**Non-accommodation of train slots in the New Working Timetable (Dec 24)**

**0B18DA 20:55 Robeston Sdgs – Margam L.I.P. WO [ABC]**

**0B33DB 21:53 Robeston Sdgs – Margam L.I.P. FSX [ABC]**

**0B41DH 21:39 Robeston Sdgs – Margam L.I.P. WO [ABC]**

**6A11DB 21:52 Robeston Sdgs – Theale Puma MWO and TThO [ABC]**

**6A11DC 22:37 Robeston Sdgs – Theale Puma MO, TO, WO and ThO [ABC]**

**6A11DE 22:37 Robeston Sdgs – Theale Puma FSX [ABC]**

**6B17DB 20:55 Robeston Sdgs – Westerleigh Puma DBC TO [ABC]**

**6B17DB 21:19 Robeston Sdgs – Westerleigh Puma DBC WO [ABC]**

**6B17DC 20:55 Robeston Sdgs – Westerleigh Puma DBC MThO [ABC]**

**6B17DD 20:54 Robeston Sdgs – Westerleigh Puma DBC MThO [ABC]**

**6B17DD 21:19 Robeston Sdgs – Westerleigh Puma DBC TWO [ABC]**

**6B47DB 19:05 Westerleigh Puma DBC – Robeston Sdgs FSX [ABC]**

**6B47DE 19:04 Westerleigh Puma DBC – Robeston Sdgs FSX [ABC]**

**Correspondences**

* **04.04.24 Received Non - Accommodation notice 04.04.24**
* **08.04.24 Internal emails from Graham White 08.04 – providing a set of paths W&W had been “working on” no discussion of if they will work?**
* **09.04.24 Duncan Campbell looked at path paths do not work as Theale doesn’t open until 06:00.**
* **09.04.24 Graham confirms there were only give paths for 6A11, 6B33, 6B41, 6B47, 6B17**
* **09.04.24 DL email Laura Heslop asking to speak with route team to find out what has happened to non-accommodate these trains.**
* **09.04.24 DL receives email form Laura Heslop confirming she is speaking to Paul Singleton, manager of Wales and Western.**
* **10.04.24 DL speaks with Laura via telephone who confirms that the route team for W& W followed procedure and sent the section 4 email off on 04.04.24 as the route was foul of GW900.15 GW900.16.**
* **10.04.24 Response sent my Dave Llewellyn “RE: Dec 24 Non-Accommodation of DBC Trains due to Section 4 Possession Opportunities GW900” explained on this email the number of trains non accommodated is more currently than the soon to be rolled back ECML ESG in which we worked collaboratively with, yet NR sent a straight non accommodation email to us despite having firm rights and being regular runners.**
* **11.04.24 Phone call from Paul Singleton 12.11pm “expressing his apologies for the non accommodation email and explained the paths are now “set” to be non accommodated and that if they knew Graham has sent the email to put this into dispute, then they would have provided a head up and discussed this better. He explained that Richard Hooper approached W&W to ask if they can “retime” the paths so that he can amended the section 4 possession for GW900.15 GW900.16. He said that Richard had done this via the “back Door” and that in hindsight he should have asked Richard to go down the correct route.**
* **10.04.24 14:47 Richard Hooper calls. Discusses for over 60 mins via telephone. Explained that “he thought” that W&W were going to provide alternative paths so that he could expend the possession. He said that he would not have extended the possession to know out the BDC Robeston services if he knew there was nothing else on the table. Richard explains that the whole project is way over budget and may get pulled anyway, I explain to Richard the paths have access rights – he was unaware – I asked why has 6B19 been included in the EAS to be “allowed” to pass through. Richard explained that this is because it’s a MoD train that must run and hes happy that its in there because it “NEVER RUNS”. I asked why not just leave it off then? It seems like one rule for the GB path and one for DBC, he didn’t have much explanation to this. I asked if he could roll back the EAS to previous and allow our trains to run but in the background we will work collaboratively? He didn’t seem inclined to do this although he seemed happy to block the train in the first place on the “assumption” W&W were working on this. I explained that this is fuel for Heathrow Airport there is huge pressure for this service to run, this could cause shortages at airports and forecourts and have as much ramifications as not running the MoD path.**
* **Laura Arranges meeting for Weds 17.04.24**
* **17.04.24 Meeting Richard Hooper, Laura H, Paul S, Rachel H, Q, DL, DC, WM, PR – see email of notes “Section 4 Possession Opportunities GW900 - Call Notes 13:00 17/04/2024” one idea after the call was to look at what options that could work with the possession staying as it is, Duncan Campbell looking at this, it was stated in the meeting that if a solution cannot be found then the EAS will be rolled back.**
