

Assessing the quality  
of Network Rail's  
routes'/System  
Operator's SBP  
stakeholder  
engagement

Report  
June 2018

Office of Rail and Road

Our ref: 23263801







Assessing the quality of  
Network Rail's  
routes'/System  
Operator's SBP  
stakeholder engagement

Report  
June 2018

Office of Rail and Road

Our ref: 23263801

Prepared by:

Steer Davies Gleave  
28-32 Upper Ground  
London SE1 9PD

+44 20 7910 5000  
[www.steerdaviesgleave.com](http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com)

Prepared for:

Office of Rail and Road  
One Kemble Street  
London WC2B 4AN

Steer Davies Gleave has prepared this material for Office of Rail and Road. This material may only be used within the context and scope for which Steer Davies Gleave has prepared it and may not be relied upon in part or whole by any third party or be used for any other purpose. Any person choosing to use any part of this material without the express and written permission of Steer Davies Gleave shall be deemed to confirm their agreement to indemnify Steer Davies Gleave for all loss or damage resulting therefrom. Steer Davies Gleave has prepared this material using professional practices and procedures using information available to it at the time and as such any new information could alter the validity of the results and conclusions made.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
	Summary of the project .....	1
	Structure of the report .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>2</b>
	Identifying stakeholders .....	2
	Stakeholder categorisation and multiple-operator owning groups .....	2
	Interviews .....	3
	Quality Assurance .....	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Results</b> .....	<b>5</b>
	Introduction .....	5
	Anglia .....	6
	Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) .....	9
	London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) .....	11
	London North Western (LNW).....	13
	Scotland .....	16
	South East.....	17
	System Operator (SO) .....	20
	Wales .....	22
	Wessex.....	24
	Western .....	26
	General Feedback .....	27

## Tables

Table 2.1: Stakeholder consultation response rate.....	2
Table 3.1: Stakeholders contacted .....	33

## Appendices

- A Methodology
- B Interview notes

# 1 Introduction

## Summary of the project

- 1.1 As part of its 2018 periodic review (PR18), the Office of Rail and Road (ORR) is conducting a review of Network Rail's strategic business plan (SBP) submissions for control period 6 (CP6), which will run from April 2019 to March 2024. The review includes an assessment of the quality of the stakeholder engagement carried out by each of Network Rail's routes and the System Operator (SO) in developing their strategic plans.
- 1.2 It is noted that ORR has not previously required Network Rail's routes and the SO to engage with stakeholder at a local level, although Network Rail did undertake some stakeholder engagement in the 2013 periodic review (PR13).
- 1.3 To support ORR's review and to ensure it is informed by the views and experiences of the stakeholders themselves, ORR commissioned Steer Davies Gleave to conduct an independent, targeted survey of the routes'/the SO's stakeholders to gather their views on the effectiveness of each of the routes'/the SO's engagement during the preparation of their strategic plans. The survey included interviews with and questionnaires to a wide range of stakeholders.
- 1.4 This report sets out our conclusions of these interviews and surveys with stakeholders, which will inform ORR's review of the effectiveness of Network Rail's strategic plan stakeholder engagement. ORR's findings are set out in the supporting document on Network Rail's strategic plan stakeholder engagement published as part of the overall draft determination.

## Structure of the report

- 1.5 Our report is structured as follows:
  - Chapter 2 provides an overview of the stakeholder consultation survey methodology;
  - Chapter 3 provides a summary of the results of our survey for each route and the SO;
  - Appendix A provides more information on the methodology and includes a full list of the stakeholders invited to participate; and
  - Appendix B provides a record of the interviews undertaken.

## 2 Methodology

### Identifying stakeholders

- 2.1 Following a discussion with ORR, we identified a long-list of stakeholders to target for interviews. A full list of stakeholders that we contacted and invited to participate can be found in Appendix A. A summary of the response rate is shown in the table below.

**Table 2.1: Stakeholder consultation response rate**

Type of stakeholder	Number contacted	Response received	Percentage
Train Operator (Franchised and Open Access) <sup>1</sup>	30	16	52%
Freight Operator	4	1	25%
Infrastructure Owner / Developer	3	2	67%
Funding or Transport Authority	10	8	80%
Local Authority / Development Partnerships	36	6	17%
User Groups and Representatives	11	5	45%
Supply Chain	5	1	20%
Freight Customers	7	1	14%

- 2.2 The survey included three different methods of engaging with stakeholders:

- face to face interviews;
- telephone interviews; and
- an online survey.

- 2.3 The method used was determined by stakeholder availability and their individual preferences concerning method of participation. We have carried out 15 face-to-face interviews and 14 telephone interviews. 12 stakeholders participated in the online survey.

### Stakeholder categorisation and multiple-operator owning groups

- 2.4 In general, stakeholders were able to specify, during the interviewing and surveying process, the routes which were of interest to them.

- 2.5 In selecting the stakeholders, however, it was necessary to predict to some degree which routes individual stakeholders would be interested in, in order to ensure that we would be

<sup>1</sup> Where an owning group comprising multiple operators has been contacted/interviewed, the owning group is counted as a single stakeholder regardless of how many operators it includes. This excludes the case of Greater Anglia, where both an Abellio and an individual operator response were collected; both the Abellio combined response and the Greater Anglia individual response are counted separately.

collecting a broad spread of data across routes and preventing undue concentration on certain routes. For operators, it was assumed that they would express interest in the routes covering all track they operate over. Additionally, it was assumed that all operators and industry bodies would have an interest in the System Operator.

- 2.6 An additional consideration was the fact that some operators are owned by the same owning group. In some cases, we were able to contact the owning group, rather than the individual operator and the representative of this owning group was able to describe the experience of multiple operators.<sup>23</sup>

## Interviews

### Face-to-face and telephone interviews

- 2.7 The interview questions were prepared following a review of the draft strategic plans and ORR's criteria for assessing Network Rail's stakeholder engagement set out in its *Guidance on Network Rail's strategic business plans*<sup>4</sup>. These questions were tailored to reflect the particular interests of different stakeholder groups. At the same time, we sought to ensure that the questions did not constrain discussions during the interviews, and all stakeholders were offered the opportunity to provide further observations on Network Rail's engagement process. This approach ensured that we received:
- responses to a common set of questions, allowing comparison between different stakeholder experiences of engagement across Network Rail routes and the SO; and
  - specific responses providing insights into individual issues of particular concern to stakeholders.
- 2.8 The common list of questions raised with stakeholders through interviews and the online survey is presented in Appendix A.
- 2.9 The questions asked were intended to feed into a common framework by which each route and the SO could be assessed, consisting of five categories:
- stakeholders' views on the nature of the route's engagement;
  - information received by stakeholders from the route;
  - the route's recording and analysis of stakeholder priorities;
  - challenge mechanisms and line of sight; and
  - stakeholders' confidence in the route's engagement process.
- 2.10 These categories are outlined in more detail in Chapter 3.

---

<sup>2</sup> In the case of Greater Anglia, the Abellio owning group response was complemented by an individual Greater Anglia operator response.

<sup>3</sup> For the operator sub-brands comprising the TSGN network (Govia Thameslink Railway, GTR), GTR itself was interviewed but the ultimate owning groups, Govia and Keolis, were not.

<sup>4</sup> Periodic Review of Network Rail, Guidance on Network Rail's strategic business plans (23 February 2017)  
[http://orr.gov.uk/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0017/24173/guidance\\_on\\_network\\_rails\\_strategic\\_business\\_plans.pdf](http://orr.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/24173/guidance_on_network_rails_strategic_business_plans.pdf)

### **Online survey**

- 2.11 The online survey questions mirrored the non-specific stakeholder list of questions, as given in Appendix A. However, the questions were offered separately for each route, in order to allow stakeholders to clearly express opinions about the processes of engagement for individual routes separately.

### **Quality Assurance**

- 2.12 All stakeholders were given an opportunity to review and comment on the interview notes we had taken in order to ensure that the notes recorded represented an accurate reflection of their views.
- 2.13 When stakeholders were contacted for review of their interview notes, a deadline was given for a response, after which, it would be assumed that the stakeholder was satisfied with the note. Almost all stakeholders contacted us to either confirm their acceptance of the note, or to offer us a revised version.
- 2.14 Additionally, two stakeholders (Transport for London and Hutchison Ports) opted to withhold permission for their consultation response to be published.



## 3 Results

### Introduction

3.1 This chapter describes the findings from our survey. We discuss the findings for each route and the SO in turn, commenting on:

- The route's/SO's engagement activities
  - covering the nature of the engagement, as presented by the route itself in its strategic plan;
- Stakeholders' views on the nature of the route's engagement
  - covering the format and depth of the engagement, as understood by the interviewed stakeholders;
- Stakeholders' views on the information received from the route
  - identifying the information and documents that stakeholders suggested they had been given prior to, during, and following the engagement activities;
- Stakeholders' views on the route's recording and analysis of priorities
  - outlining to what extent stakeholders believed that their input had been recorded, assessed and incorporated into outputs;
- Stakeholders' views on the route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight
  - detailing the available options for stakeholders to challenge any element of the strategic plan drafting process, and how far stakeholders were made aware of the process by which their engagement inputs would feed in to the final strategic plan;
- Stakeholders' confidence in the route's engagement process
  - covering whether stakeholders were satisfied that the engagement activity was effective and meaningful, as a component of the strategic plan drafting process.

3.2 In each case, we provide a brief summary of the main findings for the route/SO.

3.3 It is worth noting that the following commentary reflects the opinions of the sample of stakeholders we interviewed. Although attempts were made to consult with as many stakeholders as possible, we have only been able to record the opinions of stakeholders that elected to engage with the survey<sup>5</sup>. Furthermore, it is important to note that our approach only involved engaging with certain individuals within organisations, and it is not possible to establish:

- how widely the views expressed to us are shared across the relevant organisation;
- the individual's definition of what good 'looks like' is;

---

<sup>5</sup> Transport for London (TfL) and Hutchison Ports were interviewed as part of this study, but declined an opportunity to have their views published.

- the differing expectation levels from stakeholders; and
- whether the views reflected in the responses received have been influenced by the stakeholders' prior experience with Network Rail.

3.4 In any event, the following commentary is restricted to the stated experiences of the limited range of stakeholders choosing to participate in our consultation.

## Anglia

---

Interviewees: Abellio (Greater Anglia), Arriva Rail London, CrossCountry, c2c, East West Rail, Essex County Council, Greater Anglia, MTR Crossrail, South East Local Enterprise Partnership, Transport Focus, Transport for London

---

### The Anglia route's engagement activities

3.5 The Anglia route engaged with stakeholders through a range of channels, including workshops, briefings, meetings and deep dive activities. Since March 2017, they have held 30 sessions involving 136 people across 30 stakeholder organisations.<sup>6</sup>

### Stakeholders' views on the nature of the Anglia route's engagement

3.6 Stakeholders' views on the quality of the Anglia route's engagement varied significantly.

3.7 **Arriva Rail London** reported that it attended workshops and bi-laterals with the Anglia route. The stakeholder reported that it perceived the main focus of the workshops was attracting potential funding from local authorities rather than listening to the concerns of the train operators. The stakeholder commented that the message it received was that delivering its performance expectations would not be affordable, and so there was nothing to be achieved by discussing these expectations with the route.

3.8 **CrossCountry** attended all but two of the ten route/System Operator (SO) workshops and reported that the Anglia route's workshop was the least effective. The workshop included attendees from many local authorities and a large number of other stakeholders, which prevented CrossCountry from engaging in detail on its particular priorities.

3.9 **c2c** reported that it was invited to attend workshops with other operators, a practical session with the performance team and bi-laterals with the Route Managing Director. c2c commented that the workshops included subject experts, which c2c found helpful as it enabled the c2c representatives to exchange contact details with the Network Rail experts and arrange follow-up discussions.

3.10 **Essex County Council** reported that it was invited to and participated in round table discussions with the Anglia route and Greater Anglia. The stakeholder commented that there was an already established good working relationship with the Anglia route and the sessions worked well.

3.11 **Greater Anglia** reported that it was invited to the Anglia route's workshops but commented that the format was poor and that it, as one of the route's largest customers, was treated the

---

<sup>6</sup> Anglia Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

same as a Parish Council with an interest in one station. **Abellio**, the Owing Group of Greater Anglia, reported that it had not participated in any meaningful engagement activity and the route had engaged with it too late in the process.<sup>7</sup>

- 3.12 **MTR Crossrail** reported that it was invited to two workshops early in the process, and noted that lots of operators and local authorities attended. The stakeholder also reported that the process hadn't finished, and that the Anglia route continued to engage with them.
- 3.13 **Transport Focus** commented that the stakeholders attending had planned for a significantly deeper engagement than the Anglia route had planned for.
- 3.14 **East West Rail** and **South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP)** confirmed that, notwithstanding their interest in the Anglia route, they were not invited to participate in the consultation process.

#### Stakeholders' views on the information received from Anglia

- 3.15 **Abellio** reported that it was not provided with any information in advance of engagement.
- 3.16 Among the stakeholders interviewed, only **Arriva Rail London**, **Transport Focus** and **MTR Crossrail** reported receiving copies of the workshop presentations in early 2017.
- 3.17 **MTR Crossrail** reported receiving a copy of the draft strategic plan in October/November 2017, which it says it found useful. However, no other stakeholder reported receiving a copy of the draft strategic plan. **Arriva Rail London** noted that numerous requests to the Anglia route to see a draft of the plan had been met with no response.

#### Stakeholders' views on the Anglia route's recording and analysis of priorities

- 3.18 The stakeholders interviewed reported that they did not believe that their comments made during the workshops had been incorporated into the strategic plan. Only **MTR Crossrail** considered that its comments were taken into account, but reported that this only happened in the second draft of the plan, in February 2018.
- 3.19 **Abellio** reported that it was not aware that its views were recorded and reported, as no record of conversations was provided. The stakeholder noted that as a result it appeared to them that feedback could not have been taken into account.
- 3.20 Both **Arriva Rail London** and **CrossCountry** reported writing letters to the Anglia route following the workshops, setting out their priorities. Both stakeholders reported that they considered that these priorities had not been taken into account in the preparation of the strategic plan.
- 3.21 **c2c** reported that its comments had been recorded in the minutes from the workshop but, in most areas, not reflected in the strategic plan.
- 3.22 **Essex County Council** reported that its comments had been recorded.
- 3.23 **MTR Crossrail**, **Arriva Rail London** and **CrossCountry** all reported writing to Network Rail about their priorities, but only MTR Crossrail reported receiving a response. MTR Crossrail

---

<sup>7</sup> Greater Anglia is a part of the Abellio Transport Holdings group, which is ultimately owned by Nederlandse Spoorwegen. Abellio Transport Holdings also incorporates other train operating companies, as well as Greater Anglia. Further details of these were given in **Error! Reference source not found.**

confirmed that the points they raised to Network Rail had been incorporated into the second draft of the strategic plan.

- 3.24 **Transport Focus** suggested that the workshop was documented, and the notes subsequently circulated.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the Anglia route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

- 3.25 **Abellio** reported that there was no opportunity to challenge the decisions made by the Anglia route. The stakeholder noted that it would have been good to see what the mechanism was for feedback as the stakeholder was not convinced of the effectiveness of this mechanism. **Greater Anglia** reported that there was follow up on some specific access challenges and some other workshops but no feedback from the route on the outcome of the challenges.
- 3.26 **c2c** reported that it was able to challenge the strategic plan but that it did not appear to materially change the output. The representatives commented, "we were listened to sympathetically". c2c suggested that the output appeared to be predetermined and the purpose of the consultation was to allow the operator to have its say before telling them what had already been decided.
- 3.27 **Essex County Council** reported that it was not given the opportunity to review their comments and that they weren't taken into account in the strategic plan, and commented that the Anglia route's reasoning wasn't explained.
- 3.28 **MTR Crossrail** reported that it did challenge the Anglia route on cost estimates in a letter to the route, but reported that the answer received from Network Rail was dismissive and did not include any reasoning or justification. However, it did consider that the presentation the Anglia route circulated following the workshops, explaining how the stakeholder feedback had been addressed, was good.
- 3.29 **Transport Focus** suggested that it had not been asked to comment on the notes that were circulated.

#### **Stakeholders' confidence in the Anglia route's engagement process**

- 3.30 **Abellio, CrossCountry** and **Arriva Rail London** all stated that there was little value in the Anglia route's engagement process.
- 3.31 **Abellio** said that it was disappointed with their lack of involvement and suggested they would have expected more ongoing dialogue. **Greater Anglia** reported the consultation process for CP6 to be worse than the consultation for CP5 as there were no discussions around enhancements and the route had no interest in the needs of its customers.<sup>8</sup>
- 3.32 **Arriva Rail London** reported that the Anglia route had not responded to numerous efforts to engage.
- 3.33 **c2c** reported that the level of communication was better than in CP5, noting that the opportunity to meet subject matter experts was appreciated, but the Anglia route's own seeming lack of ability to influence the process was a weakness.
- 3.34 **Essex County Council** reported that it has a good working relationship with the Anglia route and that they have regular dialogue on the Beaulieu Park project (which includes the

---

<sup>8</sup> Enhancements fell outside the scope of the strategic plans for CP6.

construction of a new station on the outskirts of Chelmsford). However, it noted that other authorities not involved in specific Network Rail projects may have a different view of the level of consultation. The stakeholder also commented that it didn't consider itself to have the ability to influence decisions in the strategic plan.

- 3.35 By contrast, **MTR Crossrail** reported that the Anglia route's approach to engagement was good, although it considered the time taken to provide information to stakeholders between the February 2017 workshop and the draft strategic plan being issued in October/November 2017 to be excessive.
- 3.36 **Transport Focus** suggested that there had been a mismatch between stakeholder and route expectations regarding the appropriate depth of engagement, noting the impression that the route was obliged to consult but was not seeking to fully understand stakeholder views. The Anglia route had asked Transport Focus for a statement confirming that the engagement was effective, but Transport Focus refused to provide this.

### **Summary**

- 3.37 There was a significant difference in the experience of stakeholders of the effectiveness of the Anglia route's engagement activity. Among the train operators with an interest in the route, only MTR Crossrail and c2c reported having a positive experience. Other stakeholders were strongly critical of the lack of communication and consideration of their priorities and concerns. In particular, Abellio and Greater Anglia, the Anglia route's lead operator, reported that they did not feel consulted or engaged, and Transport Focus refused the route's request to confirm that the engagement had been effective.

## **Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)**

---

Interviewees: CrossCountry, DB Cargo UK, Hutchinson Ports, Nexus, Rail Freight Group, Transport Focus

---

### **The FNPO route's engagement activities**

- 3.38 The FNPO route engaged with stakeholders through six CP6 customer-focused events, with over 60 different customers, end users and stakeholders represented. These were supplemented with cross-industry groups and regular meetings.<sup>9</sup>

### **Stakeholders' views on the nature of the FNPO route's engagement**

- 3.39 **CrossCountry** reported that it was invited to all of the FNPO route's initial workshop stakeholder events in February and March 2017 as well as follow-up sessions in June and July 2017. All engagement took place via workshops held at the stakeholder's own offices.
- 3.40 **DB Cargo UK** reported that it attended the first workshop but that there was limited engagement from the FNPO route following that. The stakeholder reported that the workshop was well conducted with good opportunities for interaction and debate.

---

<sup>9</sup> Freight and National Passenger Operators Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

3.41 **Hutchinson Ports** confirmed that it had been invited to and attended three consultation events in June, August and September 2017. In line with company policy, the stakeholder requested that no further views should be published.

3.42 **Nexus** reported that it has an interest in the FNPO route but was not consulted.

3.43 **Rail Freight Group** reported that it took part in discussions and workshops, and commented that the format of engagement was good overall.

#### **Stakeholders' views on information received from the FNPO route**

3.44 **CrossCountry, Transport Focus** and **Rail Freight Group** reported that they were kept up to date with each draft of the strategic plan.

3.45 **DB Cargo UK** reported that it was provided with the information that was set out at the workshop, including a questionnaire seeking input from the stakeholder on what they would like the FNPO route to do.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the FNPO route's recording and analysis of priorities**

3.46 **CrossCountry** suggested that more could have been done by the FNPO route to involve other routes, as the FNPO route is a facilitator rather than an asset manager. The stakeholder acknowledged that there was representation from LNW at the second workshop, but noted that without other routes present, wider priorities wouldn't be heard.

3.47 **DB Cargo UK** reported that some of its views were taken into account but the scorecard doesn't reflect what the stakeholder wanted. The stakeholder reported that it considered the FNPO route's engagement process to be 'OK' in terms of understanding the freight customer.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the FNPO route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

3.48 Both **CrossCountry** and **Rail Freight Group** reported that, although it was not made explicit, there was an opportunity to escalate concerns.

#### **Stakeholders' confidence in the FNPO route's engagement process**

3.49 **DB Cargo UK** reported that the FNPO route did not have the most engaging process out of the workshops it attended (noting the SO as being the most engaging).

3.50 No other specific comments were offered by stakeholders interviewed.

#### **Summary**

3.51 CrossCountry is a key stakeholder for the FNPO route and its involvement in the process reflected this, attending the FNPO route's workshops and sitting down with an individual contact at the route to discuss the plans for CP6. CrossCountry highlighted that more could have been done by the FNPO route to engage other routes and DB Cargo UK reported that it did not find the process particularly engaging. Both CrossCountry and Rail Freight Group received draft strategic plans and were kept up to date throughout the process, although the timescales for providing feedback were short.

## London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

---

Interviewees: Arriva Rail North, CrossCountry, East West Rail, HS1, Grand Central, Nexus, North Yorkshire Moors Railway, Rail North, West Yorkshire Combined Authority

---

### The LNE&EM route's engagement activities

- 3.52 The LNE&EM route engaged its stakeholders via six CP6 stakeholder workshops across three geographic areas and via a number of bi-lateral meetings with passenger operators and Freight Operating Companies (FOCs).<sup>10</sup>

### Stakeholders' views on the nature of the LNE&EM route's engagement

- 3.53 **Arriva Rail North** reported that it had attended the workshop but offered no further opinion on the method of engagement.
- 3.54 **CrossCountry** was critical of the format of the workshops and reported that it had to attend two workshops in order to communicate its views. It commented that the LNE&EM route separated out East Coast Mainline from the other stakeholders and didn't recognise that CrossCountry, Northern and TransPennine Express all operate on the route. CrossCountry noted that there was a second workshop that took place following this feedback.
- 3.55 **HS1** and **East West Rail** say they have an interest in the LNE&EM route but that they weren't consulted with.
- 3.56 **Nexus** attended two workshops that, it reported, focused on issues of interest to it as an operator. This took the format of briefings and break-out sessions on particular subjects, such as performance targets. Nexus reported that the workshops were well structured, but noted that not enough had been known on the format in advance of the workshop.
- 3.57 **North Yorkshire Moors Railway (NYMR)** reported that it attended all meetings available to it, which included seminars (the stakeholder attended one in Derby), Time Table Risk planning forums and regular meetings with the performance manager at Network Rail. It commented that the format of engagement was very good.
- 3.58 **Rail North** attended two multi-stakeholder workshops and reported that the LNE&EM route was upfront about its inability to deliver the full performance output. It said that this meant there was no surprise when the draft strategic plan came out.
- 3.59 **West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA)** reported that it wasn't consulted and commented that this was despite having a close working relationship with Network Rail in the past.

