the West Coast Main Line in particular) has proven difficult due to the nature of the block running continuously for 23 days.

Pre-Work

* Freightliner bid for their aspirations on 23rd February 2018 and following later conversations, were confident that all of the paths were valid and therefore Train Planning Rules compliant with other services on the network
* Timetabling work on MAY18 was suspended on Wednesday 7th February 2018 due to complications with the delivery of the MAY18 timetable
* On 21st February 2018, Network Rail took a freeze of the MAY18 timetable at the time and spent 6.5 days identifying potential paths on the West Coast Main Line, which was the main pinch point last year
* Hourly paths were provisionally identified, ready to be used when the Informed Traveller Recovery Plan commenced.

Validation

* Validation commenced ahead of plan with Week 15 (14 days were allocated to identify these paths and 11.5 days for Week 16.) Our normal productivity measures cater for our Planners to each deliver the validation of approximately 18 trains per day but we allowed additional time to explore additional options due to the complexity of the diversion. We allocated the same Planner who worked within the freeze, along with other area experts.
* Network Rail prioritised regular runners over those which have not ran in the past 4 months. This information is ascertained via the billing data.
* Freightliner’s expectations have been managed throughout the duration of validation by both me and my lead Planners. At the Freight Forum in Manchester, I read a list of 9 possible rejections but we still had another 2 days to review these services and visit any which had not been started.
* Informed Traveller holds a conference call every Tuesday to update Operators of progress. Freightliner did not dial into the conference on the week of this offer, which was Tuesday 15th May 2018.
* Throughout the validation process, Network Rail has applied initiative in amending trains consequentially to maximise capacity and splitting off individual days if we can offer the majority of an SX path
* Unfortunately Network Rail were unable to find schedules for all Freightliner services that met with TPR requirements. 14 services were rejected as a result on Friday 18th May 2018 for Week 15 and 15 services for Week 16 on Friday 25th May 2018
* The reasons for the rejections clearly stated where the capacity constraints were and featured as foot-notes in both the PDF document and Offer Summary spreadsheet

Work Since:

* FLIm lodged a Timetabling Dispute on 21st May 2018 for Week 15 and on 29th May 2018 for Week 16, against the rejected services which are attached. We have now offered paths for the entirety of Week 15 (currently awaiting approval) and are continuing to roll the schedules into Week 16 (these should be an absolute replica and therefore carry no issues.)
* Network Rail invited Freightliner to spend some time working collaboratively in Milton Keynes but this was declined.

Communication and collaboration

* Regular contact has been had with Freightliner throughout the duration of this work. There have been phone calls alone made to Chris Chadwick on the following dates:
  + 17th May, 18th May, 21st May, 22nd May, 25th May, 29th May, 30th May, 31st May, 4th May, 5th May, 6th May
* Freightliner were regularly invited to spend time with Network Rail (14th May, 21st May and 25th May) to identify solutions collaboratively together which would allow greater clarity, certainty and speed in determining if there were any suitable paths. On all occasions, Freightliner declined and did not propose an alternative date.
* Network Rail went to Freightliner’s offices on Friday 1st June to work through potential solutions using TPS and a read-only version of TRUST (no TPR values were applied.)
* Suggested a live planning telephone conference on 5th June between Thomas James and Chris Chadwick, which was declined.

Additional Information Required:

* Additional information that would have assisted the validation process would have been the providing of next workings (which has been requested but not supplied), terminal times and non-runners

How NR has applied the Network Code:

Network Rail has complied with 4.4.1 (b) in that our Network Rail Variation Requests were not inconsistent with the rules. Network Rail made the decision to keep certain trains not directly affected by this possession in their original WTT slots. We have continued to make some amendments throughout the validation process and since the Dispute, which is why numbers have continued to reduce. Freightliner also do not consider there to be any other timetable parties involved. Overall this decision allowed us to balance the number of consequential amendments with maintaining WTT services to allow capacity for Freightliner’s Network Rail Variation Requests. This application of the code has meant a lesser focus on D4.6.2 because we did not have valid slots to apply this to.

Network Rail has complied with 4.6.2 (b) in that we prioritised regular runners over trains which had not been evidenced to run in the past 4 months.

Network Rail has complied with 4.6.2 (a) by rejecting services just for one day to allow for the compliant running of a Network Service, which is scheduled to run.