6 March 2024

**IN THE MATTER OF PART D OF THE NETWORK CODE**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF TIMETABLING DISPUTE TTP2388**

BETWEEN

GBRf

Claimant

and

NETWORK RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED

Defendant

WITNESS STATEMENT OF

Maria Lee

I, **MARIA LEE,** of Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd, 1 Eversholt Street, London, NW1 2DN will say as follows:

1. In November 2023 Ian Kapur (GBRf) had mentioned to the Wessex Route Director Matthew Pocock that GBRf were concerned with the volumes of late change from the Wessex route impacting the GBRf business.
2. Matthew Pocock spoke to me (Maria Lee Head of Planning Wessex) about GBRf’s concerns. I reviewed our data and the numbers that were being discussed by GBRf did not reflect the numbers of late changes Wessex route had data on.
3. I proposed to GBRf that we meet up and review the numbers and how we could work together to support GBRf.
4. The meeting was held on 6th December 2023. The meeting was attended by Ian Kapur (GBRf), Tom Mainprize (GBRf), Maria Lee (NR) and George Long (NR).
5. We had long dialogues about the volume of late changes and the figures GBRf had versus the figures NR Wessex had. I understand that the figures being identified by GBRf had reached the governmental departments.
6. GBRf stated that they were ‘overwhelmed’ by numbers, and that they could not continue with this volume as things could be missed. We quickly established that this was ‘touch points’ if you like rather than actual changes that impacted GBRf. As they were receiving requests, decisions and notifications for every change being made, whether they impacted them or not.
7. We discussed various solutions as to how NR Wessex could support GBRf by reducing the number of touch points, these covered:

* Point One: Access Planning checking TPS to see if GBRf were affected by any late notice access request (My team had access to both TPS (Train Planning System) and Trust and had the competency to use the system).
* Point Two: GBRf providing a list of locations they did not run services on in the WTT
* Point Three: Provision of a periodic ‘rainbow report’ so that the touch point would be one document but with the changes highlighted so easy for a reviewer to identify changes.

1. Point one was considered acceptable by GBRf as an easy check to establish if they were impacted by the change.
2. Point two GBRf felt that they could not provide this detail as they could be running somewhere not in the WTT at short notice but if TPS was being checked that would be helpful
3. Point three we are awaiting GBRf’s response to the ‘rainbow report’ so that next steps can be identified.
4. I can confirm that this statement is a true representation of my recollection of the meeting with GBRf.

Maria Lee

Dated: 06 March 2024