### Stakeholders' views on the information received from the LNE&EM route

- 3.60 **Arriva Rail North** reported receiving copies of presentations and the draft strategic plan. The stakeholder commented that it had to chase for further iterations of the plan.
- 3.61 **NYMR** reported receiving presentations from the LNE&EM route.

---

<sup>10</sup> London North Eastern & East Midlands Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

3.62 **Grand Central** noted that it had received the strategic plan in advance, but had to request this first.

3.63 **Rail North** reported that it had received no information in advance.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the LNE&EM route's recording and analysis of priorities**

3.64 **CrossCountry** reported that feedback at the workshop was recorded on a white board but not attributed to stakeholders. CrossCountry said it sent the LNE&EM route a letter, and noted that some of its content had been taken into account in the final version of the strategic plan.

3.65 **Nexus** reported that its views were not captured formally.

3.66 **Rail North** reported that it wrote to the LNE&EM route to seek further dialogue but received no response.

3.67 **WYCA** reported that it was not consulted on drafts of the strategic plan, which it considered to have been a lost opportunity in inputting into the effects of prioritising one scheme over another.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the LNE&EM route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

3.68 **Arriva Rail North** and **NYMR** reported that there was an opportunity to escalate concerns.

3.69 **CrossCountry** commented that feedback during the process was provided to stakeholders from the LNE&EM route on a few key areas.

3.70 **Grand Central** suggested that there was no opportunity to review what had been recorded at the workshops by the route.

3.71 **Nexus** reported that there was limited scope for change and consideration of feedback. It noted that the draft strategic plan prepared before the workshop showed no mark-up of changes made.

#### **Stakeholders' confidence in the LNE&EM route's engagement process**

3.72 **Arriva Rail North, CrossCountry, Nexus** and **WYCA** reported that the engagement process was not effective and that there was no clear engagement strategy. CrossCountry commented that it provided input to the process, but noted that this did not mean that it considered itself as having been consulted by the route.

3.73 **Grand Central** reported that the flaws in the engagement strategy left the strategic plan with a low prospect of success.

3.74 **Rail North** and **NYMR** reported a more positive opinion on the LNE&EM route's approach. NYMR commented that their views were taken into account and it was a good consultation process with an opportunity to contribute. Rail North reported that they were engaged with and there was an awareness from the LNE&EM route on the stakeholder's role.

#### **Summary**

3.75 There was a difference in opinion among stakeholders about their experiences of the LNE&EM route's engagement. Rail North and NYMR noted that the process was of value and as a stakeholder they were engaged, while Arriva Rail North, CrossCountry and Nexus were critical of the process. Arriva Rail North, CrossCountry, WYCA and Nexus commented that their priorities were not reflected in the strategic plan despite active engagement and that draft plans were not provided as often as they should have been.



## London North Western (LNW)

---

Interviewees: Abellio (Merseyrail, West Midlands Trains), Amey, Arriva Trains Wales, CrossCountry, Chiltern, East West Rail, Rail North, Merseytravel, Nexus, Stockport Council and South Manchester Community Rail, Transport Focus, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), Transport for London, Virgin Trains

---

### The LNW route's engagement activities

- 3.76 The LNW route commenced engagement in October 2015 and engaged with stakeholders through workshops and already-existing meetings.<sup>11</sup>

### Stakeholders' views on the nature of the LNW route's engagement

- 3.77 **Abellio (representing Merseyrail)** reported that following a short phone call, the LNW route agreed to a separate meeting with Merseyrail. However, Abellio commented that this was not effective as the meeting took place too late to make any material changes to the strategic plan and meant that Merseyrail's needs were not taken into account in the plan.
- 3.78 **Arriva Trains Wales** attended the initial workshop (which it described as high-level and wide-ranging) and received updates on progress through the LNW Route Infrastructure Investment Review Group (RIIRG). It chose not to attend subsequent meetings as it thought its views were adequately represented through Arriva UK Trains' nominated PR18 engagement lead.
- 3.79 **Chiltern** attended the LNW route workshops but reported that the workshops took place in early 2017 before the strategic plan had been written, which, it suggested, was too early in the process. The stakeholder reported that it was not consulted with or updated as the plan developed. The stakeholder reported that the engagement process was not clear.
- 3.80 **Merseytravel** attended a workshop in Manchester and also had regular meetings with Network Rail where the strategic plan was raised. The stakeholder reported that it had the opportunity to provide comments if it wished to. Merseytravel commented that the workshop involved stakeholders and the format was useful and "what you would expect". The stakeholder commented that the engagement was more about the process than content.
- 3.81 **Nexus, East West Rail, Stockport Council and South Manchester Community Rail** said that they were not invited to participate in any engagement activity.
- 3.82 Both **Rail North** and **CrossCountry** considered the workshop to be the primary form of engagement. CrossCountry was offered a pre-workshop bi-lateral and commented that it thought the LNW route workshop to be 'best practice' as it was inclusive and provided an opportunity for priorities to be shared. CrossCountry was also updated via regular business as usual meetings.
- 3.83 **Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)** reported that it was invited to one launch event by the LNW route in summer 2017, but was not invited to any other discussions. The stakeholder

---

<sup>11</sup> London North Western Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

reported that the launch event had no interaction and, in its opinion, could not be classed as a workshop.

- 3.84 **Virgin Trains** reported that it was invited to and attended one workshop which it described as “death by PowerPoint”. The stakeholder reported that the workshop didn’t provide an opportunity to input.

#### **Stakeholders’ views on the information received from the LNW route**

- 3.85 **Abellio** reported that it received the finalised scorecard following production of the strategic plan.
- 3.86 **Arriva Trains Wales** received a template for providing views for CP6, a summary of issues from the workshop, a revised draft strategic plan and a final strategic plan, which it says it found very useful.
- 3.87 **Merseytravel** reported that it received information prior to the workshop on the LNW route’s emerging process for delivering the strategic plan and a copy of the presentations and summary of views after the workshop had taken place. The stakeholder commented that it found the information helpful and good.
- 3.88 **Transport Focus** reported that it had received the workshop agendas and the strategic plan, though it did not indicate whether it received the strategic plan in advance of the LNW route’s engagement or subsequently.
- 3.89 **TfGM** reported that it received the draft strategic plan before meeting with the LNW route. It commented that this was a strength of the process.
- 3.90 **CrossCountry** reported receiving a copy of the draft strategic plan at one point during its development.
- 3.91 **Virgin Trains** reported that it was only able to see a draft trajectory for CP6 through informal channels and that it was not invited to comment formally.

#### **Stakeholders’ views on the LNW route’s recording and analysis of priorities**

- 3.92 **CrossCountry** reported that the LNW route’s engagement was effective in capturing priorities, making use of a break-out group discussion approach. It did note that views were not attributed to particular stakeholders.
- 3.93 **Merseytravel** reported that its views were recorded and it was given an opportunity to review the record. The stakeholder commented that it will find out whether its views were taken into account over the years to come, but as far as the process was concerned, there was a recognition of the views it had expressed.
- 3.94 By contrast, **TfGM** reported that its views were not recorded at the event it attended and **Chiltern** had no visibility of how its input would be considered until it viewed the December 2017 strategic plan.
- 3.95 **Virgin Trains** reported that its views were not recorded by the LNW route.

#### **Stakeholders’ views on the LNW route’s challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

- 3.96 **Chiltern** reported that there was a lack of a formal process with no clear timescales or milestones. The stakeholder commented that there was no visibility of how its priorities were considered.

- 3.97 **CrossCountry** provided feedback to the LNW route via email and confirmed that Network Rail provided a response. However, it noted that the feedback was not reflected in the strategic plan.
- 3.98 **Merseytravel** reported that it was given an opportunity to correct its recorded views as a matter of course and encountered no problems with this process. The stakeholder reported that there was also opportunity for the stakeholder to escalate any concerns through the Liverpool city region programming board where the strategic plan has a standing agenda item.
- 3.99 **TfGM** reported that it had provided written comments to the LNW route on the draft strategic plan as there was no opportunity to provide feedback at the meeting it attended. The stakeholder also noted that the draft strategic plan was incomplete and missing a significant amount of content. The stakeholder commented that this meant the opportunity to consult on the whole content of the strategic plan was lost.
- 3.100 **Virgin Trains** reported that it escalated its concerns to the route about the lack of engagement and the contents of the strategic plan (in particular, the scorecard). The stakeholder commented that the LNW route responded with the offer of a bi-lateral meeting that took place. However, Virgin Trains reported that this came too late in the process to make a meaningful difference.

#### **Stakeholders' confidence in the LNW route's engagement process**

- 3.101 **Abellio (representing West Midlands Trains)** noted that the LNW route had not, in its opinion, made any effort to engage with the mobilisation team for the new operator.
- 3.102 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that the LNW route was organised in its engagement process. The stakeholder comment that there was direct communication and more opportunities to engage than its primary route of interest (Wales), which surprised it.
- 3.103 **Chiltern** reported that the process was very weak.
- 3.104 **Merseytravel** reported that the consultation process was good and that it allowed it to understand what was happening with the strategic plan. The stakeholder commented that the LNW route "gave it a good shot" and there was genuine interest from the LNW route in its stakeholders.
- 3.105 **TfGM** reported that engagement was not a two-way dialogue and that it would have preferred a workshop approach that encouraged trust and collaboration.
- 3.106 **Virgin Trains** reported that it was disappointed with the LNW route and saw the process as a lost opportunity. The stakeholder further commented that the LNW route's engagement was worse under CP6 than it had been for CP5.

#### **Summary**

- 3.107 There was a difference in opinion among participating stakeholders on their experience of the LNW route workshop. TfGM commented that the format was not appropriate to facilitate engagement, Virgin Trains said it was disappointed, Merseytravel had a positive experience and Rail North and CrossCountry regarded the initial workshop as 'best practice'.

## Scotland

---

### Interviewees: CrossCountry, Transport Focus, Transport Scotland, Virgin Trains

---

#### Scotland's engagement activities

- 3.108 Network Rail Scotland engaged with stakeholders through existing quarterly Route Investment Review Group (RIRG) meetings, specific stakeholder workshops undertaken in February and September 2017, cross-industry events and more detailed sessions with Transport Scotland and ORR.<sup>12</sup>

#### Stakeholders' views on the nature of Scotland's engagement

- 3.109 **CrossCountry** reported that it was not able to attend the Scotland workshop due to the short notice given, along with the timing of the meeting. The stakeholder offered no further specific comments on the engagement.
- 3.110 **Transport Scotland** reported attending an event in December 2017 / January 2018 as well as an earlier event. The stakeholder attended all workshops to which it was invited and commented that feedback from all the Transport Scotland representatives that had attended the workshop was that engagement was well organised.
- 3.111 **Virgin Trains** reported that it had attended several workshops in Scotland and described them as being good sessions with a high level of engagement with stakeholders.

#### Stakeholders' views on the information received from Scotland

- 3.112 **Transport Focus** suggested that it had received the strategic plan, the workshop slides and the scorecard.
- 3.113 **Transport Scotland** could not confirm that suitable engagement materials had been provided.
- 3.114 No other stakeholder interviewed made specific comments on the information they received.

#### Stakeholders' views on Scotland's recording and analysis of priorities

- 3.115 **Transport Scotland** could not confirm that its views had been recorded by Scotland. During the interview, their representatives commented that they were still not happy with the contents of the strategic plan, which in their view does not reflect the priorities for which the funds have been provided.

#### Stakeholders' views on Scotland's challenge mechanisms and line of sight

- 3.116 **Transport Scotland** noted that it had escalated its concerns about its priorities not being reflected in Scotland's strategic plan to ORR, copying Network Rail.
- 3.117 **Virgin Trains** stated that Scotland did an excellent job in trying to gather input from stakeholders. The stakeholder reported that Scotland was aware of which stakeholders were in agreement or opposition with one another and didn't shy away from having "good debates" in meetings.

---

<sup>12</sup> Scotland Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

### **Stakeholders' confidence in Scotland's engagement process**

- 3.118 **Transport Scotland** reported that it did not see the engagement process as being effective as it did not address Transport Scotland's concerns. The stakeholder acknowledged that while it was important to recognise that Scotland had undertaken some engagement activity, its failure to adequately take account of the requirements of its main funding body was a major concern.
- 3.119 **Virgin Trains** reported that Scotland was very active in its engagement and the consultation was as effective as it needed to be for the stakeholder.

### **Summary**

- 3.120 Both Transport Scotland and Virgin Trains appeared to be satisfied with the engagement process undertaken by Scotland. However, as a funder, Transport Scotland has a significant interest in Scotland's outputs and said it remains concerned that its strategic plan does not reflect its priorities.

## **South East**

---

Interviewees: Amey, Arriva Rail London, DB Cargo UK, East Sussex County Council, Govia Thameslink Railway, HS1, Kent County Council, London Underground, South East Local Enterprise Partnership, South Downs National Park, Southeastern, Transport Focus, Transport for London

---

### **The South East route's engagement activities**

- 3.121 The South East route engaged with stakeholders through meetings, workshops, exhibitions, presentations and questionnaires.<sup>13</sup>

### **Stakeholders' views on the nature of the South East route's engagement**

- 3.122 **Arriva Rail London** reported that it attended a workshop and follow-up "drop in" session. The stakeholder commented that the format of the engagement was good and it was listened to.
- 3.123 **DB Cargo UK** reported that it was invited to two workshops. The stakeholder commented that the first workshop appeared to follow a traditional format where the route presented its plans in detail and asked for oral and written feedback. The second workshop was structured along the lines of a 'market stall' session.
- 3.124 **East Sussex County Council (ESCC)** said that it was invited to and attended the Kent and Sussex workshops in February 2017 and an exhibition in April 2017 which presented the route's more detailed thinking. The stakeholder commented that the workshop contents were appropriate and gave attendees an opportunity to raise issues. The stakeholder noted that the number of people from the rail industry at the events, compared to local authorities, may have diluted the local authority's voice.
- 3.125 **Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR)** reported that it was not able to attend all the workshops but attended some of the detailed sessions. It noted that the first workshop involved the South

---

<sup>13</sup> South East Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

East route presenting its plan for CP6 which was followed by one or two workshops that focused on priority areas.

- 3.126 **HS1** said that it was invited to and attended one workshop.
- 3.127 **Kent County Council** attended two stakeholder workshops which it described as “well-attended events”. The stakeholder reported that the groups at the workshop were deliberately mixed with different types of stakeholders, which enabled a productive and engaging discussions. The stakeholder also attended bi-laterals with the South East route and commented that they maintain good ongoing dialogue.
- 3.128 **South Downs National Park** has an interest in the South East route but had no recollection of being invited to participate in the consultation.
- 3.129 The **South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP)** was not engaged in the process.
- 3.130 **Southeastern** reported that it had been engaged with the South East route for a “significant period” which involved representatives, including senior managers, attending several workshops through the consultation process. The stakeholder commented that this was supplemented with weekly bi-lateral meetings, progress meetings and joint forums. Southeastern commented that the workshops were well structured and gave an opportunity to generate and discuss ideas and to list their requirements. The stakeholder commented that it had the overall impression that the workshops were inclusive and well organised.

#### Stakeholders' views on the information received from the South East route

- 3.131 **Arriva Rail London** reported that it received joining instructions in advance of workshops and copies of the presentations given. It described the information as “somewhat useful”.
- 3.132 **Arriva Rail London** and **DB Cargo UK** reported receiving draft copies of the strategic plan.
- 3.133 **DB Cargo UK** reported that it was invited to review multiple documents in parallel, which was not possible over the three week period available. The stakeholder commented that much of the information received was passenger specific, with more limited relevance to freight.
- 3.134 **East Sussex County Council** reported that some information on the workshop content was provided in advance.
- 3.135 **GTR** commented that it was provided with draft copies of the strategic plan and invited to comment on them.
- 3.136 **HS1** received copies of the strategic plan which they reported finding “somewhat useful”.
- 3.137 **Kent County Council** reported that the information provided in advance was useful and helped to inform discussions at the workshop.
- 3.138 **Transport Focus** suggested that it had seen the strategic plan “at a glance”.
- 3.139 **Southeastern** reported that it was consulted on the agenda for the workshops and the presentation material, and that it received notes from the workshops.

#### Stakeholders' views on the South East route's recording and analysis of priorities

- 3.140 **Arriva Rail London** reported that it was provided with an opportunity to write to the South East route and share its priorities. The stakeholder noted that these were taken into account in the development of a performance measure for Arriva Rail London in the 18/19 Scorecard.

- 3.141 **GTR** reported that an honest attempt was made by the South East route to explain the rationale in the strategic plan. GTR commented that it had come in to the engagement process late and the timing may have limited GTR's ability to influence the process in the early stages.
- 3.142 **East Sussex County Council** reported that a facilitator took notes at the workshop.
- 3.143 **Kent County Council** reported that its views were recorded at the workshop and in the minutes and commented that its views had been taken into account.
- 3.144 **Southeastern** reported that it was listened to but that the final outputs of the strategic plan fall far short of its expectations.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the South East route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

- 3.145 **Arriva Rail London** reported that it raised a specific, technical question in relation to the strategic plan in the follow-up drop-in workshop with the South East route. The stakeholder commented that it did not receive a response.
- 3.146 **East Sussex County Council** reported that it didn't recall being given an opportunity to review or correct the workshop notes. The stakeholder commented that although the strategic plan was well presented, it did not provide much detail or explicit feedback along the lines of "we asked, you said, we did".
- 3.147 **GTR** reported that it was given an opportunity to review and correct the notes from the workshops.
- 3.148 **Kent County Council** couldn't recall needing to challenge anything but reported that it was confident of the channels to raise concerns if that had been the case.
- 3.149 **Southeastern** reported that it had opportunity to review and correct the notes from the workshop and did so on a number of occasions.

#### **Stakeholders' confidence in the South East route's engagement process**

- 3.150 **Arriva Rail London** described the engagement process as "good" and that it considered that its views had been heard. However, the stakeholder noted that the South East route seemed "behind the curve" in starting the stakeholder engagement process, compared to the LNW route, when it first engaged in February 2017.
- 3.151 **DB Cargo UK** suggested that the South East route's approach in the second workshop was much more open, compared to other workshops.
- 3.152 **East Sussex County Council** reported that in general terms, the consultation process has been effective and it was helpful to be involved. The stakeholder noted that it appeared that local authorities were under represented.
- 3.153 **GTR** reported that it was consulted and that the South East route made a good attempt to involve stakeholders, especially on the scorecard. GTR commented that a lot of effort had been put into the process by the South East route and that the workshops were very well presented. GTR also commented that there was significant focus on engineering and asset renewal and less focus on passenger needs.
- 3.154 **HS1** reported the process to be too structured and too big. The stakeholder commented that engagement appeared to be compliance based rather than "value added". The stakeholder reported that the South East route spent most of the time dealing with Network Rail Centre rather than liaising with customers.

- 3.155 **Kent County Council** reported that it considered the consultation process to be very effective and included a high level of engagement with stakeholders. The stakeholder noted that interactions with the South East route were frequent and detailed and that there was a willingness by the South East route to take on issues.
- 3.156 Although **SELEP** was not engaged in the process, the stakeholder considered that the strategic plan shows that Network Rail has addressed the correct high-level objectives – supporting economic growth, attracting businesses, and providing a robust network.
- 3.157 **Southeastern** reported that there was genuine engagement during the consultation process and there was regular contact. The stakeholder commented that it has concerns with the output of the process but not the consultation process itself.

### Summary

- 3.158 The stakeholders that we spoke to that participated in the South East route's stakeholder engagement activity were relatively positive about the engagement process. This included both operators and local authorities. In particular, the second "drop-in" workshop was appreciated by stakeholders.

## **System Operator (SO)**

---

Interviewees: Abellio (Greater Anglia, Merseyrail, West Midlands Trains, ScotRail), Association of Community Rail Partnerships, Arriva Trains Wales, CrossCountry, c2c, East West Rail, Essex County Council, Greater Anglia, HS1, Kent County Council, Nexus, Rail North, Rail Freight Group, Southeastern, Transport Focus, Transport for London, Virgin Trains

---

### The SO's engagement activities

- 3.159 The System Operator (SO) engaged with stakeholders from spring 2017 onwards through workshops, one-to-one meetings and email.<sup>14</sup>

### Stakeholders' views on the nature of the SO's engagement

- 3.160 **Abellio** reported that it was consulted only after the development of the strategic plan and not during the drafting process. It attended a post-publication workshop. It also noted that Merseyrail had received a five-minute phone call in relation to the SO scorecard and that there was no further engagement following this.
- 3.161 **Arriva Trains Wales** was invited to the workshops but chose not to attend them all due to time constraints, and **Rail Freight Group** was invited to attend a workshop for the SO but did not attend due to diary constraints.
- 3.162 **CrossCountry** reported that it was invited to the workshops but chose not to attend as it was already represented by its owning group, the Arriva Group.

---

<sup>14</sup> System Operator Strategic Business Plan, December 2017.



- 3.163 **c2c** reported that it attended a consultation event in Manchester which was described as well-received and helpful. c2c commented that the SO engaged more through one-to-one conversations rather than formal consultations but didn't offer any further comments.
- 3.164 **Greater Anglia** suggested that it had not been invited to the workshops and only received a copy of the draft strategic plan after its submission.
- 3.165 **HS1** and **East West Rail** have an interest in the SO but were not consulted.
- 3.166 **Kent County Council** attended several workshops, bi-laterals and a smaller forum for a focused local authority discussion with key London Boroughs, Medway and some businesses. The interviewee commented that the SO was excellent in engaging stakeholders.
- 3.167 **Nexus** reported that there were two workshop events. It commented that an interesting feature of the second workshop was that other infrastructure managers (such as Nexus, TfL, East-West Rail, HS1 & HS2) had a separate session from for additional focused discussions, which the stakeholder said it found very useful and informative.
- 3.168 **Rail North** reported that the SO held a one-to-one discussion with it on the strategic plan in summer 2017. It stated that this demonstrated a clear understanding of Rail North's role and that the SO embraces it as an important player.
- 3.169 **Virgin Trains** reported that there was limited engagement with the SO at the beginning of the process but that there was more activity later on. Virgin Trains commented that the SO acknowledged it started late and was "making up for lost ground".

