

## SO140 TIMELINE

- Item was on LSER's wishlist to look at – no other operators had expressed an interest in this at the time
- 5<sup>th</sup> December 2019 - First expression of interest from another operator came in the shape of Freightliner which was made at the TPR Forum held on this date. Expression of interest made to look at this LOR due to recently taking over the contract for Hothfield and what this could potentially mean for Freightliners' services. A site visit recommended. Checking the meeting notes, GBRf were not in attendance at this meeting, but had the notes as per usual, as TPR Forum notes are distributed to all TPR participants

According to the TPR forum minutes, discussion took place regarding the Swanley to Otford section of SO140. The headways on this section have not changed, so are not under dispute. Confirmed GBRf not in attendance (JB sick and DG attending another TPR forum in Reading). Minutes issued 18/12/19.

- 21<sup>st</sup> January 2020 TPR Forum notes mention a recent visit by LSER and GTR to the Victoria Box to look at Headways on the top section of the SO140 route between Swanley and Otford Junction. GTR couldn't make it on the day due to their representative having a bad back, but it was noted that the Headways on this section of the route do not need to change (GBRf's Dan Grainger in attendance to this meeting). TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants

Again this only deals with Swanley to Otford, which is not in dispute. GBRf did not receive either an invite to Victoria.

- 5<sup>th</sup> March 2020 TPR Forum notes a visit to Ashford and Maidstone Boxes planned with MW to look at a number of things like Junction Margins, Line Codes and Headways, and invited Freightliner along on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020. Freightliners' representative agreed that when looking at the headway values, he was surprised at them considering the number of signals involved – i.e. are low considering the signal spacing involved. Probably not looked at since Eurostar ran down that way. Maidstone East to Bearstead only 2 signals for example and 4 miles. 6-7 minute headways suggested by Network Rail's Local Ops Ben Haslam. (GBRf's Dan Grainger in attendance to this meeting). TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants

Minutes state "BH thought just off the top of his head, that we could be looking at 6 or 7 minute headways when following a freight or a stopping service, so is intrigued to see our findings", which is not the same as a suggestion.

- 10<sup>th</sup> March 2020 - Calendar Placeholder sent out for Friday 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020 as per discussions had at TPR Forums to both LSER and Freightliner – no-one else expressed an interest in the visit. TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants

GBRf not invited to Ashford/Maidstone visit (as per TPR forum, visit was primarily around Freightliner's operations at Hothfield).

- 12<sup>th</sup> June 2020 - Visit of course didn't happen to either box due to CV19 – noted in TPR Forum notes. (GBRf's Dan Grainger and Jason Bird in attendance to this meeting).

OFFICIAL

- 6<sup>th</sup> August 2020 - Referenced again at the TPR Forum around wanting to get the site visit again in place once possible due to CV19 (GBRf's Dan Grainger in attendance to this meeting). TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants
- 1<sup>st</sup> October 2020 - Again referenced around revisiting at the TPR Forum (GBRf's Dan Grainger in attendance to this meeting). TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants
- 13<sup>th</sup> November 2020 – Network Rail sent email to all potentially affected parties (except GTR as this had been covered by the top section visit to Victoria ASC) including SouthEastern, DB Cargo, Freightliner and GBRf around data obtained so far. Further Signalling Detail provided in the days following to GBRf as requested. Inference of the email sighted issues Network Rail were having with Headways and the stark contrast between the “north” end of the route and the “south”. South end noted again around penning in a visit once able to both Signal Boxes (Ashford IECC and Maidstone East)

Email had an “ODA” report attached (attached). These reports are not precise measures of headway – they cannot be due to the data used – but are indicators of where problems might lie so they can be investigated in detail by other means. Signalling diagrams (including track circuits and overlaps) were requested but not provided (the additional data that was provided did not have the relevant information).