* **23.04.24 Duncan email sent “West Wales Resignalling Project – Sept24 onwards” copying in DBC internal contacts. Proposal that DBC could resource 6 services 2100 Robeston – Westerleigh 04:18 set back to arrive Robeston 18:45, then retime 0A11 Margam – Robeston earlier and retime 6A11 Robeston – Theale, this is on the agreement that PUMA will not want any extra services.**
* **23.04.24 email sent to Rachael Hann to retime 6A11, 0A11, 0B33.**
* **25.04.24 David Munt - Replies explaining that Puma wish to INCREASE its number of trains – this would mean that the alternative plan WILL NOT WORK. The customer stated they rely solely on the railway paths and that they NEED these paths. PUMA have said they will talk directly to NR if need be on this.**
* **25.04.24 – Emails from Phil Roberts & Quentin Hedderly – Issue has been raised on the Industry PMO call. *The point was made that the amended Section 4 footprint to enable re-signalling is in conjunction with a Network Change that has not been established and remains firmly rejected.***
* **30.04.24 – Internal discussion with Wayne Miller, Quentin, Phil Roberts, Duncan, Dave – before meeting on 01.05 regarding Puma. Duncan to look at what options available if NR want a daytime window and Puma are wanting to run trains day and night. (eg additional in the day)**
* **01.05.24 - 2nd Network Rail – DBC call regarding the non-accommodation and EAS.**
* **Was discussed on the call the customer (Puma) was wanting to upscale the number of petroleum trains to 12/14 per week. In doing so scuppers any plan to run only in the daytime Q paths. Of the flexes was a request to cross country to flex one train and the response was NO!**
* **DBC explained they had spent numerous time and resources looking into options for this and the only space available would be to between 08:00 and 17:00, this is where DBC would not be on the line GW900. This would affect TfW trains which Richard H and colleagues didn’t seem keen to even float the idea to TfW, DBC highlighted again that the decision criteria for this was not shared, and this was highlighted via a non-accommodation notice, despite the traffic having firm rights and regular runners and is more lucrative to the region than the passenger services. Some Network Rail colleagues were informed by Route Manager Nick Millington that this was “heading in the right direction” and was clearly highlighted that this was not going in the right direction. The question again was asked if the trains could just be let though but again this was not merited with much positivity despite it being an option. Nick Coles asked for a call to be created with senior members of NR/DBC/TfL for next week to see what can be achieved and wanted to produce a paper to summarise the issue. Graham White highlighted that most possessions on this route have been disputed, he also highlighted T18 is going out on Friday this week 03/05 and that DBC would not be allowing any changes to its services.**
* **Again, Richard mentioned on record that the EAS would be rolled back if no solution found. DBC cannot find a solution as it is bound to its customer to run in the current plan. We cannot move services to arrive during the day as the paths are too heavy to run during the day and would hoover up capacity Around Cardiff, Newport & Severn Tunnel.**
* **If nothing can be achieved then EAS to be rolled back or dispute to stand and hearing to be arranged.**
* **Wayne Miller produced notes for this paper on 03/05/2024**
* **15th May 2024 – Catch up call. Again asked what options could work. With the customer insisting that they will need the path and with the flexes Duncan Campbell looked at not satisfying the engineering times needed for the project it would not work. On this agreement, there is going to be an investment meeting on Friday 24/05 to decide if the project can still take place in the current windows.**
* **17th May 2024 – Investment meeting – but no feedback presented to DBC.**
* **21st May 2024 – Follow up email to Nick Coles asking for an update from Dave L. Scott Beech replied to state the meeting took place on Friday and the decision would be put back another 4 weeks. This would mean that the timetable would be offered in 4 weeks’ time with our 17 paths non accommodated. This is not acceptable, and Richard keeps stating on record that he will roll back the EAS but this is not the case.**
* **Phil has asked for meetings to continue and reiterate that DBC will go to dispute if this is not solved by Wednesday 28th May 2024.**
* **Richard hooper is on holiday until then and not in position to roll back until then. Laura is working with Nick Coles for next steps.**