#### **Stakeholders' views on the information received from the SO**

- 3.170 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that it received working papers, the draft strategic plan and final plan and found the information to be very useful.
- 3.171 **CrossCountry** reported that it had received a matrix listing stakeholder feedback prior to the December 2017 workshop.
- 3.172 **Rail Freight Group** stated that it had received information which it found somewhat useful.
- 3.173 **Transport Focus** reported that it had received a draft strategic plan, a workshop agenda, and preparatory reading material.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the SO's recording and analysis of priorities**

- 3.174 **Rail North** and **Nexus** reported that their views had been recorded by the SO. Rail North was unable to comment on whether its views had been incorporated into the strategic plan as it had not had the opportunity to read it.
- 3.175 **Abellio** reported that its feedback had not been reflected in the published plan.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the SO's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

- 3.176 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that the SO engagement process was open and transparent compared with the route consultation processes it had been involved with (LNW and Wales).
- 3.177 **CrossCountry** and **Nexus** reported being given the opportunity to provide feedback, and CrossCountry reported the ability to escalate concerns.
- 3.178 **CrossCountry** noted that the SO supplied a written feedback form on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2017, but that this process was rushed and that the strategic plan was presented as "a done deal".

- 3.179 **Virgin Trains** also reported that it appreciated the SO's openness and transparency and that the SO took Virgin Trains' questions at face value and appeared to take Virgin Trains' feedback and suggestions on board.

#### **Stakeholders' confidence in the SO's engagement process**

- 3.180 **Abellio** reported that the SO's approach was 'consultation after creation', and not during the drafting of the strategic plan.
- 3.181 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that the SO's engagement was generally good and that it involved operators early in the process when it first began to shape its approach.
- 3.182 **Kent County Council** reported that there was a high level of engagement by the SO with stakeholders and it considered the consultation process to be very effective.
- 3.183 **Rail North** reported that its experience of engagement with the SO was positive as the SO recognised Rail North's statutory role (in contrast with the routes with which Rail North engaged).
- 3.184 **Transport Focus** described the SO's workshop as being better organised than that of the routes.

#### **Summary**

- 3.185 The majority of stakeholders interviewed were complimentary of the SO's engagement process. Stakeholders found the different methods of engagement particularly helpful. Only Abellio and Greater Anglia had a negative experience of the engagement process, reporting that they had only been engaged late in the process. Virgin Trains also said that it had limited engagement in the beginning of the process.

## **Wales**

---

Interviewees: Amey, Arriva Trains Wales, CrossCountry, Transport for Wales, Virgin Trains, Welsh Government

---

#### **The Wales route's engagement activities**

- 3.186 The Wales route engaged with stakeholders through workshops, one-to-one sessions, meetings and discussions.<sup>15</sup>

#### **Stakeholders' views on the nature of the Wales route's engagement**

- 3.187 **Amey** reported that it engaged with the Wales route through bi-lateral discussions and responding to a consultation on the strategic plan. The stakeholder commented that most of the discussion related to infrastructure and operations.
- 3.188 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that it was invited to participate in the workshops and consultation process. The stakeholder noted that it did not attend the first workshop because Arriva UK Trains was a bidder at the time for the new Wales and Borders franchise and could

---

<sup>15</sup> Wales Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

have been viewed by some attendees as being conflicted in representing the view of the operator.

- 3.189 **CrossCountry** reported that it was unable to send representatives to the Wales route workshops.
- 3.190 **Transport for Wales (TfW)** reported that it was invited to and attended all workshops as well as participating in discussions. The stakeholder reported that the format was relaxed and the Wales route was fairly open to input.
- 3.191 **Virgin Trains** reported that it had limited engagement with the route as it only operates on a small part of the network. The stakeholder reported that it attended business as usual meetings where the strategic plan was discussed.
- 3.192 The **Welsh Government** reported that engagement was through regular, bi-lateral Planning and Strategy Meetings (which are held monthly) in addition to an extra monthly meeting on the strategic plan. However, the stakeholder reported that the strategic plan meetings had frequently been cancelled at short notice with the strategic plan becoming an agenda item at the Planning and Strategy meetings instead. The stakeholder reported that the strategic plan was rarely discussed (two or three times during 2017) in dedicated meetings.
- 3.193 The **Welsh Government** reported that the Wales route held two workshops, which were attended mainly by industry organisations as well as representatives from the Welsh Government. The stakeholder noted that all four original bidders for the Wales & Borders franchise attended. The Welsh Government reported that the first workshop involved presentations and round table discussions. The stakeholder noted that there was limited passenger representation in the workshop, although Transport Focus was present. The stakeholder reported that the second workshop involved lots more talking and engagement with the Wales route.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the information received from the Wales route**

- 3.194 **Amey** reported that it received information in advance of engagement and during discussions through paper summaries and website links. It described the information provided as being very useful.
- 3.195 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that it received a copy of the draft strategic plan and final strategic plan but that the Wales route was not very forthcoming in providing updates and information and the stakeholder had to seek the information itself or gain the information indirectly.
- 3.196 **TfW** reported that it received copies of the workshop presentations and strategic plans which it found somewhat useful.
- 3.197 The **Welsh Government** reported that the Wales route engaged with them at a level towards the minimum end of the possible spectrum. The stakeholder reported that they rarely received the data or information to understand an issue or decision. Network Rail provided the Welsh Government with a draft plan in December 2017.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the Wales route's recording and analysis of priorities**

- 3.198 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that the Wales route focused its attentions more on the Welsh Government as a stakeholder rather than Arriva Trains Wales as the incumbent operator. The stakeholder reported that the communication channels were unclear.

- 3.199 The **Welsh Government** reported there was some discussion of options and priorities at the second workshop, but it was not apparent how the Wales route made decisions.

**Stakeholders' views on the Wales route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

- 3.200 **Arriva Trains Wales** reported that it had sight of most proposals, but that work appeared to be undertaken in isolation from stakeholders and was presented as a "fait accompli" with little opportunity to engage.
- 3.201 **TfW** reported that it had opportunity to escalate concerns to the Wales route planning team but offered no further information on the specifics.
- 3.202 The **Welsh Government** reported that they had requested a plan or a list regarding when the renewals that were cancelled or deferred in CP5 would occur during CP6, but that this was never provided.

**Stakeholders' confidence in the Wales route's engagement process**

- 3.203 **Arriva Trains Wales** provided comments regarding its confidence in the overall engagement process that were common to both the Wales route and LNW route in reflecting its impression of the engagement process. The stakeholder reported that there were not enough opportunities to engage in the process which it attributes to the lack of visibility to Network Rail's planned approach of engagement, a lack of direct engagement at director level and Network Rail underestimating the levels of interest and willingness from their stakeholders to engagement.
- 3.204 **TfW** commented that the approach of the Wales route was fairly engaged and aligned but limited. The stakeholder reported that this was because the Wales route found it difficult to include the Welsh Government's service aspirations as they were not committed given the 'outcome' based nature of the procurement.
- 3.205 **Virgin Trains** reported that although it chose not to actively engage with the Wales route as it only covers a small part of their operations, it was thought that it would have been listened to if it had anything to raise.
- 3.206 The **Welsh Government** reported that they were aware from industry engagement that other routes had been sharing draft strategic plans with stakeholders at a much earlier stage than was the case on the Wales route.

**Summary**

- 3.207 Most of the feedback in relation to this route came from the Welsh Government, which highlighted some perceived shortcomings. However, the Welsh Government broadly agrees with the intent and content of the strategic plan
- 3.208 TfW, Amey and Virgin Trains had a fairly positive experience from the engagement. Arriva Trains Wales reported that it did not have enough opportunities to engage with the process, which may have been to do with its position as the outgoing incumbent of the franchise.

**Wessex**

---

Interviewees: Association of Community Rail Partnerships, CrossCountry, Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership, South Downs National Park, Transport for London

---

### **The Wessex route's engagement activities**

- 3.209 The Wessex route engaged its stakeholders via workshops, email, board meetings and liaison meetings. A briefing pack was also sent to stakeholders.<sup>16</sup>

### **Stakeholders' views on the nature of the Wessex route's engagement**

- 3.210 **Arriva Rail London** reported that it attended a workshop in March 2017 and was invited to a stakeholder board meeting but could not attend due to a diary clash.
- 3.211 The **Association of Community Rail Partnerships (ACORP)** reported that it has an interest in all the routes and the SO but noted that it was only invited to the Wessex route workshop. The stakeholder described the workshop as very good and open. ACORP noted that the Wessex route laid out its thinking for CP6 and made it clear there was a need for funding from third parties to deliver all the route's ambitions for CP6.
- 3.212 **CrossCountry** reported that it attended the workshop plus the stakeholder board which provided updates on the strategic plan as a specific agenda item.
- 3.213 The **Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and South Downs National Park** reported that the Wessex route did not engage with it.

### **Stakeholders' views on the information received from the Wessex route**

- 3.214 **ACORP** received a summary of topics that would be discussed at the workshop in advance. The stakeholder also reported that they did not receive a copy of the draft SPB nor were they invited to comment on it.

### **Stakeholders' views on the Wessex route's recording and analysis of priorities**

- 3.215 **CrossCountry** reported that all participants were given an opportunity to contribute to discussions at the workshops. However, it suggested that the consultation was not particularly effective. The stakeholder acknowledged the route executive seemed quite engaged.

### **Stakeholders' views on the Wessex route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

- 3.216 **ACORP** reported that it was not given an opportunity to comment on the strategic plans prior to publication and so was unable to say with confidence if its views were taken into account the plan.

### **Stakeholders' confidence in the Wessex route's engagement process**

- 3.217 **Arriva Rail London** reported that the level of engagement from the Wessex route was proportionate to its needs, which are not particularly high given the minimal interface its network has with the Wessex route (e.g. at Clapham Junction).
- 3.218 **ACORP** reported that it wasn't in a position to comment on how effective the consultation process had been but it noted that the approach taken by the Wessex route was "excellent". The stakeholder added that the approach would be harder to replicate on larger routes such as LNE.
- 3.219 **CrossCountry** described there being relatively little engagement from the Wessex route compared with other routes.

---

<sup>16</sup> Wessex Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

- 3.220 Although the **Dorset LEP** had no engagement with the Wessex route on the strategic plan, it reported that there has been good engagement with the route on a routine basis and it is possible its views have been taken into account in other forums.

#### **Summary**

- 3.221 The stakeholders we interviewed did not provide much specific feedback about the Wessex route. The Wessex route's key stakeholder, South Western Railway, was not interviewed.

### **Western**

---

Interviewees: CrossCountry, Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership, East West Rail, MTR Crossrail, Transport Focus, Transport for London

---

#### **The Western route's engagement activities**

- 3.222 The Western route engaged with stakeholders through workshops, bi-laterals and online surveys. It used a different approach to engage each group of stakeholders.<sup>17</sup>

#### **Stakeholders' views on the nature of the Western route's engagement**

- 3.223 The Western route engaged with **CrossCountry** in bi-lateral meetings and invited it to two workshops. CrossCountry was complimentary about the engagement, stating that it was considered the best among the routes due to the one-to-one sessions.
- 3.224 The **Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)** reported that it was invited to one workshop, but only at short notice and so could not be represented. The stakeholder considers this oversight to be a missed opportunity.
- 3.225 The Western route did not engage with **MTR Crossrail**, and **East West Rail** reported not being consulted despite its interest in the route.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the information received from the Western route**

- 3.226 **MTR Crossrail** reported that it had to request the strategic plan and remind the Western route that it is a stakeholder for the Western route. However, after receiving a copy of the draft plan, MTR Crossrail reported that it was afforded a reasonable timeframe (1 month) to respond to the consultation.
- 3.227 **Transport Focus** reported that it received the strategic plan and the stakeholder workshop agenda.

#### **Stakeholders' views on the Western route's recording and analysis of priorities**

- 3.228 **CrossCountry** reported that it was consulted on targets for the strategic plan scorecard and agreed them in advance of the draft strategic plan publication. In general, the stakeholder considered that its views were captured in the draft plan.
- 3.229 **MTR Crossrail** reported that the first draft of the strategic plan did not mention it. The stakeholder noted that following an exchange of letters, the Western route arranged a bi-lateral with MTR Crossrail for 9 March 2018.

---

<sup>17</sup> Western Route Strategic Plan, December 2017.

### **Stakeholders' views on the Western route's challenge mechanisms and line of sight**

- 3.230 **MTR Crossrail** reported that it wrote to Network Rail and received responses, and the Western route also responded to letters from CrossCountry<sup>18</sup>. MTR Crossrail also reported providing feedback to the Western route on the draft strategic plan, some of which was incorporated into the second draft. However, the stakeholder stated that it was left with the impression that the draft strategic plan was a *fait accompli*.

### **Stakeholders' confidence in the Western route's engagement process**

- 3.231 **CrossCountry** described the route as having the "best" engagement process. In particular, the stakeholder considered that the second workshop was inclusive, with an opportunity to have priorities heard.
- 3.232 **MTR Crossrail** noted that, as a new operator, the stakeholder is still developing an understanding of the industry forums and channels in which it needs to participate on a regular basis. The stakeholder reported that it might be more effective for operators to engage with Network Rail on SPBs through the Rail Delivery Group (RDG) rather than individually.
- 3.233 The **Dorset LEP** reported that it considers that the engagement did not take proper account of the needs of regions at the margins/borders of the route, and that a more targeted consultation for these regions would have been more effective.

### **Summary**

- 3.234 Some stakeholder comments suggest that the Western route engaged effectively with stakeholders, and its approach to workshops has been described as best practice. However, it appears that the Western route neglected to engage with key passenger and freight operator stakeholders from the outset, making it difficult for them to influence the strategic plan.

### **General Feedback**

- 3.235 This section of the report includes the general feedback we received on the Network Rail stakeholder process as a whole, and which was not about specific routes or the SO.

---

Who we interviewed: Abellio, Department for Transport (DfT), Rail Delivery Group (RDG), Transport Focus

---

### **Abellio**

- 3.236 Abellio, as the owning group of multiple operators, provided some overarching feedback covering multiple routes, in addition to the route-specific comments it offered.

### **Information received**

- 3.237 Abellio reported that they had not received any information from any branch of Network Rail in advance of the engagement taking place.

---

<sup>18</sup> Other routes reportedly did not respond to this stakeholder.

Challenge mechanisms and line of sight

- 3.238 Abellio commented that Network Rail did not explain its decisions, and that no opportunity to challenge those decisions was given. Instead, the only route to challenging Network Rail decisions that Abellio were aware of was through ORR consultation.

Confidence in the engagement process

Abellio did not believe that the engagement process was particularly effective, suggesting that the process began too late, and that the engagement was not conducted with the genuine intention of feeding in to the strategic business plans.

**Department for Transport (DfT)**

- 3.239 DfT confirmed that it had been consulted extensively on the strategic plans, directly through Network Rail and also through other forums such as RDG.
- 3.240 DfT reported that Network Rail made several material changes to the strategic plans in response to DfT's comments. DfT noted that it could escalate any issues to a senior level within Network Rail, and it was clear that action was taken to address their comments. DfT appeared satisfied that the process was transparent, but noted that it was aware other parties held different views. DfT suggested that a single document outlining the process could have helped all stakeholders and enabled further discussion.
- 3.241 DfT reported that they had some reservations about whether the engagement was balanced or was a one-way conversation from Network Rail to stakeholders. DfT noted that some of the strategic plans showed clear evidence of work with train operators to develop better track access strategies and better timetabling, but in other cases this evidence was limited. The quality of engagement varied between routes but did not appear to be driven by whether a route had a single passenger operator.
- 3.242 DfT was unsure how well-prepared and resourced the operators were.

**Rail Delivery Group**

Methods of engagement

- 3.243 RDG suggested that its role was more as an intermediary than as a stakeholder in its own right. Its focus was towards facilitating dialogue between its members and Network Rail's strategic plan teams rather than providing detailed and distinct feedback of its own on the plans. RDG's working groups were a key arena in which these discussions could take place, along with the RDG-led National Task Force on performance trajectories.
- 3.244 RDG has been involved in the majority of Network Rail's stakeholder workshops, and noted that generally, there were two rounds of these for most routes. Notably, RDG felt that its feedback on the process of the first rounds impacted on how the second rounds were conducted. RDG further commented that it was aware of other mechanisms of engagement alongside these, including at pre-existing industry meetings such as Route Investment Review Groups, and bi-lateral conversations between Network Rail and its customers and stakeholders.
- 3.245 RDG considers that it is important for the individual Network Rail routes to be free to shape their own engagement processes with their stakeholders. RDG hoped that, over time, these engagement processes would evolve into a relationship characterised by continuous dialogue.



Information received

- 3.246 RDG considered that stakeholders generally had the opportunity to comment on draft strategic plans that were circulated during the engagement process.

Challenge mechanisms and line of sight

- 3.247 RDG noted that it provided feedback on the engagement formats, which it believed was acted upon.
- 3.248 Building on RDG's role as a facilitator of discussions within the industry, RDG noted that the FOCs have recently sent a letter in support of the FNPO strategic plan to ORR. RDG suggested that this represented industry buy-in to the FNPO strategic plan, and that ORR ought to look favourably upon these efforts by the industry and Network Rail to reach a common position.
- 3.249 On a more general level, RDG commented that a divergence of opinion or disagreement between Network Rail and operators does not necessarily imply a failure of the engagement process. RDG suggested that transparency about the process, and continuous engagement, should be the priorities in circumstances where such disagreement emerges.

Confidence in the engagement process

- 3.250 RDG highlighted that a huge amount of work had gone into the production of the strategic plans, and that much engagement with stakeholders had taken place. RDG suggested that most operators would note that the plans are locally-developed and locally-owned, rather than being determined from the centre. Additionally, the route engagements were not uniform, highlighting that the plans have been developed with a significant degree of independence.
- 3.251 RDG did note that different individuals within a stakeholder organisation may have different opinions regarding the quality of the engagement process.
- 3.252 RDG also thought that it was important to refer consistently to 'engagement', rather than 'consultation', to highlight the two-way nature of the process.
- 3.253 It was further suggested by RDG that the industry should now focus on the future improvements to the engagement process which can be made, based on the lessons learnt from the CP6 process.

**Transport Focus**

- 3.254 Transport Focus was invited to participate in consultations on the strategic plans by all the Network Rail routes, as well as the SO. Where it chose to make comments regarding the engagement by individual routes, these have been incorporated into the route-specific sections above.

Methods of engagement

- 3.255 Transport Focus suggested that the engagement it was involved in was always in the format of a workshop, and highlighted that it had not had any bi-lateral engagement with Network Rail.
- 3.256 It was thought that there was a good level of discussion, although stakeholders often wanted to discuss enhancements, which fell outside the scope of the strategic plans.
- 3.257 Transport Focus was able to secure a ten-minute slot at each workshop event to outline the passenger perspective on the strategic plans.

- 3.258 An area of concern for Transport Focus was that, for some of the events, details were only circulated ten days in advance of the event taking place. This led to difficulties in finding a representative available to attend.

Information received

- 3.259 Transport Focus noted that Network Rail circulated an agenda in advance of the workshops. Combining the information received before and after the workshops, Transport Focus received draft strategic plans, along with workshop materials, for many of the routes. It was thought that this information was useful, and that it provided an honest overview of the CP6 challenge.
- 3.260 Following the workshops, Transport Focus received draft material for the Anglia and LNE route strategic plans.

Challenge mechanisms and line of sight

- 3.261 Transport Focus were clear that it did not intend to escalate any concerns about the process or the strategic plans, but noted that it has communicated with Network Rail's most senior levels in the past, and that it would be able to do so again if it intended to challenge the plans.

Confidence in the engagement process

- 3.262 Transport Focus suggested that ORR might wish to give more direction to Network Rail in future regarding what is required for effective stakeholder engagement.
- 3.263 Transport Focus suggested that the engagement process commenced too late, effectively meaning that all that could be done was the presenting of a near-final draft strategic plan.
- 3.264 Transport Focus thought that the onus fell on itself to ensure that the passenger perspective was incorporated in the strategic plans, as Network Rail did not appear to be taking the initiative on this.

Transport Focus expressed concern about the availability of funding to carry out effective stakeholder engagement, noting that some routes recognise that more needs to be done, but that they are constrained from acting on this by a lack of funding.



# A Interview notes

## Setting up and conducting interviews

- A.1 An email was sent out to all stakeholders identified. It included a letter of introduction from ORR that set out the background to the project and asked stakeholders to participate in either a face to face or telephone interview or an online survey.
- A.2 The initial email was followed up with:
- a reminder email to spur a greater response, which was successful in bringing about further interviews; and
  - phone calls:
    - where we had a number for a specific contact, this was used;
    - for organisations we didn't have a specific contact name for, we contacted the switchboard.
- A.3 We had two dedicated interviewers to undertake the interviews who were supplemented by other members of the project team who had been briefed on the content.

## Designing and distributing the survey

- A.4 The online survey was hosted by SurveyMonkey. The mechanism of the survey allowed respondents to offer information based on individual routes, as opposed to general comments.
- A.5 A link to the survey was distributed in an email to the relevant stakeholders and any stakeholders who were unable to take part in a face to face or telephone interview but still wanted to comment on the process.

## Stakeholders contacted

- A.6 The following table provides a breakdown of all the stakeholders we invited to participate in this survey. The response column indicates whether we received an acknowledgement from the stakeholder, rather than if they agreed to participate in the survey.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Bold text indicates that a response was received from the stakeholder; asterisks indicate that an owning or umbrella group covers multiple individual operators.