- 17<sup>th</sup> December 2020 – Site visit again spoken about at TPR Forum meeting held on this date - (GBRf's Dan Grainger in attendance to this meeting). TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants
- 9<sup>th</sup> March 2021 – Another TPR Forum held and spoken about getting the visit in at some stage once able (GBRf's Dan Grainger and Jason Bird in attendance to this meeting). TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants
- 4<sup>th</sup> May 2021 TPR Forum, again reference to visit looking to pen in with LSER and Freightliner. Also first reference of LOR review here also. GBRf's DG and JB in attendance to this – JB commented that Headways are insufficient in some areas from the data MF had sent him previously (13<sup>th</sup> November 2020). Invite extended to all other participants should they wish to attend Signal Box Visit, also LOR detail to be shared once complete
- 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021 TPR Forum – more detail given around LOR review, and the SRT changes required. Signal Box Visit penned in for 27<sup>th</sup> July 2021. Major change involving another operator rather than LSER was Otford to Swanley, looking to increase from 7'00 to 8'00. No GTR service runs direct (intermittent stations Eynsford & Shoreham) between the two however but could of course impact them. LSER and GTR spoke around the impact this has from Otford Junction and upwards, with SouthEastern confirming that with timetable work which had been done further south in the Up direction, this would mean more of a chance of right time arrival at Otford Junction which means a further gap between GTR and LSER services. (GBRf's Dan Grainger in attendance to this meeting). TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants.

Again, this relates to Otford to Swanley, which is not under dispute.

OFFICIAL

- 16<sup>th</sup> September 2021 TPR Forum – noted that the Signal Box Visit to look at this was pushed back until 15<sup>th</sup> October 2021. GBRf's DG and JB in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants

GBRf has no record of an invite for the Maidstone visit (GBRf was unable to attend this day anyway due to DG on leave and JB in the north of England on other business).

- 9<sup>th</sup> December 2021 TPR Forum notes mention around Box Visit had taken place to Maidstone Box. Network Rail, SouthEastern and Freightliner shared an email chain with their findings, 2 stations within the same signal section which basically shoots up the headway, 6-7 minutes likely here with this in mind. Bearsted to Maidstone East looking like perhaps a 6½ minute section but could arrive on a single yellow noted by Freightliner . Action noted for Network Rail, SouthEastern and Freightliner to finalise headway values for Version 2's inclusion. GBRf's DG and JB in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants
- 27<sup>th</sup> January 2022 – Meeting notes that SO140 meeting between Network Rail, SouthEastern and Freightliner is due Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022 ahead of Version 2 to finalise and publish into Version 2 directly. GBRf's DG in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants.

Minutes actually say: "Some changes here in the offing though not finalised, a meeting is due for this next week" and later in the same document "Area has been looked at and final detail to be drawn up next week with a meeting which is being held around this". Meeting invite for 31/01/22 sent out later that day and subsequently changed to the following day on 31/01/22 due to availability.

- 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022 - It was decided not to publish directly into Version 2 and wait until Version 3 during the meeting held around this. Email sent out with confirmation of what was discussed to all on this date after the meeting – GBRf's DG and JB on the email chain

Result was "the general consensus was this was too large a potential impact to following trains (earlier starts, crew change/patterns and so forth) to assess and be in for December 22, so this **would be better suited for May 23 now**" (01/02/22 email refers; our emphasis).

- 25<sup>th</sup> February 2022 – Version 2 response received from Freightliner referencing agreement had been reached around Headway changes and to publish these within Version 3 as agreed. Response reads - "Revised headways needed following stopping trains in both directions on this line of route. As values are now agreed, please include in Version 3 for consultation"

Not relevant to this dispute.

- 17<sup>th</sup> March 2022 - TPR Forum notes talk about the above response received from Freightliner. Network Rail also had an action to re-send out the Headway proposals to all as GBRf's JB couldn't recall seeing anything. Network Rail has asked for comments to be received before Version 3's publication. GBRf's JB in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants
- 18<sup>th</sup> March 2022 – Network Rail re-sent revised Headways email first sent out on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022

This did not however include any details of how the numbers were deduced.

## OFFICIAL

- 6<sup>th</sup> May 2022 - Official response received from GBRf in response to draft publication in Version 3 citing “further detailed work and assurance that SouthEasterns SRT’s are not overinflated” to agree the change
- 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022 - Noted in TPR Forum notes that Network Rail had re-sent the Headway table ahead of Version 3. This work was supplemented by the SRT changes also coming in on the line in terms of adjustments, and then would be formally changed come December 22 with the adjustments forming part of the SRT. Noted that GBRf’s DG was happy with this as he had had feedback from GBRf’s JB that trains were waiting around (2 trips JB completed had taken place before this TPR Forum hosted on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022). GBRf’s DG in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants

Minutes say: “MW went onto add that this **will** sit with the Passenger line of route review, of which the SRT changes will come into effect from May 22 (next week) in terms of adjustments, and the formal SRT changes will then subsequently trump the adjustments formally from December 22” (our emphasis), which implies work on SRTs is due. Note that GBRf has had no involvement in that process either then, or since.