**Table 3.1: Stakeholders contacted**

<u>Stakeholder contacted</u>	<u>Responded?</u>	<u>Interviewed?<sup>20</sup></u>
<b>CrossCountry</b>	Yes	F2F
<b>Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR)*</b>	Yes	Tel
<b>Arriva Trains Wales</b>	Yes	Web
<b>Southeastern</b>	Yes	Tel
<b>Abellio*</b>	Yes	F2F
<b>Greater Anglia</b>	Yes	Web
<b>c2c</b>	Yes	Tel
FirstGroup*	Yes	No
<b>Crossrail</b>	Yes	F2F
TfL Rail	No	No
Virgin Trains East Coast	No	No
Eurostar	No	No
<b>Chiltern Railways</b>	Yes	Web
Heathrow Express	No	No
Keolis*	Yes	No
Stagecoach*	Yes	No
<b>Virgin Trains</b>	Yes	Tel
<b>Northern (Arriva Rail North)</b>	Yes	Web
London Midland	No	No
<b>London Overground (Arriva Rail London)</b>	Yes	Web
<b>DB Cargo UK</b>	Yes	F2F
Colas Rail	No	No
GB Railfreight	No	No
Freightliner	No	No
<b>Grand Central</b>	Yes	F2F
<b>London Underground</b>	Yes	F2F
<b>Nexus</b>	Yes	Tel
FirstGroup*	No	No
<b>North Yorkshire Moors Railway</b>	Yes	Tel
Northern Belle	No	No
UK Railtours	No	No
West Coast Railways	No	No
<b>High Speed 1 (HS1)</b>	Yes	Web
High Speed 2 (HS2)	No	No
<b>East-West Rail</b>	Yes	Tel
<b>Department for Transport (DfT)</b>	Yes	F2F
<b>Transport Scotland</b>	Yes	Tel

<sup>20</sup> "F2F" denotes a face-to-face interview, "Tel" denotes a telephone interview, and "Web" indicates that the stakeholder completed the online survey.

<u>Stakeholder contacted</u>	<u>Responded?</u>	<u>Interviewed?<sup>20</sup></u>
<b>Welsh Government</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>F2F</b>
<b>Merseytravel</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>F2F</b>
<b>Rail North</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>F2F</b>
<b>Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Tel</b>
Transport for the West Midlands (TfWM)	No	No
<b>Transport for London (TfL)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Web</b>
Highways England	No	No
<b>Transport for Wales (TfW)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Web</b>
<b>West Yorkshire Combined Authority</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>F2F</b>
<b>Kent County Council</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>F2F</b>
<b>South East Local Enterprise Partnership</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Tel</b>
<b>Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Tel</b>
<b>Essex County Council</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Web</b>
Liverpool Local Enterprise Partnership	No	No
Devon County Council	No	No
Solent Local Enterprise Partnership	No	No
Medway District Council	No	No
London Borough of Bexley	No	No
London Borough of Bromley	No	No
London Local Enterprise Partnership	No	No
Royal Borough of Greenwich	No	No
London Borough of Lambeth	No	No
London Borough of Southwark	No	No
London Borough of Lewisham	No	No
Thames Gateway Kent Partnership	No	No
Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	No	No
Rother District Council	No	No
Hastings Borough Council	Yes	No
<b>East Sussex County Council</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Tel</b>
West Sussex County Council	No	No
Surrey County Council	No	No
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham	No	No
London Borough of Merton	No	No
London Borough of Wandsworth	No	No
Brighton and Hove City Council	No	No
Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership	No	No
Crawley Borough Council	No	No
<b>Transport Focus</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>F2F</b>
London TravelWatch	No	No
Campaign for Better Transport	No	No
<b>Association of Community Rail Partnerships</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Tel</b>

<u>Stakeholder contacted</u>	<u>Responded?</u>	<u>Interviewed?<sup>20</sup></u>
<b>Crewe-Manchester Community Rail Partnership</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Web</b>
Sussex Community Rail Partnership	No	No
Devon and Cornwall Community Rail Partnership	No	No
<b>Rail Freight Group</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Web</b>
<b>Rail Delivery Group</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>F2F</b>
RailFuture	No	No
Railway Heritage Trust	Yes	No
Bombardier Transportation UK	No	No
Hitachi Rail Europe	No	No
Siemens Mobility	No	No
Balfour Beatty	No	No
<b>Amey</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Web</b>
Associated British Ports	No	No
<b>Hutchison Ports</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Tel</b>
Jaguar Land Rover	No	No
North London Waste Authority	No	No
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	No	No
Dover Port	No	No
Tarmac	Yes	No
<b>South Downs National Park</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Tel</b>
Gatwick Airport	No	No

### Interview questions

- A.7 The questions asked in the interviews varied according to the category of stakeholder. There was a general list of questions, applicable to most stakeholders, along with additional sets of questions targeted at the Local Authority or Development Partnership category, the Funding or Transport Authority category and Transport Focus. These are given in the table below.

<b>Question</b>	<b>General</b>	<b>LA/DP</b>	<b>Funder</b>	<b>TF</b>
Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?	Yes	Yes	No	No
Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bi-lateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
If yes, did you take them up on this offer?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
If no, why?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
How did the route/the SO ensure it was securing a consistent and coherent DfT view?	No	No	Yes	No
In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
If no, why?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Question	General	LA/DP	Funder	TF
Did you find the engagement proactive?	No	No	Yes	No
What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were the questions open-ended and encouraging for stakeholders to respond?	No	No	Yes	No
What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
How useful was this information?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Were you given the chance to present all the information/research you wanted to the route/the SO?	No	No	No	Yes
Do you believe the routes/the SO engaged with and took account of the information/research you presented to them?	No	No	No	Yes
Would the routes'/the SO's ability to take account of passenger interests in their plans have benefited from better/more use of information/research (including newly commissioned research)?	No	No	No	Yes
Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Do you think there was enough transparency of the process to stakeholders?	No	No	Yes	No
To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
To what extent did the route/the SO explain the scope of the strategic business plan and how that related to particular railway priorities that you have an interest in?	No	Yes	No	Yes
To what extent did the route/the SO work with you to identify areas of joint or collaborative working?	No	Yes	No	No



## B Interview notes

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Brad Woodworth  
Date 27 February 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Abellio (Rebecca Holding, Head of Infrastructure, Access Management and Strategy)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. The interview was conducted with a representative for an operator of multiple franchises: she noted an interest in the Anglia route, for Greater Anglia; the London North Western route, for West Midlands Trains and Merseyrail; the Scotland route, for ScotRail, and the SO for an overall perspective.
2. The stakeholder was surprised that the centralised NR organisations had specific plans for smaller areas, such as property. This did not come into consultation. The stakeholder was expecting that the routes would have held oversight of these areas.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

3. The stakeholders' views were sought, but the extent to which they were sought was questionable. She noted that this was not an ongoing process.
4. The extent of Anglia's consultation was a very brief. Followed by participation in a large workshop.
5. LNW's consultation with Merseyrail consisted of a phone call "stating what they'd done" Following that, LNW agreed to a separate meeting with Merseyrail, as the strategic plan didn't really incorporate their needs. The TOC feels it's too late to make any material changes to the strategic plan.
6. The SO did seek views from Abellio, but the attitude was of "we've done this" as opposed to "we are doing this." The consultation was not during creation, but afterwards. Feedback was taken but Abellio feels there was not an effective feedback loop. Feedback was not reflected once published.
7. None of the TOCs within Abellio thought that meaningful SO engagement had happened.
8. Abellio UK was not invited or involved in any of the workshops prior to workshop in February, in Manchester.

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

9. Greater Anglia attended a workshops/working groups; although this were town hall meeting affairs and GA held a minority voice, rather than a dominant Operator on the Anglia route.

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

10. The format depended on the TOC:
  - Merseyrail received a 5-minute phone call relating to the SO scorecard, and the stakeholder noted that there was no further engagement following this.
  - There was no engagement with the West Midlands Trains mobilisation team – the stakeholder wondered whether the engagement may have been undertaken by the people at London Midland.
  - For Greater Anglia, the whole engagement took place after the strategic business plans had been produced. The key engagement was a 5-minute conversation, which included an apology for not engaging sooner.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

11. To Abellio's knowledge, they were not invited to any meetings after the initial SO Strategic Business Plan was published. There was a working group established post-publication, along with the February 2018 engagement in Manchester, both of which Abellio attended.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

12. The engagement that did take place happened a little too late, and was in any event too little.
13. The feedback that was given, Abellio is not sure if it was incorporated. It was post production so likely not much will change as things are already signed off.
14. Regarding the conversations that did happen, Abellio doesn't believe they made any material difference to the output.
15. All the engagement that Abellio was involved in was informal.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

16. Merseyrail was only consulted on the SO Scorecard.
17. Abellio admits that it was difficult timing for WMT, with them still mobilising; however, there was no engagement with mobilisation team. By the time that the Strategic Business Plan was in development, WMT had taken on the franchise.
18. Generally, greater engagement earlier on in the process would have been appreciated. A feeling that the engagement would have had an effect would have been good. Abellio doesn't feel that conversations they had were acted on.
19. Greater Anglia would have expected more ongoing dialogue as they are the major player on the Anglia route. The stakeholder suggested that it would have been good to have initial engagement, with a view towards reflecting customer priorities.
20. The stakeholder didn't think that the priorities of the TOC would have been well reflected in the outputs. She suggested that Abellio have raised several flags saying that trajectories between themselves and the routes are not aligned, and that conversations would have allowed them to work towards the same end goal.

21. For Anglia, the stakeholder noted that the Performance Trajectories anticipate all the performance risk of Greater Anglia's new rolling stock, but none of the benefit. There was concern that Network Rail doesn't seem to fully understand this. The stakeholder also suggested that Network Rail has overlaid a lot of risk, and that this would have been useful when working out exit targets for CP6.
22. Abellio has appetite for engagement, but it didn't seem to have happened.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

23. The stakeholder was not provided with any information in advance of the engagement.
24. Information was provided by Merseyrail following production of the plan; however, the stakeholder felt that this was too late. The information provided was the finalised scorecard.
25. Regarding trajectories and exit targets, the stakeholder notes that West Midlands Trains had been given an improvement target of 2%, with a 1% improvement in assets having no justification. Renewals were described as having a like for like target, with projections more risk averse. The stakeholder was unsure how this would tie up with the performance impact, and expressed concern that it was not stated how behaviours would tie up with improvements.
26. The stakeholder noted that it would have been useful, when working up exit targets, to understand how NR were getting there. It was felt that this should have been done with TOCs in conversation. The risk associated with new fleets was included in this calculus, but not the upside of this improvement in terms of benefits. This would have been pointed out, if NR were working with the TOCs to state their case.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

27. Abellio is not aware that their views were recorded. Operators engaged after strategic business plans were completed, and there was concern that Network Rail seems to have written the plans in a silo and not worked up with an operator.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

28. No records of any conversations were provided; timing wise, it appears that feedback could not have been taken into account.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

29. No reasons were explained by Network Rail, and no opportunity to challenge decisions was given.
30. The only avenue to challenge decisions that the stakeholder was aware of is via ORR consultations. The stakeholder has already submitted one response, and intends to submit another.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

31. On a scale of 1-10: 5. The contact suggested that people within Abellio's TOCs are likely to have stronger views. Rebecca (our contact) understands the rationale and the process, but she previously worked at Network Rail.
32. There is a view within the Abellio TOCs that all the of business plans are unambitious, which is the other side of realistic or pragmatic.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

33. The stakeholder did not believe the consultation process to be particularly effective. Network Rail tried to engage, but they did it a little too late. Furthermore, it was lip service to engagement, as opposed to engagement with the intention of feeding into and changing the strategic business plans.
34. It was felt that it would have been good to see what the mechanism was for feedback, as the stakeholder was not convinced of the effectiveness of this mechanism. The stakeholder didn't know if the consultation process made a great deal of difference.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

35. **STRENGTH** – Network Rail's approach was methodical, and a lot of work went into the analysis. However, it was done too much in isolation. Both NR and their TOCs have Strategic Business plans, and it would have been good to operate in conjunction with each other.
36. **WEAKNESS** – The stakeholder felt that there needs to be more alignment between the TOC and Network Rail to reach common objectives. They are currently misaligned, driving different priorities and focuses. The stakeholder felt that everyone should want the same thing – a safer more punctual railway.
37. **STRENGTH** – The stakeholder felt that it is good that each of the routes have their own SBP. It allows them to cater to their TOCs. If you have a lead TOC, with a specific priority, you can cater your business to work best for that.
38. **WEAKNESS** – The stakeholder didn't know how much engagement happened between the routes, and thought that it would have been helpful to understand how they consulted with each other worked. Abellio thinks a lot was done in isolation. The stakeholder didn't know if the routes have different plans, which affects TOCs that operate across a boundary – particularly when they only operate across a boundary very slightly.
39. **WEAKNESS** – The stakeholder suggested that the consultation process occurred too late, and that it lacked a transparent feedback mechanism.
40. **WEAKNESS** – It was suggested that it would have been useful to engage on customer needs. The stakeholder expressed concern that the outputs don't really reflect passenger needs, and that they lead back to different objectives. The passenger is the end user, and the stakeholder questioned whether this is adequately reflected.
41. **WEAKNESS** – The stakeholder thought that it would have been useful for TOCs to understand the impacts of CP5 exit targets, as Network Rail didn't engage about what the starting point was for CP6. Again, a lack of joined up working between NR and TOCs occurred regarding the starting and ending point. As for NR understanding what the priorities of TOCs are over the 5 years of CP6, the stakeholder felt that assumptions were made without being ratified, and that the TOCs would offer more information.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

42. Abellio was given early sight of the SO strategic business plan, and fed into an ORR consultation about the results.
43. Operators had meetings about their strategic business plans with the route directors; the stakeholder expected that the opportunity was there, but didn't know what was escalated.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

44. No – the stakeholder did not attend any engagement activity.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

45. The contact, Rebecca, worked for Network Rail at the time.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

46. No further information was provided.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From John Collins  
Date 29 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with ACORP (Brian Barnsley, Deputy CEO)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. Community Rail Partnerships (CRPs) exist across the whole of Great Britain. ACORP therefore has an interest in all the Routes and the SO.
2. ACORP has a good relationship with the SO (more so than the Routes) and engages in regular meetings with them.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? If so, what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

3. ACORP was only invited to attend a workshop with the Wessex Route – this invitation came through “informal” channels.
4. There was some dialogue with the SO through existing channels.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

5. Yes (Wessex at Basingstoke ROC, relatively early in the process).

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

6. The Wessex workshop was described as “very good” and open. The Route laid out its thinking for CP6 and made it clear there was a need for funding from third parties to deliver all the Route's ambitions for CP6. The Route provided case studies on work delivered in CP5 and explained that some CP5 projects would need to role-over into CP6. The Route Director also addressed the workshop. In general, the “people on the ground” were very effective in delivering a good stakeholder engagement event.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

7. ACORP was not asked to provide input into any specific CP6 topic.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement? How useful was this information?**

- 8. The invitation to the Workshop provided a summary of the topics that would be discussed on the day.
- 9. ACORP were not provided with draft copies of the SBPs.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

- 10. Yes, views were recorded on paper (flip charts, post it notes) as well as digitally (on tablets).

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

- 11. Yes.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

- 12. ACORP can't say with confidence if their views were taken into account in any of the SBPs.
- 13. ACORP was only able to review the SBPs when they had been published. They noted some references to projects that have an impact on some Community Rail Partnerships (e.g. Swanage/Wareham).

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

- 14. In general terms, most parts of Network Rail are bad at explaining why they not doing something. Some parts of the organisation appear to have a "bunker mentality". The SO, on the other hand, is better at communicating and engaging with organisations like ACORP.
- 15. ACORP were unsure how to challenge the SBPs through formal channels.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

- 16. The SO's SPB is generally well explained.
- 17. There is some ambiguity between planning and projects and a risk the boundaries between these two Network Rail functions are blurring.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

- 18. ACORP is not in a position to assess how effective the consultation process has been.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

- 19. The approach taken by the Wessex Route was excellent. It would be harder to replicate this approach on a larger route such as LNE (breaking down routes in to sub components could work better).
- 20. There are some excellent strategic planners in Network Rail who are adept at engaging with stakeholders. There are also others who do very little engagement. ACORP's experience is described as "patchy".
- 21. ACORP acknowledges (and sympathises with) the challenge in explaining the complexities of the railway to the public.



**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

22. No.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

23. ACORP only engaged with one route (Wessex).

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

24. Yes.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

25. The CP6 process was described as much better than CP5. There was very little engagement at all in the CP5 process. This time, the process was much more open.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

26. Network Rail are pretty good at big projects (e.g. Reading, New Street, Hitchin flyover, Arlington chord – all of which were delivered on time and budget). Where Network Rail struggles is delivering smaller projects (e.g. accessible footpaths), which are often of greatest interest to ACORP and its members. It is understandable that Network Rail focuses on higher impact projects, but internal processes (and a lack of delegation to local engineers) appears to bog down smaller projects.

# #3

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, March 02, 2018 4:20:40 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, March 02, 2018 4:26:06 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:26  
**IP Address:** 216.31.202.190

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

Nicola Hindle

### Q2 Organisation

Amey

### Q3 Role

MD Consulting and Rail

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4** Are you interested in the Anglia route? **Yes**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5** Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **No**

**Q6** If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7** If no to Q5, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q14** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **Yes**

---

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

<p><b>Q21</b> Has the LNE&amp;EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Q22</b> If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q23</b> If no to the above, why not?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q24</b> In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&amp;EM route?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q25</b> Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q26</b> If "no" to the above, why not?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q27</b> What are your views on the format of the LNE&amp;EM route's stakeholder engagement?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q28</b> What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&amp;EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q29</b> What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q30</b> How useful was this information?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q31</b> How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q32</b> If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q33</b> Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&amp;EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route? **Yes**

---

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q39** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q46** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **Yes**

---

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q55** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **Yes**

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q78** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**



**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route? **Yes**

---

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

---

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

---

**Q87** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? **Consultation process, Bilateral session**

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **No**

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not?

time limited

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement?

very helpful

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

infrastructure and operations

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance

**links to web site**

(b) during the engagement

**paper summaries**

**Q94** How useful was this information?

**Very useful**

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

reasonably

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route?

**Respondent skipped this question**

Page 15: Wessex

<b>Q101</b> Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?	<b>No</b>
<b>Q102</b> If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q103</b> If no to the above, why not?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q104</b> In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q105</b> Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q106</b> If "no" to the above, why not?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q107</b> What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q108</b> What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q109</b> What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q110</b> How useful was this information?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q111</b> How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q112</b> If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q113</b> Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 16: Route selection: Western

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **Yes**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **No**

---

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **No**

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q142** How useful was this information? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? Respondent skipped this question

---

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? Yes

---

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

<b>Q149</b> Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?	<b>No</b>
<b>Q150</b> If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q151</b> If no to the above, why not?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q152</b> In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q153</b> Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q154</b> If "no" to the above, why not?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q155</b> What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q156</b> What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q157</b> What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q158</b> How useful was this information?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q159</b> How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q160</b> If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

---



# #8

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Friday, March 09, 2018 12:12:29 PM  
**Last Modified:** Friday, March 09, 2018 5:30:51 PM  
**Time Spent:** 05:18:22  
**IP Address:** 213.123.59.222

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

John Salmon

### Q2 Organisation

Arriva Rail London

### Q3 Role

Head of Relationships & Alliancing

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4** Are you interested in the Anglia route? **Yes**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5** Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q6** If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

**Q7** If no to Q5, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route?

**Workshop,**  
**Bilateral session,**  
 Other (please specify):  
 Separately, Arriva Rail London wrote to the Route in February 2018 to outline our business priorities

**Q9** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

**Yes**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement?

The two workshop sessions addressed both Local Authorities and Train Operators. I got the sense the main focus was towards attracting potential funding sources from Local Authorities, rather than on listening to the concerns of Train Operators

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

High overview of OMR plans, CP6 Scorecards, Overall Access Strategy plus bi-lateral exploration of any opportunities to procure enhancements through a "renewals plus" concept. ARL requested specific detailed dialogue to explore performance assumptions more deeply, and despite numerous reminders of this request over the course of the 2017 year, but the information was not forthcoming.

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance

**A request to input ARL's priorities**

(b) during the engagement

**Copies of the presentational material from workshops**

(c) following the engagement

**The actual draft Strategic Business Plan was not shared (despite requests to see it)**

**Q14** How useful was this information?

**Somewhat useful**

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

To Network Rail's credit, engagement was much more transparent than when compared with CP5. The style of approach however was one that left us as a customer not particularly feeling listened to. Instead it felt like a procedural exercise to prove that we had been "consulted". We input our priorities in February 2017, but these were not really acknowledged. The key important issue for ARL was to understand performance assumptions, and despite writing to the Route in February and December 2017 to request a detailed bi-lateral meeting on this subject, such a meeting was not forthcoming.

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

I also attended workshops on South East, LNW, and Wessex Routes in the first quarter of 2017. LNW presented a credible message that they were listening to customers and focused on improving the railway. I left with strong confidence in their team. Similarly, South East helped us understand the challenges that they face - and I could see alignment in the vision that they had set out for CP6 with ARL's own vision. Both LNW and South East responded to ARL's performance priorities by offering ARL a weighting on their Route Scorecards (which had not existed before). ARL is only a small player on Wessex Route, but gave a strong vision on safety culture leadership at their workshop, which sticks in the memory.

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

We escalated our concerns about the lack of visibility of the performance assumptions in the plan, and the fact the performance trajectory did not match with our expectations. This was highlighted to the RMD in December and as a result, ARL sent a letter to confirm its concerns. There has been no response to that. In essence, the message we have received is that delivering our performance expectations is not affordable - and so there is no point in talking with us about it.

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

I was involved at the interface between Chiltern Railways and Network Rail in CP5. Please see above for general comment on this - more engagement has been noticed locally in CP6 (even though the style was not particularly satisfying)

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

We only were given sight of the SBP after it had been published, despite a request to see a draft. The performance trajectories within the plan are not supported by ARL. Our attempts to prompt engagement on that subject were not responded to over the course of the whole of 2017 (as illustrated above). We had to chase follow up engagement that we requested on exploring whether Incremental PSR improvements could be procured on the back of renewals in the CP6 plan.

It should be noted also that ARL has concerns about how the Network Rail Customer / Route Scorecard process within Anglia Route was handled in preparation for the 2018/19 year (albeit that does not relate to CP6).

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **No**

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q23** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q30** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route? **Yes**

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

**Q39** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route? **Workshop**

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Yes**

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement?

Excellent initial workshop in February 17. No material follow up with ARL after that. That said, ARL is a small player on the Euston-Watford line and we receive an excellent service from the Route. Furthermore, ARL's priorities were listened to in February 2017 - and we now have a position on the Route Scorecard for 2018/19

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

The initial workshop sought views on customer priorities

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance **Joining instructions**

(c) following the engagement **None**

**Q46** How useful was this information?

**Somewhat  
useful**

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

See comments above

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

See comments elsewhere

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

No need to - but we would do this via the Chief Operating Officer if we needed, with whom we have an excellent relationship.

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

See above

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route?

**No**

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q55** If no to the above, why not?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **Yes**

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Workshop,**  
Other (please specify):  
Follow up drop-in centre to the initial workshop

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Yes**

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement?

Good. The appeared behind the curve when they engaged with us in February compared with where LNW were - but we felt listened to. Furthermore , the Route has responded to the priorities that we shared with them - and has offered ARL a place on the Route Scorecard for 18/19.

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

High level overview of the Vision

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance

**Joining Instructions**

(b) during the engagement

**Material from the presentations**



**Q78** How useful was this information?

**Somewhat  
useful**

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Useful information gathering for ARL. We felt listened to - by having the opportunity to write to the Route to share our priorities. The Route demonstrated their Customer Focus to us by including our performance measure in their 18/19 Scorecard. We did raise a technical specific question about an aspect of the CP6 E&P Plan in the follow up drop-in workshop - but didn't receive a response.

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

See above

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

No need to - but we now have established an regular interface with the RMD and his top team.

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

See above

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route?

**No**

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q87** If no to the above, why not?

**Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q94** How useful was this information? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route? **Yes**

Page 15: Wessex

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

**Q103** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route? **Workshop**

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Yes**

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not?

I attended the March 18 workshop, from which I was invited to a subsequence Stakeholder Board - but regrettably couldn't support this due to diary clash

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement?

Proportionate to our needs (which arise from our minimal interface at Clapham Junction)

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Early workshop to canvas views on our priorities

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(b) during the engagement **As with other Routes**

**Q110** How useful was this information? **Somewhat useful**

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

As above

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

As above

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Not needed - but offer exists to be part of their Stakeholder Board

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

As above

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

---

Page 16: Route selection: Western

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **No**

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q135** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q142** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? **Yes**

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Only for one/some routes (please specify):**  
In general, this was handled through an Arriva Group lead

**Q151** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? **Other (please specify):**  
In personally attended the national System Operator Conference in Manchester in February 2018

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **No**

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not?

Arriva Group represented on our behalf

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement?

The Manchester Conference was a useful opportunity to understand direction of travel - and to offer observations on how the SO role might help keep network overview across devolved routes

---

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

I personally didn't respond to consultation - as above

---

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(b) during the engagement

**As above**

---

**Q158** How useful was this information?

**Somewhat  
useful**

---

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

As above

---

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

As above

---

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

N/A

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

As above

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Local preparation of SO Scorecards has been "patchy" - and there appears some misalignment between whether Routes or SO should accept accountability on their Scorecards for the quality of timetable outputs in the context to Late Notice Changes

---



# #5

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, March 05, 2018 12:33:49 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, March 05, 2018 12:41:29 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:07:40  
**IP Address:** 87.102.28.2

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

helen cavanagh

### Q2 Organisation

arriva rail noth

### Q3 Role

head of alliancing

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4 Are you interested in the Anglia route?** **No**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5 Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6 If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7 If no to Q5, why not?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8 In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9 Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q14** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **Yes**

---

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

**Q23** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route? **Workshop**

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Yes**

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement?

we had the opportunity to feed into the process, not really sure our views were sufficiently considered. it was clear ECML was a priority

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

set out a list of priorities which were important to our business

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance	<b>very little</b>
(b) during the engagement	<b>slide deck;/draft of RSBP</b>
(c) following the engagement	<b>we had to chase for further engagement and iterations of the plan</b>

**Q30** How useful was this information? **Somewhat useful**

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

no proactive approach, no clear engagement strategy, not sure we have been able to influence the plans. just given dates for workshops no consultation on dates. Not always sure NWR had the right people in the room

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

yes

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route?

No

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q39** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q46** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **No**

---

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

---

<b>Q54</b> If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q55</b> If no to the above, why not?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q56</b> In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q57</b> Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q58</b> If "no" to the above, why not?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q59</b> What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q60</b> What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q61</b> What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q62</b> How useful was this information?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q63</b> How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q64</b> If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q65</b> Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	
<b>Q66</b> Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?	Respondent skipped this question
<hr/>	

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 10: Route selection: South East

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route?

No

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q71** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q78** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route? **No**

---

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q87** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---



**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q94** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route? **No**

---

Page 15: Wessex

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

---

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q103** If no to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q110** How useful was this information? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

---

Page 16: Route selection: Western

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route?

No

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q119** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q126** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **No**

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q142** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? **No**

---

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

---

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q151** If no to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q158** How useful was this information? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

---

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

---

**Respondent skipped this question**

## #13

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, March 28, 2018 9:26:47 AM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, March 28, 2018 11:08:49 AM  
**Time Spent:** 01:42:02  
**IP Address:** 89.206.168.12

## Page 1: Introduction

**Q1** Name of respondent

Chris Dellard

**Q2** Organisation

Arriva Trains Wales

**Q3** Role

Network Access Strategy Manager

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4** Are you interested in the Anglia route? **No**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5** Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7** If no to Q5, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**



**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q14** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **No**

---

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

---

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q23** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q30** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route? **Yes**

---

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

---

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

---

**Q39** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route? **Workshop**

---

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **No**

---

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not?

We attended the initial stakeholder workshop and received updates on progress through the LNW Route Infrastructure Investment Review Group (RIIRG). There were several other specific meetings that we were aware of but did not attend as we generally felt that our views were being adequately represented through Arriva UK Trains' nominated PR18 engagement lead, Richard McClean.

---

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement?

The initial stakeholder session was necessarily high-level and wide-ranging as it sought to set the general scene. We have had regular contact with Martin Jurkowski who has kept us informed on progress. Generally, any feedback that we have given has been through Arriva.

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Generally all of it.

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance	<b>Template for providing views for CP6</b>
(b) during the engagement	<b>Invitation to workshop; draft RSBP; summary of issues from workshop; revised draft RSBP</b>
(c) following the engagement	<b>Final RSBP</b>

**Q46** How useful was this information? **Very useful**

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

NR engaged extensively with the industry on the development of its RSBPs and the SO's SBP - more so than during PR13. However our MD is left with the strong impression that there were not enough opportunities to engage in the process. I think that there are several reasons for this, which are common to LNW and to Wales Route (and so I have pasted this comment into both).

1. Firstly, Network Rail did not set out clearly its planned approach for engaging with operators. We did not know what to expect, and when. We received information to review and to respond to without any warning which did not allow us to plan our engagement effectively.
2. Because of this lack of planning it was difficult to relate incoming emails to specific areas of the development of the SBPs and to see where our advice and expertise could be most usefully targeted.
3. There appeared to be a lack of focus from Network Rail in its consultations. Clearly Network Rail would not have wished to have led operators in a certain direction, but it would have helped us immensely if Network Rail had provided more targeted emails/questions relating to specific areas where it felt that our input would be most useful. This would not have stopped us from commenting on any other aspects of the emerging plans, but it might have helped us to provide more thorough and timely comments.
4. Lack of direct engagement at director level. There appears to have been little in the way of structured overviews or updates on progress given by Network Rail at any directors' liaison meetings or any other director-level meetings. This has required others in the business to advise them on progress and to try to anticipate what they should be involved in, and how.
5. It is clear that operators have been very proactive in seeking to constructively engage with Network Rail, especially at Owinging Group level – more so than for previous Periodic Reviews. I feel that Network Rail did not anticipate such levels of interest and willingness to engage, and has struggled to exploit this effectively.

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

There were no particular differences. In general LNW's management of the process seemed to more organised than Wales Route's, with more direct communication and opportunities to engaged. This was surprising to us.

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Not applicable

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

We did take part in the consultation for CP5. NR's approach to CP6 has certainly been more thorough, which in large part has probably been driven by the substantial changes that NR has undergone in the previous 5 years - particularly the reclassification of NR, the setting up of Route Business units and the creation of the System Operator Business - which has in general moved NR closer to its customers. For their part, operators increasingly see the importance of the role that NR plays in supporting their own business objectives, whether it be improving Performance, growing revenues or improving customer satisfaction. Operators' willingness to engage has helped NR to consult more effectively. However there are still opportunities for improvement.

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **No**

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q55** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 10: Route selection: South East

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **No**

---

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

<p><b>Q70</b> If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q71</b> If no to the above, why not?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q72</b> In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q73</b> Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q74</b> If "no" to the above, why not?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q75</b> What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q76</b> What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q77</b> What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q78</b> How useful was this information?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q79</b> How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q80</b> If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q81</b> Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>
<p><b>Q82</b> Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?</p>	<p>Respondent skipped this question</p>

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route?

Yes

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Yes

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Yes

**Q87** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route?

Workshop,  
Consultation process

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

No

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not?

We did not attend the first stakeholder workshop because Arriva UK Trains was a bidder for the new Wales & Borders franchise at the time of the workshop and so it was felt that this could be viewed by some attendees as a conflict of interest.

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement?

Our general view is that Wales Route has focused its attentions more on Welsh Government as a stakeholder rather than ATW as the incumbent TOC. The communication channels were not as clear to us as they were with LNW Route.

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

We had sight of most of the proposals, after a fashion. Much of the work appears to have been undertaken in isolation from stakeholders and presented as a fait accompli, with little opportunity for collaborate engagement during the process.



**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance	<b>Invitation to workshop</b>
(b) during the engagement	<b>Draft RSBP</b>
(c) following the engagement	<b>RSBP</b>

**Q94** How useful was this information? **Somewhat useful**

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

NR engaged extensively with the industry on the development of its RSBPs and the SO's SBP - more so than during PR13. However our MD is left with the strong impression that there were not enough opportunities to engage in the process. I think that there are several reasons for this, which are common to LNW and to Wales Route (and so I have pasted this comment into both).

1. Firstly, Network Rail did not set out clearly its planned approach for engaging with operators. We did not know what to expect, and when. We received information to review and to respond to without any warning which did not allow us to plan our engagement effectively.
2. Because of this lack of planning it was difficult to relate incoming emails to specific areas of the development of the SBPs and to see where our advice and expertise could be most usefully targeted.
3. There appeared to be a lack of focus from Network Rail in its consultations. Clearly Network Rail would not have wished to have led operators in a certain direction, but it would have helped us immensely if Network Rail had provided more targeted emails/questions relating to specific areas where it felt that our input would be most useful. This would not have stopped us from commenting on any other aspects of the emerging plans, but it might have helped us to provide more thorough and timely comments.
4. Lack of direct engagement at director level. There appears to have been little in the way of structured overviews or updates on progress given by Network Rail at any directors' liaison meetings or any other director-level meetings. This has required others in the business to advise them on progress and to try to anticipate what they should be involved in, and how.
5. It is clear that operators have been very proactive in seeking to constructively engage with Network Rail, especially at Owinging Group level – more so than for previous Periodic Reviews. I feel that Network Rail did not anticipate such levels of interest and willingness to engage, and has struggled to exploit this effectively.

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Wales Route did not seem to be so forthcoming in providing updates and information. In some cases we sought information ourselves, or were sent information indirectly. We were not fully aware if there was a nominated point of contact for comments related to the RSBP. Because it is a small Route, there was no dedicated team or person responsible.

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

N/A

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

See previous answer

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route? **No**

Page 15: Wessex

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q103** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q110** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 16: Route selection: Western

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **No**

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q135** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q142** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? **Yes**

---

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

---

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

---

**Q151** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? **Discussion, Workshop, Consultation process**

---

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **No**

---

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not?

Time constraints

---

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement?

The SO's engagement was generally good, quite possibly because of their position as a new business unit going through the Periodic Review process for the first time. Their naturally close relationship with all train operators as their customers does generally mean that they have good insights into the particular commercial environment of each operator. They involved operators early in the process when they first began to shape the format of their approach - again quite possibly due to the fact that they were going through this process for the first time.

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

We were mainly concerned with aspects aligning the SO's incentives and metrics with operators' requirements. We were less concerned with the SO's proposed spending, but were keen to ensure that the SO would have the means to be suitably resourced and to fund the development of current and new planning tools to help automate processes in order to provide consistent and high quality timetables for the industry.

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance	<b>Working papers</b>
(b) during the engagement	<b>Draft SBP; workshop</b>
(c) following the engagement	<b>SBP</b>

**Q158** How useful was this information? **Very useful**

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Generally effective. The process has been generally more open and transparent compared to the Route consultations processes.

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

We did not directly attend engagement activity for SO

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

N/A

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

See previous answer

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

---



To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From John Collins  
Date 27 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with C2C (Julian Drury, Managing Director, and Joel Mitchell, Delivery Director)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. C2C principally engaged with the Anglia Route.
2. There was also some engagement with the SO.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? If so, what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?

3. The Anglia Route invited C2C to attend a several workshops/events with other operators. This was followed by a practical session with the performance team, which focussed on performance goals and the SBP's scorecard.
4. C2C also attended an event in Manchester led by the SO, where the SBP was discussed.
5. C2C were formally consulted on the draft SBP and provided feedback to Network Rail on its contents.
6. There were also bilateral meetings with the Route Managing Director.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

7. Yes.

### What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?

8. The first event was a "Town Hall" style meeting. At this meeting, the Route presented its high-level aspirations for the SBP. This was followed by a second event where the Route described, in more detail, what can be realistically achieved with the estimated budget.
9. From the outset, the Route stressed the SBP would focus only on operations, maintenance and renewals. The constraints of the SBP process and its budget were clearly explained. There was some discussion of "Renewals Plus", but these were watered down/dropped at the end.

**What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

10. C2C were consulted on many aspects of SBP. In particular, C2C provided significant input on the Scorecard. C2C provided input to the SO as well. At times, it was not always clear whether C2C's input related to the Anglia Route, SO, CP5 and/or CP6.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement? How useful was this information?**

11. Network Rail included subject experts into the workshops, which C2C found very helpful. This enabled their representatives to exchange contact details with Network Rail experts and arrange follow up discussions.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

12. Yes, minutes were circulated.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

13. Yes, indeed this is still ongoing.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

14. C2C were able to secure some movement in key areas on the scorecard.
15. However, C2C regard the output as "vanilla". While the level of communication and engagement was generally excellent, many aspects of the SBP appeared to be a "done deal".
16. From delivery prospective, notably for PPM trajectory, the Route was comfortable with the final product. [Post script: The evening after the day of this interview, Network Rail sent C2C a revised PPM trajectory for CP6 that is 0.6% lower than that which C2C had agreed. This now means the PPM trajectory is not agreed.]
17. In terms of influencing funding, C2C do not feel their views were (or indeed could be) taken into account. A number of initiatives were dropped from the SBP by the end of the process. For example, C2C had been under the impression accessibility objectives would be included in scorecard (GRIP 5) but these got dropped 12 hours before the closure of the scorecard.
18. C2C also attempted to highlight the problem of complaints by lineside neighbours, but this was not captured in the SBP or scorecard.
19. Part of the reason it was hard for C2C to influence the SBP is that its contribution to the Route Scorecard is relatively small. For example, C2C's weighting in scorecard is just 4%.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

20. The Anglia Route was clear about funding constraints from the outset. Stakeholders were "discouraged from asking for anything beyond the existing level of performance or amount of OM&R work". The debate was only at the margins.
21. C2C were disappointed in the level of funding committed to earthworks remediation. There were significant issues with dry clay embankments two years ago that resulted in severe speed restrictions on

the C2C route for 8 weeks, which had a significant impact on PPM. However, C2C was told this need was competing against other funds, so this was not taken forward. Additionally, two sets of plain line track renewals have been removed from the draft CP6 plan after NR discovered that this would exceed their budget for Schedule 4 payments. On the other hand, C2C acknowledges the Anglia Route has done well to secure funding for renewal of around 33% of its OLE.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

22. C2C were able to challenge to SBP, but this did not appear to make much difference – “we were listened to sympathetically”.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

23. From C2C’s perspective, there was a lot of discussion noted but this did not appear to materially change the output. The outputs themselves appeared to be predetermined and the purpose of the consultation was to allow the TOC to have its say before telling them what had already been decided.
24. If C2C were to score the process, they would award 8/10 for communication and 2/10 for the ability to influence the process.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail’s approach?**

25. Strengths.
- C2C appreciated the opportunity to meet subject matter experts on the Route. C2C believes it now in a stronger position to work with the Anglia Route in the future because of this initiative.
  - The amount of communication was very high.
26. Weakness
- The Route didn’t appear to have the ability to make changes to their own plan – which appeared to undermine the level of devolution the Route had been afforded by the center. One C2C representative observed “it’s almost as if centre was using route to deliver mandatory changes”.

### **If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

27. The processes were “not dissimilar”. The SO appeared to start the process later than the route. It engaged more through “1:1 conversations” than formal consultations. The Manchester event was well received and helpful.

### **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

28. Yes.

### **If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail’s consultation process for CP6?**

29. The CP6 consultation was better. The CP5 process appeared to be a “done deal” and stakeholders were involved relatively late. The CP6 process sought engagement earlier.
30. There was generally more communication in the CP6 process. This ensured C2C had a better understanding about what would likely be included in the final SBP.
31. The absence of enhancements from the SBP means the CP6 SPB is “drier” than the CP5 SBP as c2c was told that it could not include enhancements in its requests.

32. C2C note that some enhancements for other operators were included in the CP6 SPB, but this was inconsistent (none were mentioned for C2C's route). An example was that £25.5m is earmarked for ETCS Level 2 between Stratford and Chelmsford in CP6, while c2c's proposal for ERTMS Level 2 between Fenchurch St and Barking is not mentioned.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

33. C2C wished to place on record that relations with the Anglia Route are excellent. C2C is, however, disappointed with the outputs of the SPB.

# #7

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, March 08, 2018 12:59:42 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, March 08, 2018 1:08:02 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:20  
**IP Address:** 81.140.244.59

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

Tasmeen Bachra

### Q2 Organisation

Chiltern Railways

### Q3 Role

Regulatory Contracts Manager

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4 Are you interested in the Anglia route?** **No**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5 Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6 If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7 If no to Q5, why not?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8 In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9 Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q14** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **No**

---

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

---

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q23** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q30** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route?

Yes

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Yes

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Yes

**Q39** If no to the above, why not?

N/A

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route?

Workshop

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Yes

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not?

N/A

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement?

There was no clearly described formal consultation process. The workshops occurred early in 2017 long before the Route SBP had been drafted. Chiltern Railways repeatedly asked for visibility and input to the plans prior to submission through bilateral workshops. This did not happen, Chiltern Railways were not consulted or updated as the SBP developed and new versions were released. The consultation process was not structured and how Chiltern Railway's input would be captured and taken into account was unclear throughout.



**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Chiltern Railways provided input to the scorecard and set out our priorities for CP6 covering infrastructure management, performance and enhancements. . Until the first draft of the SBP was produced in December 2017 Chiltern Railways was mainly unsighted of its contents and remained unaware of how the priorities that we had expressed were considered.

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance

**Nothing useful until the initial draft was produced in December 2017 (which we detected was released with some reluctance).**

(b) during the engagement

**No information was provided during the period when the SBP was being developed in terms of what would be included in the SBP following on from the initial workshop(s).**

(c) following the engagement

**CR provided concerns raised at the workshop. These did not have appropriate follow up. We received the draft SBP in December 2017 – this was the first time we’d received any insight into the Plan contents at any useful level of detail. Even then it was not clear how our input would continue between the initial draft being produced (Dec 2017) and final draft submission to ORR (in Feb 2018) – in fact we were not given formal visibility of the 9 Feb 2018 submission deadline by Network Rail despite asking specifically about this date. We only managed to formally meet to discuss the SBP in March 2018.**

**Q46** How useful was this information?

**Not useful**

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

There was a real lack of formal approach to how/when the consultation process would occur and no clear timescales or milestones for this. Once we had given NR our list of priorities to be considered for CP6 we did not have feedback until the initial draft of the SBP had been submitted to the ORR in February 2018. We had no visibility of how our input had been considered in the initial or the later Final draft (despite asking NR for this information). We are also aware that between the initial (Dec 2017) and Final (Feb 2018) drafts, the requirement for TOC agreement by signature was removed from the TOC specific sections in appendix A and to this day Chiltern has not agreed the Chiltern Railways TOC specific appendix (A1) in the LNW Plan. NR has subsequently advised that this will be updated with Chiltern Railway's agreement despite the ORR now being in the process of developing its conclusions.

We are unsure of the process or logic behind their proposed assumptions and figures within the SBP. Having visibility of this would have given better assurance on their proposal and deliverables to Chiltern Railways.

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

N/A

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

There was no formal consultation process defined so any escalation was done through our current meeting structure with NR (i.e. Level 1 and Directors Liaison). But again, no appropriate feedback was given back to Chiltern Railways.

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Did not take part in CP5 consultation

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

The lack of visibility of the consultation process and lack of communication with the development of the SBP meant that the 'process' was very weak. Chiltern Railways have reached out to NR for dialogue but felt effectively engaged in the process to develop the SBP. Following submission of the final draft of the SBP in February 2018 Chiltern Railways and Network Rail has met to discuss the contents of the Plan although there are no opportunities for any further changes to be made before the ORR reaches their initial conclusions in early Summer 2018. LNW Route has assured that the process is fluid but to what extent Chiltern Railways can now influence is again unclear.

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **No**

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q55** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 10: Route selection: South East

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **No**

## Page 11: South East

---

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q78** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route? **No**

---

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q87** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q94** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route?

No

Page 15: Wessex

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q103** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q110** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**



**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route?

No

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q142** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? **No**

---

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q151** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q158** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Brad Woodworth  
Date 6 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with CrossCountry (Pauline Rawlings, Head of Performance and Planning)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. The stakeholder operates on seven routes; all except for South East.
2. The primary route of interest is the FNPO, though the seven routes that Cross Country serve, and the SO, are of interest as well.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

3. In February or March 2017, the stakeholder was invited to all of the geographical route's initial workshop stakeholder events and FNPO.
4. The LNW and Western routes offered some pre-workshop bilaterals in 2016.
5. The stakeholder attended the sessions for all routes, apart from Wales and Scotland. This absence was due to short notice and busy diaries;
6. The stakeholder was provided with a plan for CP6 from the FNPO route. The stakeholder sat down with the relevant contact, and gave him their clear list of priorities that he could take to the other routes.
7. The stakeholder was invited to some follow-up sessions, though not for every route. These took place in June and July for the Western and FNPO routes.
8. Again, the stakeholder was unable to attend such a workshop in Scotland as this was at 0900 on a Monday in Glasgow.
9. Other than this, the stakeholder didn't get any other invites, to the best of their knowledge.
10. The LNW route opted to update the stakeholder through RIRG; the Route Investment Review Group.
11. Wessex updates, meanwhile, came via the stakeholder board as an agenda item.
12. The stakeholder received an invite to the SO workshop, and were represented by Grand Central as part of the Arriva Group.