- 24<sup>th</sup> June 2022 – Version 3 official response sent by Network Rail to GBRf in response to Version 3’s publication, and items discussed at the last TPR Forum. This detailed that Network Rail has been present and part of the review on this line of route review, cited the site visit to Maidstone East to complete the Headway review and this was made in conjunction with both LSER and Freightliner

But without any involvement from GBRf or any substantiating detail.

- 28<sup>th</sup> June 2022 - Page Turn even held ahead of the issuing of Version 4, with both GBRf’s JB and DG in attendance. Headway proposal still live, notes added in top section between Swanley and Otford Junction around where a 3 minute headway can be applied in this section. No mention or query to take it out at all or discussion had as part of the page turn event. GBRf’s JB and DG in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants. DG was only via Teams however, JB attended in person

MF was advised at that meeting that the Otford to Ashford headway changes from Version 3 were still not agreed, again due to the lack of evidence and review of SouthEastern’s SRTs. Nothing is minuted about a SO140 headway discussion.

- 5<sup>th</sup> August 2022 - Version 4 response received – item still present and same response received
- 5<sup>th</sup> September 2022 – Network Rail responded to GBRf’s Version 4 response with the same response as Version 3, as Network Rail thought this to be addressed and complete.
- 8<sup>th</sup> September 2022 – Item discussed at the TPR Forum held on this date. Noted that Network Rail re-iterated the fact that the Headway changes had been made as well as the SRT’s on the line of route, so all should now be ok here. GBRf’s DG in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants

The meeting minutes note that this is still not an agreed change.

OFFICIAL

- 25<sup>th</sup> November 2022 - Version 1 response received from GBRf– again this item was on their response
- 15<sup>th</sup> December 2022 - Item still on Version 1 response which came in and discussed at TPR Forum. Similar stance given here by Network Rail to the Version 1 response, in that this should all now be complete in terms of Headways and SRT's also in the system and working today. LSER noted a 16% on time performance improvement/benefit on the LOR since this had gone live. Network Rail also highlighted that no they had been made aware of no other issues or concerns on the route from Local OPS or various planning teams. GBRf's DG in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants

The meeting minutes note that this is still not an agreed change.

- 13<sup>th</sup> January 2023 – Version 1 response sent by Network Rail in response to the continued presence of this item. Network Rail believed this item to be closed and was an old item.
- 25<sup>th</sup> January 2023 - Page turn event held ahead of Version 2's issuing. Item not brought to the attention or disagreement with, so as far as NR are concerned the item is completed and therefore is included in Version 2 issued on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2023. GBRf's DG in attendance to this meeting and TPR Forum notes distributed to all TPR participants
- 24<sup>th</sup> February 2023 – Version 2 response received. Response item updated in response to Version 2 being issued, with the addition of the potential of taking Network Rail to dispute following the Headway's being included into Version 2. The ask from GBRf, is to revert the numerical values to Dec 22's TPR's (Version 2) as part of a Version 2.1 is from GBRf. These were 3 minutes for Non-Stopping trains, and 4 minutes for stopping.
- 15<sup>th</sup> March 2023 - Network Rail challenged GBRf's DG at the last TPR Forum and explained the 15% overall performance uplift for this LOR for the whole of May 22's timetable. Network Rail asked GBRf's DG what exactly GBRf wish to see here? DG went onto explain that JB within GBRf had completed 2 timing runs (before 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022 and the changes being made), one train was late and made up some time, and the second had lots of slack in, had long dwells, as well as not being run on full power. The concern was over the SRT's themselves. Network Rail noted around how they went about the changes to SRT's, looking at historical data (1000's of runs), live timings, and also Network Rail's Michael Fox has an app on his phone which he randomly checks the speeds of the train to ensure they are hitting line speeds. TSR/ESR's are removed and any anomalies, so we get the 75% percentile of trains and base our findings to complete our outputs. GTR followed up with a counterquestion to LSER around if SRT's for outer-suburban services were still set to 75mph so a Networker can achieve them? LSER confirmed this wasn't the case, and from the work completed by themselves in conjunction with Network Rail and Freightliner, there were only a few Networkers running the route. GTR thought it could be a driving standards policy, so the only way to find out 100% would be to be in the cab with the driver. LSER added that the 5% was in the SRT's also. Network Rail took an action to send over the SRT detail to GBRf from the meeting, which was completed on Friday 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023 @ 23:35
- 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023 – Version 2 response sent to GBRf citing the most recent TPR Forms' discussions

## OFFICIAL

- 
- 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023 – TPR Forum notes from 15<sup>th</sup> March issued to all TPR participants