### **If yes, did you take them up on this offer?**

#### **If no, why?**

13. The stakeholder did supply information to all fora.

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

14. All engagement was conducted in workshops, in terms of the structure and the approach taken.
15. The stakeholder felt that the least effective was the Anglia route; this included lots of local authorities and board stakeholders. The TOC wanted to get into the details of the plan, but the local authorities invited had different priorities.
16. The LNE route separated out ECML and others, regardless of the fact that CrossCountry, Northern, and TransPennine Express do operate on the route. The stakeholder missed out on some elements of the engagement, and needed to attend two different workshops in order to communicate their views.
17. The LNW route included TOCs and FOCs, along with some PTEs as well. The stakeholder felt that this approach was effective; the participants were split up into different tables, with priorities captured table by table. There was an opportunity to put priorities on the table, and have points heard.
18. For the Wessex route, everyone was sat in a horseshoe formation. All participants had their voice heard – but the stakeholder felt that the consultation wasn't particularly effective, though the route executive did seem quite engaged. TOCs and FOCs were both present.
19. The Wales and Scotland consultations were not attended by the stakeholder.
20. The FNPO engagement was held at the stakeholder's own offices. It was split into freight and other stakeholders. It was well attended. For the second round, as the FNPO route are not an asset manager; instead, they are a facilitator with the routes, it was suggested by the stakeholder that it would be good to include other routes at the FNPO engagement to support in ensuring the priorities are heard. The LNW route was present at the second engagement.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

#### **If no, why?**

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

21. The stakeholder pursued the following priorities at the particular sessions: key performance issues, more cohesive nationwide access plans and efficiencies, performance, renewals, track access, and delayed projects from CP5.
22. The stakeholder provided input, but wouldn't say that they were "consulted" per se. For example, the LNE route's approach could be summarised as "here is our plan", with limited opportunity for feedback.
23. In terms of scorecards, the LNE route omitted CrossCountry from their scorecard, while the Western route engaged the stakeholder. All of the other routes conducted this through the Account team. Some routes, such as Wessex, still can't agree on targets, and the stakeholder noted that they didn't feel consulted.

24. All of the engagement was very early on; between July and November there was nothing, then everything was done in a real hurry.
25. There was a missed opportunity to continue, and the stakeholder felt it seemed that the shutters went down and there was a wall of silence.
26. Everything was requested in short time scales once things happened again; the stakeholder had to read 9 plans in three weeks over Christmas of 100 + pages each. This only allowed the stakeholder to provide a high-level response.
27. The stakeholder wrote letters in November; they were conscious of running out of time with priorities and key issues, where they thought they were gaps.
28. In most instances, the stakeholder did not feel listened to.

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

29. For some of the SBPs, nothing was provided up-front.
30. Western was considered the best in terms of engagement. They had a follow up workshop, and a 1 to 1 session. The stakeholder could tell that their views were captured.
31. The FNPO kept the stakeholder up to date with their business plans.
32. LNW sent a business plan to the stakeholder at one point.
33. Regarding CP6, the FNPO kept in touch on most issues.
34. The stakeholder received something from LNE and Anglia right before their December session.
35. This was also true of the SO, who sent their feedback matrix.
36. LNE only picked out two things from their whole letter.
37. LNE mentioned CrossCountry twice in their draft, and in the final version this increased to four times.

### **How useful was this information?**

38. The stakeholder felt that it was useful to have the SPB drafts before the workshops.
39. During the engagement, some of the presentations were interesting, some not so much.
40. The stakeholder was concerned that not much follow-up was provided afterwards.
41. Information on where the feedback went was only provided very late on.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

42. The LNW and LNE routes jotted things down on a whiteboard, but these were not attributed to particular stakeholders.
43. The only thing that came back to the stakeholder was from the Western route, which responded specifically on things that CrossCountry had said in a 1-to-1 following the sessions. The 1-to-1 was in November, following CrossCountry sending letters to everyone saying that not much time was left.
44. The SO supplied a written feedback form.
45. The LNE route fed back to the stakeholder on a couple of key items.

46. The LNW route did respond to the stakeholder's email with some generic answers, but nothing from this was captured in the business plan.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

47. NR never provided opportunity for the stakeholder to review, but CrossCountry did send a letter to each saying what they'd like to see included.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

48. No

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

49. The stakeholder was not given an opportunity to challenge the reasoning. The stakeholder had to give feedback in a three week period.
50. The LNE and Anglia routes ran workshops following the feedback.
51. The stakeholder received a letter from the SO on 18<sup>th</sup> December asking for feedback but no deadline was given.
52. The stakeholder complained that the process felt rushed, and that by the end, the process felt like it was a done deal.
53. Except for some of the financials, everything was completed by December.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

54. The stakeholder gave some specific feedback, along with high-level feedback, to ORR. Only opportunity to give feedback to ORR was by the day of the interview.
55. The stakeholder would have liked to provide more detailed feedback.
56. Been engaged as an operator, though it was difficult to attend everything. The stakeholder had taken the time out to prepare presentations and talk people through their concerns. The stakeholder had also taken time to write letters to each route, and to highlight the areas where they'd like to see more information. With the exception of Western and FNPO and a small amount on LNW, CrossCountry was not really mentioned on most of the business plans.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

57. The stakeholder described the process as a box ticking exercise.
58. After the experience of LNW's initial workshop, it was felt by the stakeholder that it was going to be a collaboration
59. Western's engagement was seen as the best, and was where the stakeholder felt most engaged. This route was the only one with a real 1-to-1.
60. There was very little engagement from Wessex and Wales.
61. Anglia had the workshops, but didn't incorporate any of the feedback.

- 62. All the time between July and November was lost. For that reason, the stakeholder felt this wasn't effective. Additionally, people were squeezed into tight timescales over Christmas.
- 63. The intentions were good, but the opportunity was missed.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

- 64. It was felt that there were too many different stakeholders, with different levels of interest and different areas of interest.
- 65. The LNW initial workshop was seen as best practice.
- 66. It was inclusive, and there was an opportunity to get priorities heard.
- 67. The stakeholder felt that Western did the same in their second session.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

- 68. The stakeholder wrote a letter saying that they hadn't had responses, and escalated this to the FNPO lead.
- 69. It wasn't clear if there was an official route for escalation, so the stakeholder went to the FNPO.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

- 70. The stakeholder did not participate for CP5.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

- 71. The stakeholder offered a timeline and a summary, though they felt they had laboured the point.
- 72. The stakeholder felt most engaged by Western as a geographical route, due to the 1-to-1.
- 73. They had asked in their letters for this, and Western was the only route that responded.
- 74. Other routes also didn't attend the FNPO workshop.
- 75. The main concern was the lost time over the summer. It would have been a different conversation if that had continued – there was a SOFA delay, but it shouldn't have stopped people talking and collaborating.
- 76. The stakeholder was given extremely tight timescales over Christmas to return on everything. It was felt that 900 pages to provide feedback on was not really achievable.
- 77. The stakeholder was not consulted on the scorecard, which was found concerning given this is how they will be regulated going forward.
- 78. There were some changes to the scorecards.
- 79. LNE omitted the stakeholder from their CP6 scorecard.
- 80. Wessex has changed the methodology for the calculation of targets.
- 81. Apart from for Western and the FNPO, no targets were consulted on and agreed.



82. The Western route wanted to see views on the content of their scorecard.
83. The SO delivered theirs quite late on.
84. The stakeholder felt that there was more that could have been done by the FNPO to get everyone around the table.
85. The stakeholder was clear that the consultation is ultimately individuals doing the best possible job they can.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Brad Woodworth  
Date 7 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with DB Cargo UK (Richard Clarke & Nigel Oatway)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. All of them, and the SO.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

2. Not all of the routes sought our views. The ones that did were: SO, FNPO, Anglia and South East.
3. Between all the FOCs, DB believes that they managed to attend the first round workshop for every route.
4. There was limited interaction with the routes following the first workshop.
5. DB Cargo UK was not spoken to regarding the non-route plans, such as property.
6. DB Cargo UK doesn't think there is a reason to publish the non-infrastructure plans. They were only given three weeks to comment on something that they had no chance to comment on them during the consultation process.
7. DB Cargo UK believes that the ORR is at fault for the lack of time to review.
8. DB Cargo UK commented that they had 9 SBPs to review in three weeks, which totalled over 1000 pages, which was therefore impossible to do.
9. There were some second workshops. DB Cargo UK went to Anglia and South East for the second round.

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

10. Wales invited them to one they couldn't get to due to a conflict with another route.

### If no, why?

11. In the first round, some workshops happened on the same day.
12. No coordination of timing for national operators who needed to attend more than one workshop.

### In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?

13. In the first-round workshops, where all stakeholders for the route attended, the route presented its plans in detail, and asked for feedback both verbally and written.

14. Second round was more of a “market stall” affair, different booths for different aspects for their SBPs.
15. Everything was well produced and presented.
16. Major issue: very passenger focused, tend to be the direct customer of the routes. Freight is a customer of FNPO, and was seen as a smaller part over all business, this is a regular issue.
17. The workshops which they attended were well conducted, with good opportunities for interaction and debate.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO’s stakeholder engagement?**

18. One thing that was of concern: trying to answer the ORR question about scorecards didn’t in turn answer the customers’ requirements, ORR was asking how the customers wanted to be measured, but this wasn’t compatible with the scorecard.
19. The scorecards don’t mean anything across the routes.
20. This has to do with the roll-up to the Centre.
21. Only two scorecards that mean anything are FNPO and some parts of the SO, this is what drives efficiency and customer service. Hard to see alignment into routes, clumped into “freight” in the small ones. The TOCs can see through their individual franchise.
22. DB Cargo UK does understand this it is difficult to get down to all customers in all routes.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO’s proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

23. DB Cargo UK was involved in SO Scorecard from a safety and capacity area.
24. The measures in these areas were purely from input
25. DB Cargo UK believes they can’t influence financials as they don’t have sight of how this happens, have asked OOR for the modelling and have not seen it.
26. DB Cargo UK has no input into the individual route scorecards. The figures used have been derived from the FNPO across 2-3 measures. DB Cargo UK admits that this outcome may have been a result of resourcing on both sides.

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

27. DB Cargo UK was provided with the information that was set out at the workshops. The routes had a questionnaire, seeking input into various comments, such as ‘what we would like the route to do’. A feedback sheet was provided on all questions and responses. The System Operator had a tracker of what they’d done.
28. The System Operator was the slowest to start, but was the most engaging.
29. Many of the first-round workshops were split up into groups to tackle topics. This was great for the topics that you were on, but you didn’t have time to do more than one topic. This meant you might not get an overview of what the journey was.
30. The various groups fed back on the outcome of the discussions.

31. The workshops had a mix, and not every topic had the right inclusion of people.

### **How useful was this information?**

32. For the areas of interest, it was very useful. There was a lot of information, a lot of which wasn't useful, but it was about passenger services, as these were passenger measures. This was of general interest, but not of specific interest to the freight operators.

33. Difficult to pick out freight from the SPBs.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

34. Views were recorded by Anglia and South East, there were note takers jotting down the relevant points.

35. Afterwards got a list of questions and topics that were raised.

### **If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

36. There was no need to correct it, can't recall if there was an opportunity.

37. Most of these were brainstorming and validating assumptions.

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

38. On some accounts, not on all.

39. FNPO did, but they didn't take everything into account. The scorecard isn't as DB Cargo UK would have wanted it.

40. The routes also didn't set challenging enough targets.

41. Around Freight Delivery Measure – Performance will get no better in CP6 than it currently is, even though Freight is above target at the moment. The overall summary says everything is going to get 15% better, but this means that freight will stand still.

### **If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

42. They have explained them, but still not convinced on how it's linked. Even if performance is due to get worse, it should have a downward trajectory instead of flat.

43. Have explained increased connection, but don't know how they've justified it to the regulator.

### **To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

44. Haven't reviewed them yet, haven't had enough time.

45. Difficult to pick up the FNPO plan and cross-reference it across the geographical routes.

46. Have to take it on trust that what's in there has been replicated.

47. DB Cargo UK isn't sure how to test that it is replicated.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

48. It's been new, because it's a new process.

49. No one realised how big the separation of the routes was going to be.

50. Throughout things were well managed, presented, and was effective for something that was a massive topic.
51. Through having the stakeholder sessions, it was good to hear the views of other stakeholders, which helped understand some of the reason why things were there or not included.
52. The consultation started last year with a build-up and by the summer, SOFA delay announcement, NR goes silent. Industry felt that there was no engagement because of government process. Lost 3-4 months because of this.
53. There are some lessons to be learned in how to keep things going.
54. Scotland was worse due to no clarity of funding. Not sure how they will deliver the aspiration of Scottish Government
55. All of the senior route team were at all workshops, along with the heads of departments there. This means that the people who had the authority to make decisions and comment were there when the comments were being made. This also let the stakeholders know that the people at the top were hearing what you said.
56. This was also useful because the only people that stakeholders usually see at a senior route board level is the route MD. Giving the opportunity to see the whole board, made the event more credible. DB Cargo didn't realise there was a COO for routes until they were introduced at a workshop.
57. DB Cargo UK did get the impression that there was a lack of understanding of freight on the routes themselves as Freight is a small part of business or and the routes are more focused on passengers. The FNPO was OK, but the others not as much.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

58. System Operator was fully engaged with RDG. Worked well as industry, as was FOCs and Owning groups
59. They tried to solve the problems before consultation, even if they didn't resolve them all.
60. Was a well-structured approach, and let them scrutinize chunks of business plans.
61. Routes could have had a sub-workshop for their smaller customers to listen to those concerns instead of being part of a bigger workshop – this is a trade-off, would get more focus, but miss the opportunity to meet other customers.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

62. Route MD was there at the workshops.
63. Had the opportunity through formal consultation following publication.

### **If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

64. The two they went to were fairly similar.
65. The follow-up 'market stall' approach employed by South East was very good, it felt much more open. It also meant you could turn up when you like and go to whichever areas you liked.
66. Would have liked to have seen this in others. Not sure if they did this or not.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

67. Yes, and CP4, 3, 2 and 1.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

68. Felt from memory the approach this time was a lot better than had happened before.

69. Even if all of your comments didn't get taken into account, it was open and you could meet all the people, including other customers.

70. Don't remember this level of engagement at previous CPs.

71. Before it was "here's the document" and this time we felt like a customer.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

72. A request to please coordinate timings for national operators and owning groups to be better able to attend. Would be more useful if they were spaced out better.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Brad Woodworth  
Date 28 February 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Department for Transport (Oliver Mulvey and Dan Moore)

### **Has Network Rail, a route(s) and/or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s), in advance of submission to ORR in December and in February?**

1. DfT first noted that there is a duality of roles within DfT. In addition to being funders and customer, the Government is also the shareholder of Network Rail.
2. As a result of this, Government sits in a distinct and specific position – this is important context for the discussion around stakeholder engagement.
3. For example, there is a specific requirement that Network Rail consult DfT and that the Secretary of State approves the Strategic Business Plans (SBPs) to go forward for scrutiny by the ORR before they are published. To do so, DfT set out specific tests by which the SBPs would be assessed. The three tests were, in essence:
  - Compatibility with HLOS and SOFA
  - Appropriate governance processes had been employed within Network Rail
  - That there was an appropriate process of stakeholder engagement
4. DfT was provided access to the drafts of the SBPs in December by NR Centre, which also went to ORR. These drafts were not widely available.
5. Following this process, DfT provided specific feedback on the drafts, both directly to NR and to the ORR. In doing so this feedback had two components – comments from a shareholder perspective, which were provided directly to NR (which did lead to NR making specific changes to the plans), and comments from a customer perspective which were provided to the ORR to inform their regulatory scrutiny. While this distinction was a fine one in certain instances, that distinction was held to, to the greatest extent possible, so as not to cut across appropriate industry and regulatory processes. DfT was particularly concerned not to take action which undermined, or could be perceived to have undermined, NR's engagement with its customers.
6. DfT also tried to minimise the range of information flows between NR and DfT, with clear DfT contact points for NR and ORR identified for each of the shareholder and customer roles. This was important to avoid the provision of mixed messages and to support clarity.
7. Therefore in response to this specific question, this is a very clear YES.

8. DfT's experience with Network Rail's central function during this process was a positive one. This was partially due to the highly constructive approach taken by key NR personnel (most particularly Charles Robarts and his team).

### **How did the route/the SO ensure it was securing a consistent and coherent DfT view?**

9. As noted above, DfT in its shareholder function, used core, central contact points to reduce possibility of mixed messages. To avoid cutting across the appropriate process of engagement between NR's routes/SO and their customers, DfT predominantly fed specific comments on routes plans to the ORR to inform its regulatory scrutiny.
10. Network Rail told DfT at one point that this was more effective than had been the case in previous Periodic Reviews, where there had been more mixed messages.

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

11. In addition to the direct process of engagement, DfT also engaged with Network Rail (as well as other industry parties) as part of wider industry forums, particularly numerous Rail Delivery Group (RDG) forums, which were focused on broader strategic questions. A key aspect of this engagement was to emphasise the significant importance that the DfT placed on NR having a meaningful process of engagement with its customers on the SBPs – a theme which DfT has emphasised repeatedly in the SBP process, including in representations to the ORR.
12. Most of the stakeholder engagement from DfT took the form of bilateral conversations. There was an ongoing process of dialogue between the two parties that included a fortnightly standing discussion, with significantly more frequent discussion leading up to the final approval of the SBPs.
13. This was supported by DfT having a very good level of access to the relevant documents.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

14. DfT always attended all meetings available to them.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

15. DfT's general view on this issue formed part of the stakeholder/shareholder test mentioned above. Essentially, if the Secretary of State was not content on the level and nature of engagement, then he would have withheld consent. However, in doing so, DfT was also realistic that the process of engagement as an evolving one, as it has been with other regulated utilities, so that there would inevitably be challenges.
16. DfT therefore sought views from operators as part of its shareholder approval process. It considered that there was a clear indication that NR followed a more open process, with the provision of more material than in previous periodic reviews. However, DfT did have some reservations about whether it was genuine engagement or it was more of a one-way information provision process from Network Rail to stakeholders. In particular, there was a view that Network Rail hadn't always explained how it had used feedback as part of a genuine two way discussion. It noted that this comment wasn't about NR making changes in response to feedback – this may sometimes not be appropriate (e.g. because of cost considerations), but about how NR demonstrated how it had considered the feedback provided by stakeholders.



17. DfT also saw evidence of different levels types and quality of stakeholder engagement between the routes. Some of the SBPs showed greater evidence of the route having worked with its train operators to develop better track access strategies and better timetabling – more positive behaviours. Some plans had limited evidence of stakeholder engagement (or rather stakeholders being activated for advocacy purposes, rather than being involved in the making of appropriate choices and trade-offs).
18. DfT considers that effective stakeholder engagement should be a meaningful and interactive process and is particularly relevant with respect to difficult and challenging issues.
19. DfT was surprised not to see the correlations between the number of operators and the quality of engagement. There appeared to be no correlation. There were examples of good practice from routes that have both single and multiple dominate operators.
20. DfT therefore considered that while there was evidence of improvement which, on balance, justified approving the SBPs to go forward to the next stage of the regulatory process, there were reasonable concerns which it considered should be further explored by the ORR, helping to support a stronger culture of engagement. It wrote to the ORR following the approvals of the SBPs to highlight this comment.

### **Did you find the engagement proactive?**

21. Most of this experience is reflected the above.
22. DfT did mention that there is probably of a temporal change to the level of proactivity. The workshops which NR set up began in earnest in the start of 2017, but they did reduce over time. However, bilateral conversations did take place following these workshops, albeit DfT is less sighted on the frequency, nature and extent of these conversations.
23. On a related note, DfT did have questions about how some TOCs approached the process and how well-resourced they were to have the maximum impact.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

24. DfT was consulted on the whole Strategic Business Plan over the two months before it had to make its decision re approval, with various iterations of certain plans provided. All the route plans were examined in detail, albeit certain other plans received less detailed scrutiny - Central function plans were triaged, with the System Operator, Infrastructure and Digital selected as the key areas to prioritise.
25. The digital plan also received considerable scrutiny, with material comments provided directly to NR – particularly to ensure clarity as to the funded and unfunded aspects of the plan.

### **Were the questions open-ended and encouraging for stakeholders to respond?**

26. Network Rail didn't put specific questions to DfT. NR were however open, constructive, collaborative and highly responsive to the questions DfT raised, making available appropriate staff.
27. DfT understands, however, consistent with its particular role that Network Rail knew that if they weren't being open, the Secretary of State could refuse approval.

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance of the engagement; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

28. Network Rail provided some information alongside the Strategic Business Plans to help with the assurance, such as:

- a covering note that provided a reconciliation to SOFA; and
- providing working material in advance.

29. As there was considerable, collaborative work undertaken with Network Rail on the production of the HLOS and SOFA throughout all of 2017, DfT saw this as a continuation of this process, working from shared level of insight.
30. DfT considered this to be positive, reflecting continuing level of engagement. The personal role of Charles Robart's team was, again, referred to positively in this regard.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

31. Yes, throughout and on an ongoing basis. NR then responded to these points as part of the approval process – both in e-mail and in discussion .

### **If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

32. As this was an iterative process, there wasn't a formal record as such. However, the exchanges of e-mails and discussions (some of which were of a challenging nature) meant that DfT considered that it was clear that its points had been properly reflected.

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s)/the SO in question?**

33. Yes – DfT's view, from a shareholder perspective, had been reflected in the final version. However, it is important to note that DfT was indicating that, in approving publication, it was approving the provision of the documents for regulatory scrutiny, rather than agreeing to each and every proposition included therein. DfT had a number of material comments and observations from a customer perspective. However, these were raised by DfT with the ORR to inform the regulatory scrutiny process.

### **Do you think there was enough transparency of the process to stakeholders?**

34. To DfT, yes. DfT is aware that different parties have different views.
35. From the RDG discussions, there was some indication that some stakeholders didn't know what was happening, particularly following the initial workshops. While there were a number of slides presented to the RDG working groups, which included timelines, there remained a sense that some stakeholder were unclear about next steps. It considered that a single document illuminating the process may have been helpful, recognising that any such document would be a starting point to enable more bespoke, focussed discussions to also take place.

### **To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

36. Yes, with respect to the shareholder tests. This included being clear that there were some areas where DfT wanted ORR to scrutinise further – hence the letter mentioned above following the SBP process. There were further questions raised from a customer perspective which, as described above, DfT would expect to be addressed during the regulatory process.
37. This level of knowledge reflected the detailed internal process conducted by the DfT, the time it had to consider the plans and the level of engagement with NR. It accepted that this will not be the case for all stakeholders.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? Are you satisfied in how the process has gone?**

38. DfT believes that Network Rail conducted the process well as it relates to DfT. However, it did have reservations with respect to other stakeholders, as highlighted above. It noted that in particular, it did feel that there was more to do to embed a culture of engagement within NR.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

39. Most of these are discussed above.
40. With respect to DfT, Network Rail were open, available, and engaged, did explain things, and were also open in their thinking. The feeling at DfT is that if that experience was replicated more generally it would be a perceived to be a more positive process than some stakeholder perceived.
41. It was also clear that a greater priority was given to stakeholder engagement by NR, both at the centre and with the routes.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

42. Yes, there was. DfT was able to escalate material shareholder issues to very senior level within NR and is clear that action was taken in relation to them.

### **How did the engagement activity for the routes differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

43. This is considered above.

### **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

44. Yes; this one was very different. NR gave stakeholder engagement greater prominence and enabled the provision of considerably more information to customers through this process. From a Government perspective, the reclassification of the Company and the need for shareholder approval for the SBPs fundamentally changed the process meaning that there was a significant, sustained process of engagement between NR and DfT

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

45. No further information was provided.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Vernon Baseley  
Date 6th March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Dorset LEP (Lorna Carver)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. Wessex and Western Routes. Also SO.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

2. Western sent an email to a colleague inviting the LEP to be represented at an event in Bristol.
3. Ms Carver is not aware of any invitation to any consultation event specifically for the Wessex Route SBP, nor for any invitation from the SO.

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

4. No.

### If no, why?

5. The invitation to the Bristol event was not sent far enough in advance for Ms Carver (who would have been the attendee) to have the prospect of being free. It is also too far away from Bournemouth for it to be realistic to attend.

### In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?

6. Not known but understood to be multi-party.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

7. No.

### If no, why?

8. Only had the one opportunity but not possible for reasons given above.

### How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?

9. Not effective as no practical opportunity to participate was available and this was a missed opportunity for NR to share how it believes it can improve the poor connectivity to Dorset.
10. It is recognised that much of the focus of the SBP is on network maintenance and renewal but the LEP is seeking information about proposals for step-change.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

11. Whilst not aware of any specific SBP consultation for Wessex, there has been good engagement on a routine basis and it may be that account has been taken of the LEP's views expressed in these fora. However, there has not been any presentation of a draft of the SBP.
12. It was a weakness that Western did not take into account the fact that Dorset is at the margins of the Route geography and perhaps needed to be the subject of more targeted consultation.

### **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

13. No

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

14. It is not very clear to the LEP how to get schemes for improving connectivity onto the long list of schemes and it is not resourced to fund route / timetable studies. It is at this level that consultation would be most effective.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From John Collins  
Date 29 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with East Sussex County Council (Jon Wheeler, Team Manager, Strategic Economic Infrastructure)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. South East Route.

**Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? If so, what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

2. The South-East Route invited ESCC to attend at least three events (including a workshop in February 2017 and an exhibition in April). There was an opportunity to review the draft SBP and offer feedback.
3. There were no specific bilateral meetings for CP6 but ESCC does have quarterly catch ups with the Route Planning team, where they are able to table specific questions (which Network Rail usually respond to in a timely fashion).
4. There was no engagement with the SO.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

5. The February workshops were divided into two separate sessions – one for Kent and one for Sussex. ESCC attended both and provided broad input into the operations, maintenance and renewals parts of the SBP.

### What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?

6. There was a workshop in February where the Route set out its high-level thinking. This workshop was described as "fast paced". Some stakeholders were confused about the lack of inclusion of enhancements in the process. The February event was followed by an exhibition in April, where the Route presented its (more detailed) thinking on display boards.
7. The workshop contents were described as appropriate and gave attendees an opportunity to flag up what we felt was appropriate for the area.
8. The interviewee noted there was many "rail industry people" compared to local authorities at both events. There is some concern the local authority voice may have been diluted.

**What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

9. ESCC was not consulted on any specific CP6 issue.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement? How useful was this information?**

10. Some information about the workshop content was provided in advance. The interviewee believes attendees would have benefitted from being better informed by the Route that enhancements would not be included in the CP6 planning process.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

11. A facilitator took notes at the workshop.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

12. ESCC do not recall being given this opportunity.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

13. It is difficult to say if ESCC's views were taken into account. ESCC has a greater interest in enhancements than renewals and regards the level of engagement on the SPB to be appropriate.

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

14. The Route did not provide much detail, although the SBPs were well presented.  
15. The Route did not provide any explicit feedback along the lines of "we asked, you said, we did".

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

16. ESCC recognises the challenges in the South East (density of network, age of infrastructure, etc) and the need for renewals, but is more focused on (and interested in) enhancements.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

17. In general terms, ESCC believes the consultation process has been effective. It has been helpful to be involved. The process may have been more efficient if all stakeholders had acknowledged enhancements were not in scope.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

18. Strengths: Network Rail engaged ESCC and other stakeholders from the outset.  
19. Weaknesses: Some stakeholders were confused by the absence of enhancements in the SBPs. It appeared that local authorities were under represented. The interviewee also didn't see many passenger or rail interest group representatives at stakeholder events.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

20. The ESCC had no need to escalate any issue and has channels (through quarterly meetings) with the Route to do so if required.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

21. ESCC only engaged with the South-East Route.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

22. Yes.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

23. There was a bit more engagement than in CP5. However, enhancements were included in CP5, which would have generated more interest.



To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Daniela Phillips  
Date 26 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Rob Brighthouse (East West Rail)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. The stakeholder has interest in the Western, LNW, Anglia, LNE&EM and System Operator. The stakeholder indicated that their greatest interest was with the System Operator.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

2. The stakeholder hadn't been engaged but recognised that they were a relatively new company. The company was established in November 2017 but had been in operation since early 2017 and Network Rail have been aware of their existence for a while.

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

3. The stakeholder reported that a broader consultation and awareness from Network Rail would be an improvement. East West Rail is one of the companies set up following the Hansford Review and it is important that Network Rail consult organisations such as these.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Matthew Whearty (FW from: Essex County Council)  
Date 5 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Web survey of Essex County Council (Gary MacDonnell)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. The stakeholder was interested in the Anglia route (Great Eastern Main Line) and the SO.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

2. Yes; ECC have had a discussion on the matter.

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

3. The stakeholder did take the route up on the offer.

### If no, why?

### In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?

4. The format was a round-table discussion involving both Network Rail (NR) & Greater Anglia (GA).

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

5. The stakeholder attended everything available to them.

### If no, why?

### What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?

6. The stakeholder and the route have good working relationships and liaise regularly. It was pre-existing jointly attended sessions that were used. The stakeholder suggested that this worked well.

### What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.

7. In terms of NR, the stakeholder and the route have only had discussions on the high-level principles. No specific project details were discussed; merely guiding principles. ECC are able to engage with GA on a much greater level of detail discussing specifics on plans and investment.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

8. Almost nothing was provided prior to or after the consultation. The stakeholder characterised what was received as only really a ‘heads up,’ on what was likely to be brought up.

**How useful was this information?**

9. It was of little value to the stakeholder.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

10. The stakeholder’s views were recorded.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

11. The stakeholder was not given the opportunity to correct the record.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

12. The stakeholder did not think their views had been taken into account, and that the process didn’t/doesn’t feel like a genuine consultation in that sense.

**If not, do you feel Network Rail’s reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

13. The stakeholder did not feel NR’s reasoning was well-explained.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its ‘final’ strategic business plan?**

14. Again, the stakeholder said that through regular liaison (formal and informal), they have a good understanding as to why decisions have been taken. There is just the matter that ECC don’t consider themselves to have the ability to influence those decisions.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

15. It acts as a good information exchange.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail’s approach?**

16. Again, the stakeholder said that they have regular dialogue with NR and have a strong relationship with them. ECC are developing a project (Beaulieu Park) with them. This means that they have ample opportunity to discuss all relevant matters with them. I could imagine that authorities without this close relationship would have many concerns with the recent consultation.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

17. There was no formal option set out through which to escalate concerns.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

18. The stakeholder did not participate for CP5.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail’s consultation process for CP6?**

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

19. The stakeholder had no further information to provide.

**To what extent did the route/the SO explain the scope of the strategic business plan and how that related to particular railway priorities that you have an interest in?**

20. ECC have a good understanding of these principles and these are well set out.

**To what extent did the route/the SO work with you to identify areas of joint or collaborative working?**

21. Beyond areas where the stakeholder and route are currently working jointly on, this wasn’t investigated further.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Vernon Baseley  
Date 23 February 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Grand Central (Richard McLean, MD)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in?

1. The lead route for Grand Central is LNE, and most responses relate to this. Richard spoke primarily in his role as MD of Grand Central, but he also coordinates the participation of Arriva TOCs in general.

### Has Network Rail invited you to take part in a consultation on the route strategic plan?

2. Both the LNE Route and the SO had invited the stakeholder for consultation. Grand Central were invited to various sessions, but they had already actively sought engagement by requesting documents to review to try and drive the process - the TOC felt that they were more advanced timewise in their approach to the SBP planning process consultation than NR was.

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

Yes – the stakeholder did take part in the consultation.

### In what format did the consultation take place for the route(s)?

3. LNE held two town hall-style meetings involving all operators. One took place in Autumn (for the first draft), and one took place in late December/early January (for the second draft).

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

4. Yes – the stakeholder attended everything available to them.

### What areas were you consulted on / provided input to?

5. It seemed to the stakeholder that the NR process was geared to the delivery of its own project plan. The consultation process appeared to be 'bolted on' to it. Where consultation events were held, they were immediately before NR's own cut-offs for finalising versions of the SBP.
6. The stakeholder was consulted upon draft versions of the Route's SBP, but it was really a briefing-out of the content of NR's draft, rather than a two-way process.
7. LNE also had bi-lateral meetings concerning the scorecard - mainly customer service scorecards. These were focused upon 2018-19 CP5, but these discussions will continue for future years.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the consultation; and (c) following consultation? If so, how useful was this information?**

8. Grand Central provided NR with a documented set of its priorities so that these could be referred to in engagement – though no use was made of this.
9. The LNE document being consulted upon was c.150 pages. Grand Central requested sight before and, as a result, it was provided with a few days' notice.
10. The SO provided no information in advance of workshops.
11. No information was sent after workshops until the next draft was produced for the next round.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

12. In the final draft, an appendix stated that “you told us X so we did Y”. So, the feedback had been noted but the responses were not considered by the TOC to be adequate.

**Is so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

13. No, no opportunity was given to review.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

14. Mechanistic responses were given that the TOCs did not consider met the need. He notes, though, that the plans themselves are subject to ongoing negotiation.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

15. The stakeholder believed it to be less effective than it needed to be, because a good, robust plan is needed to succeed in CP6. Much effort was put into the consultation by Arriva and its TOCs, but this was not built-upon by NR. Much more use could have been made of these inputs.
16. NR did not take opportunities offered at each of the workshops for follow-up, which would have entailed specialists talking to each other during plan development.
17. It was clear that there is still a strong degree of central direction to the process, for example through templated approaches which suit NR's corporate purposes. An example was a common approach of stating that Route Supervisory Boards would be employed, but TOCs are not happy with the templated arrangements. The Routes appeared not to be able to respond to feedback that ran counter to these templated approaches.
18. There were particular concerns expressed by the stakeholder about the SO, which claimed to have consulted a number of groups such as the Planning Oversight Group and Route investment review groups but it is not clear that these were listening exercises.
19. The resultant LNE plan on operations was felt to be lacking in weight, and to have low prospects of succeeding.
20. In part, TOCs were seeking an opportunity to give views on what they sought from restructuring, as this has not been consulted upon otherwise.

## **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

### *Strengths*

21. It is a strength of devolution that maintenance and renewal plans are more robustly-developed, and that this has clearly been done 'bottom-up'.

### *Weaknesses*

22. However, the impression given is that the SBP development process has focused on M&R at the expense of operations and network management. Perhaps for this reason, it didn't seem to be obvious to those developing the SBP why TOCs would have an interest in the content.
23. TOCs were being asked about choices about how NR maintained its own assets (on which TOCs have little technical knowledge on which to base an opinion) rather than about network management issues.
24. The stakeholder felt that the SO departments appear to be inventing themselves through the SBP development process. They could have involved stakeholders much more in identifying what they wish to have delivered, but they seem to be too internally-focused.
25. SBPs were also presented for several Network Rail central departments such as the Technical Authority. This was unexpected but welcome. NR clearly sees the work of these departments as an internal matter. However, the outputs of these departments are of fundamental importance to TOCs. For example, they write many of the standards and plan the timetable, which is the core of what the railway sells to passengers.
26. For the central departments no response was received to requests to talk to them (and, so far as he knows, this was the case for all operators that asked). These teams include IP/Tech Authority/Digital Railway – the central departments have written their SBPs without any consultation.
27. Many in the rail sector still don't see a need for the SO – NR has missed an opportunity to obtain buy-in.
28. They have serious concerns about whether the SO SBP will deliver what is necessary and so they see it as problematic that SO is not listening.

## **Was there an opportunity to escalate concerns?**

29. Yes. Because of Arriva's structure, the contact attends the RDG Group that coordinates this activity, so he could talk to senior NR managers involved in the process.
30. However, he gained the impression that these senior NR managers did not believe the feedback that they were being given, on the basis that, because a lot of meetings had been held, consultation must have been achieved successfully.
31. He also spoke to ORR.
32. The DfT have asked all franchised TOCs for feedback on effectiveness.

## **If you attended consultation activity for more than one route, was there consistency?**

33. The stakeholder was aware of other Routes' events through his Arriva role. Different approaches were taken by different Routes. Some Routes had a wider scope for their workshops. Some invited a wider range of stakeholders. Some had more bi-laterals, which TOCs thought were very helpful.

## **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

34. No – he was not involved in such a process.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

35. The stakeholder believes that parts of the SBPs should have been jointly-authored with TOCs. This would have been perfectly possible, because, for instance, NR and TOCs write Joint Performance Improvement Plans – it's not clear why this approach is not suitable for the SBP.



To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From John Collins  
Date 27 March 2018  
Project Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with GTR (Gerry McFadden, Engineering Director)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. GTR engaged with the South East Route only.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? If so, what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

2. The Route provided detailed presentations on their plans for CP6, including asset renewal works planned for this period. This was followed by one or two workshops that focussed on priority areas. The route also sought GTR's input on the scorecard.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

3. The interviewee was not able to attend all workshops, but did attend a couple of detailed sessions.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

4. Route Asset Managers explained their priorities for their areas of the Route. There was an opportunity for discussion and feedback. GTR were provided with draft copies of the SBP and were invited to comment on them. GTR worked with the South East route to agree a scorecard for the Route.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

5. There was a significant amount of engagement on the performance elements of the scorecard.

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement? How useful was this information?**

6. Although the interviewee did not receive/see all information, he understands from his colleagues that the information provided was useful and timely.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

7. Informal notes were taken at workshops.

### **If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

8. Yes.

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

9. An honest attempt was made was made by the Route to explain a “vast amount of detailed work” and explain the rationale behind their proposals. Where appropriate they sought GTR’s views. It was clear a lot of effort had gone into the presentation.
10. The interviewee acknowledged that GTR maybe came in a bit late into the process. This timing may have limited GTR’s ability to influence the process in the early stages.

### **If not, do you feel Network Rail’s reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

11. From an asset management perspective, GTR understand why the Route has prioritised the infrastructure renewal schemes included in the CP6 SBP. However, not all schemes will meet GTR’s aspirations (see below).

### **To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its ‘final’ strategic business plan?**

12. GTR did not engage with the SO.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

13. In summary, GTR “felt consulted” and “felt Network Rail (South East) made a good attempt” to involve stakeholders, especially on scorecard.
14. There are several less infrastructure focused issues that GTR would have like to have seen included in the SBP. This includes managing new lineside neighbours (arising from developments near lines, stations and depots) through managing noise and light pollution. GTR would also have liked to have seen more on accessibility issues.
15. GTR had some feedback on the approach and philosophy of the CP6 planning process:
- The CP6 process appears to focus on “esoteric areas of engineering excellence” rather than passenger needs. It is therefore no surprise the SBPs are “infrastructure heavy” and that the Route Asset Managers priorities have been given most focus in them.
  - If the intention is for the SBPs to be engineering focused, then there is a limit to the role a TOC can play in the planning process.
  - It is not GTR’s place to make effective representation on engineering excellence (although it is good to know what is happening on the railway). TOCs are better placed to communicate passenger needs and recommend interventions that ensure these needs will be met in the future. GTR do not expect to be asked to tell Network Rail asset managers how to do their job, but they appreciate the time specialists/engineers have taken to communicate with GTR through the CP6 planning process.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail’s approach?**

16. There was clearly a lot of effort put into the process. The workshops were very well presented.
17. There was a significant focus on engineering and asset renewal. There was less focus on passenger needs.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

18. Yes.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

19. GTR did not engage with other routes.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

20. Yes.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

21. Yes. The CP5 consultation took longer and included enhancements as well as renewals. The process was not as effective as the CP6 consultation.

# #14

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, March 29, 2018 8:15:29 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, March 29, 2018 8:27:07 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:11:38  
**IP Address:** 148.252.128.252

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

Richard Dean

### Q2 Organisation

Greater Anglia

### Q3 Role

Train Service Delivery Director

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4** Are you interested in the Anglia route? **Yes**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5** Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q6** If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

**Q7** If no to Q5, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route? **Workshop**

**Q9** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Yes**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement?

Poor. Essentially one of the Route's largest customers was treated the same as a Parish Council with an interest in one station.

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Discussion was limited to a high level discussion around the level of maintenance work that was being proposed subject to funding

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance

**None**

(b) during the engagement

**High level presentation of work proposed**

(c) following the engagement

**Brief note that a meeting took place**

**Q14** How useful was this information?

**Somewhat useful**

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Felt like a tick box exercise to say that consultation had taken place.

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

N/a

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

There was follow up on some specific access challenges and some other workshops but no feedback on the outcome.

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Yes but not for Anglia Route. The CP6 process is worse as there has been no discussion around enhancements at all and the Route has no interest in the needs of its Customers

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

I had have expected to comment on draft submissions to the ORR but that did not take place, we were sent a copy after submission.

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **No**

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q23** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q30** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route?

No

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q39** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q46** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **No**

---

Page 9: Scotland



---

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q55** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q62** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 10: Route selection: South East

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **No**

---

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q78** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route? **No**

---

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q87** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q94** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route? **No**

---

Page 15: Wessex

---

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q103** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q110** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 16: Route selection: Western

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **No**

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q142** How useful was this information? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? Respondent skipped this question

---

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? Yes

---



Page 21: System Operator (SO)

<b>Q149</b> Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?	<b>No</b>
<b>Q150</b> If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?	Only for one/some routes (please specify): N/a
<b>Q151</b> If no to the above, why not?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q152</b> In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q153</b> Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q154</b> If "no" to the above, why not?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q155</b> What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q156</b> What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q157</b> What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q158</b> How useful was this information?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q159</b> How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>
<b>Q160</b> If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?	<b>Respondent skipped this question</b>

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

The SO consultation did not really take place, again received a copy of their draft plan after submission

---

# #12

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Tuesday, March 27, 2018 1:37:31 PM  
**Last Modified:** Tuesday, March 27, 2018 1:47:14 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:09:43  
**IP Address:** 85.115.33.180

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

D Crowther

### Q2 Organisation

HS1

### Q3 Role

CEO

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4 Are you interested in the Anglia route?** **No**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5 Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6 If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7 If no to Q5, why not?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8 In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9 Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q14** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **Yes**

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

<p><b>Q21</b> Has the LNE&amp;EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Q22</b> If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q23</b> If no to the above, why not?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q24</b> In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&amp;EM route?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q25</b> Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q26</b> If "no" to the above, why not?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q27</b> What are your views on the format of the LNE&amp;EM route's stakeholder engagement?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q28</b> What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&amp;EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q29</b> What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q30</b> How useful was this information?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q31</b> How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p>No contact despite the fact that St Pancras is the gateway to East Midlands and there is a significant TT change affecting St Pancras</p>	
<p><b>Q32</b> If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>
<p><b>Q33</b> Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&amp;EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?</p>	<p><b>Respondent skipped this question</b></p>

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

it would be good if the LNE route remembered it has customers and interface stakeholders south of Peterborough and Bedford.

---

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route? **No**

---

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q39** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q46** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **No**

---

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q55** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---



**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **Yes**

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Only for one/some routes (please specify):  
High speed**

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Workshop**

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Yes**

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement?

compliance based rather than value add.

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

interface with HS1 and future alliance with TOC

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(c) following the engagement **copy of route plans**

**Q78** How useful was this information? **Somewhat useful**

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

too structured and too big, felt they spent most of the time dealing with the centre rather than liaising with customers.

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

N/A

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

N/A

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

N/A

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route?

**No**

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q87** If no to the above, why not?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q94** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route? **No**

---

Page 15: Wessex

---

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q103** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q110** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 16: Route selection: Western

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **No**

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q142** How useful was this information? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? Respondent skipped this question

---

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? Yes

---

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **No**

---

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q151** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement?

I didn't see anything but as an adjacent Infrastructure owner I would have expected to be consulted.

---

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Costs

---

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q158** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

poor

---

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---



**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

no

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

N/A

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

N/A

---

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From John Collins  
Date 21 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Kent County Council (Stephen Gasche, Principal Transport Planner (Rail))

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. South East Route
2. System Operator

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

3. Both the SO and South East Route Contacted KCC and invited them to engage in the SBP development process.
4. KCC were invited to attend two South East Route stakeholder days in Southwark. This was a well attended event. It included an address by Route Managing Director and a clear presentation of the change in approach from CP5 to CP6 (i.e. how enhancements will be funded separately and will no longer be restricted to control periods).
5. KCC was also invited to attend several SO workshops, which were described as "Excellent in engaging stakeholders".
6. SO also organised invited key London Boroughs, Kent, Medway, some businesses to a smaller forum for a focussed Local Authority discussion.
7. There have also been bi-laterals with both South East and System Operator, covering both SBP and Draft Kent Route Study. KCC maintains a good dialogue with both Network Rail and the TOC through regular bi-lateral meetings.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

8. The interviewee attended two workshops out of at least three (maybe four) organised by both the South East Route and SO.

### **If no, why?**

9. The South East Route workshops were split by sub-Route (Sussex and Kent). KCC only attended the Kent Sub-Route.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

10. The format included a presentation from the Route Managing Director and group discussions. The groups were deliberately mixed, which the interviewee said enabled a productive and engaging discussion about new structures and funding arrangements.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

11. KCC was consulted on all aspects of the SBP. As a Local Authority, it was not included in the Scorecard.

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

12. KCC received an agenda and (if memory serves) a paper setting out main elements of the SBPs.
13. KCC also received copies of draft SBPs.

### **How useful was this information?**

14. This information was useful and helpful inform discussion at the workshop.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

15. Yes, on flipchart and minutes.

### **If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

16. The interviewee did not recall that detail but does not recall needing to correct anything.

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

17. Yes, absolutely. KCC has a strong interest in ensuring the rail network was the capacity to meet planned housing and employment growth (further details of forecast growth is provided in [KCC and Medway's Growth and Infrastructure Framework](#)).

### **If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

18. The interviewee couldn't recall any specific example where challenge was needed.

### **To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

19. KCC understands the SBP contents and the reasons behind them. KCC broadly supports government policy that determines the SBP, provided there is sufficient HMT/DfT managed funding for enhancement projects (with third party funding). KCC is particularly keen to ensure funding is sufficient for enhancements such as Thanet Parkway, the proposed Crossrail to Ebbsfleet (C2E) extension, and enhancements to the Ashford Spurs at Ashford West (to enable high-speed services to Hastings).

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

20. Very effective.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

21. Only strengths were mentioned. There was a high level of engagement with stakeholders (by both the SO and the South East Route), interactions were frequent and detailed, there was willingness by Network Rail to take on issues

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

22. There was no need to escalate to this level, but the interviewee was confident he knew which channels he could access to raise concerns.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

23. Yes. The South East Route approach was very clear and (obviously) geographically relevant. The interviewer liked the way South East Route was split Kent from Sussex throughout the consultation process (this saved time).

24. System Operator was dealing with wider remit, especially in terms of capacity and what was needed to meet future projected demand. The interviewer saw both approaches as complementary.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

25. The interviewer was in post but cannot recall the CP5 consultation exercise.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

26. All of the attendees of the South East Route workshops felt the venue was very cramped. That said, the event itself was well managed and well run.

**To what extent did the route/the SO explain the scope of the strategic business plan and how that related to particular railway priorities that you have an interest in?**

27. This was done well. The interviewer noticed that certain initiatives (e.g. Ashford West enhancements needed to unlock high-speed access to Hastings) were included in the discussion from the outset, even if though these are enhancements (and therefore out of scope of the HLOS).

**To what extent did the route/the SO work with you to identify areas of joint or collaborative working?**

28. The process helped KCC identify non-Network Rail stakeholders, such as business stakeholders, to engage in developing the case for enhancements (e.g. Crossrail extension to Ebbsfleet).

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Daniela Phillips  
Date 2 February 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Merseytravel Interview Responses (Wayne Menzies & David Jones)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. The stakeholder was interested principally in LNW, and the System Operator.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

2. The route had a workshop in relation to the SBP in Manchester. There was a separate session on the SO role as well.
3. The route consulted Rail North as a separate process.
4. Merseytravel have regular meetings with NR, where the SPB does come up, and Merseytravel has an opportunity to feed in comments they wish to.

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

5. The workshop involved everyone, and the stakeholder got to identify what they wanted from the process.
6. Merseytravel represented other PTEs and operators at the sessions.
7. It was felt that it was an interesting workshop.
8. The route MD and various other members attended.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

9. NR arranged workshops, but also invited a collection of different representatives from different parts of Merseytravel. They made sure that they represented each one of them.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

10. The stakeholder felt that the format was what you expected from a workshop, and that it was useful.
11. There was more of a process than content, and the session wasn't about how the route were proposing doing things.

**What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

12. The consultation wasn't about volumes, and was instead about the process the route intended to pursue.
13. The route wasn't proposing any specific works; instead, they were looking for the gaps they thought were there, that Merseytravel was going to take forward.
14. The route "gave it a good shot".

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

15. The route sent materials around before the workshop, and had given Merseytravel their emerging processing for how they were going to deliver the SBP.
16. The presentations were provided at the session and not provided beforehand; this was not a surprise.
17. The stakeholder was sent the material used at the workshop afterwards, and a summary of the views located on the day.

**How useful was this information?**

18. The information was helpful and good; it was about the process they intended to follow, and they did follow that process.
19. There was advance notification about what the route intended to do.
20. The workshop was about the information they were trying to get out of stakeholders.
21. The route asked "How do you think you'll fit in"; it was a listening exercise.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

22. Yes, they were sent back following the meeting.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

23. The opportunity to correct came as a matter of course, and Merseytravel had no problem going back.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

24. Merseytravel will find out whether their views were taken into account over the years to come.
25. There are two levels to this; as far as the process was concerned, there was recognition of the views expressed.
26. If the actual items in the SBP are delivered, these will be seen overtime.
27. There was a genuine interest from the route in the stakeholders; but it was felt that the problem is when you have a lot of stakeholders saying different things, and you can't do all of them.
28. Merseytravel has a good working relationship, with the both the LNW route and the SO.
29. Both routes had been at Merseytravel with a follow-on to what they said, and Merseytravel were engaged over the content of the plans as well.

30. It was not felt that Merseytravel was critical of what the route said at the time, and that it was more a case of how the plan pans out in the future.
31. Merseytravel want to give themselves the best chance regarding how it pans out in the future.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

32. The stakeholder understood it completely, but didn't agree with it all.
33. The stakeholder responded to the ORR consultation about the content, but didn't respond to all of the consultations.
34. They have a whole stack of working papers.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

35. The stakeholder felt the process was good.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

36. The only observation was that a lot of what they were able to do through the SBP would be through infrastructure delivery.
37. There was concern about moving work into the next CP, and that NR was a victim of circumstances.
38. The process was seen as being as much as about the circumstances and what the government wanted, as what the stakeholders wanted.
39. Similar reviews to this have been undertaken in the past, regarding what is going wrong with the consultation process. The stakeholder was concerned that this was about funding.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

40. There was an opportunity; they have a Liverpool city region programming board, and the route MD is on that. A standing agenda item is the SBP, and the stakeholder could escalate their comments through that.

**What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

41. The stakeholder thought that, because it wasn't just about the SBP, it was also about the level of engagement through the strategic planning process. From that engagement process, the stakeholder got a pretty good idea of what is happening.
42. Merseytravel may feel better than other stakeholders who do not undertake this process.
43. If Merseytravel is unhappy with an explanation, Network Rail will explain it again.

**Have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

44. There was no big change observed between CP4 and CP5.
45. The consultation for CP6 focused on route regulation and changes through the ORR, with changes including the System Operator.
46. For CP6, the planning process was different to previously.
47. It was felt that the process was better than for CP5.

**To what extent did the route/the SO explain the scope of the strategic business plan and how that related to particular railway priorities that you have an interest in?**

- 48. The stakeholder hadn't had anything specific regarding the scope and priorities.
- 49. However, the Rail North presentation had a view on how that was taken forward.
- 50. Other than a general notification that it was going to be more Operations Maintenance and Renewals that came out of the plan, the stakeholder didn't get much explanation.
- 51. Additionally, the stakeholder didn't know what was going to come out of government.

**To what extent did the route/the SO work with you to identify areas of joint or collaborative working?**

- 52. It was felt that this would be more of an issue with Merseyrail.
- 53. Merseytravel is not involved in Maintenance and Renewal. They are, however, interested in enhancements.
- 54. The stakeholder has a good relationship with Network Rail and meet with them regularly, including regular strategic level meetings.
- 55. The stakeholder attended a workshop on enhancements with NR, where the latter explained the role of the Business Development Directors. Merseytravel don't know what this role is going to change, but don't see things changing drastically.



To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Daniela Phillips  
Date 6 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with MTR Crossrail (Richard Schofield, Programme Director)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. The stakeholder is interested in the Anglia route predominantly and the Western route from May 2018 onwards. There is also a small amount of interest in the South East route. There was awareness of the SO but no interest in engagement.
2. The stakeholder flagged up that he was the Route Manager of Anglia at the beginning of the process and had only been at MTR Crossrail for five months.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

3. The Anglia route were very engaged. The stakeholder was invited to two workshops (London and Ipswich) that was attended by lots of TOCs, FOCs and Local Authorities.
4. The Western route did not engage with the stakeholder at all to start with. There was no mention of MTR Crossrail in the first draft of the SBP and the stakeholder had to get in contact with the route to remind them that they were a stakeholder.
5. The SO made no contact that Richard is aware of.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

6. The stakeholder attended the London workshop for the Anglia route (as they thought it more appropriate than the Ipswich workshop).
7. The stakeholder wasn't invited to a workshop for the Western route. However, following an exchange of letters, Western have offered the stakeholder a bi-lateral meeting which will be taking place on 9 March 2018.
8. The stakeholder didn't know if there was anything else available that they should have gone to. Because MTR Crossrail is a new TOC, they often don't know which meetings / invitations are important, and similarly with services not going live on Western until 20 May 2017, it is understandable how NR could omit MTR from processes / meetings until then.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

9. The stakeholder felt that the Anglia workshop was good and did a fair job of engaging early on in the process.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

10. The stakeholder was given a copy of the draft Anglia SBP (that included the scorecard as an annex) and concentrated on providing comments on asset management.
11. The stakeholder didn't receive a copy of any Western documents to comment on and had to actively seek the SBP out (see comment below).
12. Detailed feedback was given on both routes via a letter from the Managing Director. The timescale for feedback was a month, which the stakeholder believed would have been an adequate timescale. However, this sat in the Managing Director's inbox and had to be turned around in a few days.

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

13. For Anglia:
- no information was provided in advance;
  - following the workshop, a presentation was circulated that addressed the feedback that had been received at the workshop; and
  - there was no further information apart from the updated SBP.
  - We acknowledge that there is a significant internal process for NR around funding so we didn't expect engagement until the SBP was in draft; but some updates would have been welcome (See below).
14. There was no information provided from Western.

### **How useful was this information?**

15. The stakeholder felt that the presentation addressing feedback from Anglia was good. However, there was a big gap in time where no information was given. Between the workshop that took place early in 2017 and the draft SBP in October/November 2017 there was no communication. The stakeholder recognised that receiving constant updates on a weekly basis would have been too much, but a letter or update every two months would have been appreciated.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

16. The stakeholder sent letters of their views to Network Rail which they responded to.

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

17. The stakeholder noted that the first draft of the SBP didn't include the feedback that they had given (in both Anglia and Western's case) but this was rectified in the second draft. However, the edits requested were minor and the stakeholder felt that the second draft SBP was more or less a 'fait accompli'. If the stakeholder had had substantial comments, they don't think they would have been taken into account.

18. The stakeholder challenged the numbers that the Anglia route had included regarding track volumes and costs. They felt that the response from Network Rail was dismissive and didn't give them any justification, nor prompted NR to look again at the costs (issue was a 25% increase in volume for only a 2% increase in costs).

19. The stakeholder noted that the layout of the plans made it difficult to comment on them. As the SBPs were different depending on the route, it made it hard to find where the relevant information was.

### **To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

20. There was no fundamental disagreement to the SBP but the stakeholder struggles to understand how the Anglia route will hit its financial target. (See 18)

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

21. The stakeholder believed that it wasn't very effective in general but doesn't blame Network Rail. The stakeholder felt that the SBP is an internal piece of work for Network Rail and they should be left to it. It was noted that an update on the consultation process via RDG might have been more effective.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

22. The stakeholder thought it was unfair to judge and criticise Network Rail. They thought that the Anglia route had done well to gain that amount of money for CP6 from the government and they should work with them to get as much money as possible spent on MTR Crossrail.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

23. There was no specific opportunity but the stakeholder wrote a letter to Network Rail that they responded to.

24. No feedback was invited following the circulation of the presentation from the Anglia workshop.

### **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

25. The contact was at Network Rail as the Anglia Route Manager at the time and admitted he didn't remember any stakeholder consultation taking place (so believed this was an improvement).

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

26. The stakeholder highlighted that the process hadn't finished and Network Rail were continuing to engage with them.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Vernon Baseley  
Date 6th March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Nexus (Derek Gittins)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. It should be noted that Derek was able to cover two different roles in his answers. Nexus is a customer of NR as the operator of Metro, as well as being a regional stakeholder.
2. He expressed an interest in the LNE&EM route, and, in Nexus' stakeholder role, the LNW route because of TransPennine Express services. He was also interested in the Freight & National Passenger Operators route.
3. Nexus also has a definite interest in the SO.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

4. The LNE&EM route, and the SO, have sought Nexus' views.

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

5. The stakeholder took them up on this offer.

### If no, why?

6. N/A

### In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?

7. For the SO, there were 2 national events. The first, in Birmingham, was to share an early draft of the SBP. The second, in Manchester, was about a month ago and covered much more detail. However, there was only a small window remaining for raising "show-stoppers". An interesting feature of this workshop was where other infrastructure managers (such as Nexus, TfL, East-West Rail, HS1 & HS2) were taken to side rooms, which Nexus found very useful and informative.
8. For the LNE&EM route, there were 2 workshops in York, to very similar timescales. These were focused on issues of interest to Nexus, as a TOC. There were briefings and then break-out sessions on particular subjects, such as performance targets. The purpose of the sessions had not been made very clear in advance.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

9. Yes

**If no, why?**

10. N/A.

**What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

11. The events were well-structured, but not enough had been known in advance of the first stage of what would take place.

**What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

12. The stakeholder covered this in response to questions 9 and 10 above.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

13. The stakeholder suggested that just an invite and agenda were sent for the first meetings. A draft SBP was distributed for the second. The stakeholder further stated that some material was circulated afterwards.

**How useful was this information?**

14. The stakeholder argued that it would have been better to have had more information in advance about how attendees could make input.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

15. During the breakout sessions, the SO captured a formal list of who said what.

16. On the other hand, the LNE&EM route didn't capture this information formally.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

17. The stakeholder noted that this opportunity was certainly given for the SO.

18. For the LNE&EM route, there was less scope for change, and furthermore, there was no mark-up of changes that had been made since the draft prepared before the workshops.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

19. The stakeholder suggested that Nexus' views had only been taken into account in some cases.

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

20. The stakeholder did not think that NR's reasons were well-explained, or that there was an opportunity to challenge their decisions.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

21. The stakeholder suggested that the proposals were well-argued, and made clear the financial constraints that NR was working under.

22. It was a concern that a number of schemes that had been discussed over time were not mentioned. This may be due to the move of enhancements away from the SBP process, but this was not evident. It is not known where such enhancements are now presented for stakeholders to see.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

23. There were two points of engagement, but with nothing in between. Whilst there was some marking-up of documents, and information was fed in, there was little feedback to suggest this had been taken account of.
24. In general, the SO engagement was more effective than that of the LNE&EM route.
25. The LNE&EM route's engagement with Nexus Metro as a TOC was not effective. Other TOCs were given performance scorecards, but Nexus Metro was not.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

26. The stakeholder suggested that a weakness was that the purpose remained unclear throughout, especially when views were being sought about restructuring.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

27. This was not discussed.

### **If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

28. N/A

### **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

29. The stakeholder had taken part in the CP5 process.

### **If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

30. The stakeholder suggested that more information was provided this time than had been for CP5. For instance, the information on work-banks from the LNE&EM route was better – though it was still not clear in what geographical sub-areas the work would take place

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

31. The stakeholder made clear that it is important Nexus Metro is given recognition as a TOC – this did not appear to be the case.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Brad Woodworth  
Date 26 February 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with North Yorkshire Moors (Liz Parkes, Head of Operations and Safety)

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

1. The stakeholder is interested in the London North East & East Midlands, specifically, in the north-east of England. The stakeholder has had no interaction with the System Operator.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

2. Network Rail invited NYMR to seminars; the stakeholder attended one in Derby. The stakeholder spoke about the investment that they are focusing on including flooding risk and timetable planning.
3. Additionally, the route set up Time Table Risk planning forums, which NYMR has been involved in.
4. NYMR also has regular meetings with their performance manager at Network Rail, and have engaged on problems with timetable planning.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

5. NYMR did attend all meetings available.

### What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?

6. The stakeholder felt that the format was very good; they noted it proved both formal and informal as necessary at their workshops, and that the presentation was distributed at the end.

### What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.

7. NYMR were consulted on timetables, and all the schemes and plans that the route have in place. They were informed on how the schemes have allocated money, and that the schemes are part of the whole picture

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

8. NYMR were provided with a copy of presentation at the workshop. NYMR were additionally provided with links to documents discussed in the workshop. The stakeholder couldn't recall if these links were provided before or after the workshops.

### **How useful was this information?**

9. The background information presented was good, and the stakeholder felt it was good to understand what CP6 was all about.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

10. The route recorded views at meetings, in the form of notes on what NYMR had to say.

### **If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

11. The stakeholder could not recall if they saw the notes afterwards; they did not get to provide feedback, but did not expect this to be the case in any event.

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

12. NYMR feels that their views were taken into account, "even if they weren't able to give us everything we wanted".

### **To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

13. On a scale of 1-10, the stakeholder rated their level of understanding at 7. The stakeholder also admitted that they were a small player on the route.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

14. NYMRs felt that it was a very good consultation process, as it is essential that they understand what is being done and have the opportunity to contribute. The biggest weakness the stakeholder identified was the output of CP6: in the north east, NR is trying to add additional trains, to 15% above current levels. The output of CP6 is to improve the timetabling process. The stakeholder suggested that NR is presently struggling with that, due to too many commitments from TOCs, creating quite a significant work load when developing timetables. NYMR did engage in the process, but they are concerned about the achievability of the outputs.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

15. There was an opportunity to escalate at the workshops, as they included contributions from senior figures. The stakeholder did have another opportunity to escalate concerns, but the nature of this was not specified.

### **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

16. Our contact at NYMR is new to the role since the CP5 consultation, so she is not aware of the process used for that consultation.



**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

17. The stakeholder offered no additional information. She suggested that she thought it was a good consultation process, and that it had been well-explained.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Brad Woodworth  
Date 5 February 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Rail Delivery Group (John Thomas & Tom Wood)

**NOTE: RDG would like to see a copy of everything before it goes to ORR. Will have to get approval internally for the response to be shared.**

### General overview from RDG

1. RDG said that it is first important to acknowledge the huge amount of work that has gone into producing the Strategic Business Plans (SBPs) and believes that it is important to recognise that there has been much engagement. The introduction of the devolved route structure represents a significant change for Network Rail, part of a wide-ranging transformation plan.
2. RDG believes that this consultation will hear from most operators that the plans have been developed from the bottom up – are locally developed and locally owned, rather than having been determined from the centre.
3. RDG expects that this exercise will find some areas of good practice and some areas where there is room for improvement. Collectively, the industry needs to focus on what improvements can be made on engagement going forward, learning from the process to date.
4. There will inevitably be times when Network Rail and operators are unable to find agreement (for example, where there are divergences between TOC franchise commitments on punctuality and what Network Rail believes can be delivered for the available funding). However, failure to agree does not in itself imply that there has been a breakdown in the engagement process. The focus in such circumstances should be on clarity and transparency around how the proposals in the plans have been developed and on-going engagement to try to close the gap.
5. RDG expects that, moving forward, there will be an increasing focus on engagement around efficiency initiatives that will need to be established in order to deliver successfully in CP6. One current example is the Network Rail project to facilitate operators and suppliers to review and challenge standards. This engagement has started and, RDG expects, will be accelerated.
6. It is clear that the content of SBPs has not been dictated from the centre but have been developed with a significant degree of independence. Similarly, routes have not followed identical engagement processes.
7. Improving engagement does not only involve identifying areas of improvement for Network Rail. Collectively, Network Rail and its stakeholders need to ensure that they are getting the most out the engagement process. Operators must be pro-active and feed into the process in a structured manner.

8. It may be that, depending on who SDG consults within a stakeholder organisation, there are different opinions on the engagement process. This may be the case, for example, where engagement has been taking place at different levels but where no single individual can provide a comprehensive overview.
9. Further engagement between Network Rail and its customers is very important, whether it be to close the gap on different views regarding achievable punctuality improvements, efficiency initiatives, or in the development of delivery plans for CP6.

**Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

10. RDG's approach has been to facilitate conversations and foster cross-industry dialogue between its members and other stakeholders, rather than providing detailed input on the content of the plans. RDG facilitates discussion through its working groups. At these meetings Network rail has frequently presented on items such as the development of route scorecards. These meetings have worked well and have been inclusive, with ORR, DfT, Transport Scotland and Passenger Focus frequently attending. There have also been discussions at the National Task Force, a cross-industry group led by RDG, on performance trajectories.
11. RDG has been involved in the majority of Network Rail's stakeholder workshops. Broadly speaking, there were two rounds of workshops. Following the first round, in around March 2017, RDG provided some feedback on the events directly to Network Rail, which was reflected in how Network Rail undertook the second round.

**In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

12. RDG understands that engagement has taken place in a variety of formats, whether explicitly under the banner of SBP engagement events or otherwise (e.g. at pre-existing industry meetings such as Route Investment Review Groups).
13. In addition to workshop events, RDG understands that there have been bilateral conversation between Network Rail and their customers/stakeholders.

**What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

14. RDG believes it is right for Network Rail's routes to have the freedom to decide how best to engage with their stakeholders. Over time, the relationship between Network Rail and key stakeholder should evolve into one of continuous dialogue.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

15. Stakeholders have generally been able to comment on draft plans circulated during the process.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

16. Although Network Rail's SBP workshops followed a somewhat similar format, certain events were attended by a broad spectrum of stakeholders and others only attended by train operators. Messages and event formats will inevitably need to be tailored to the audience, which may have a greater or lesser level of knowledge of the industry.

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

17. RDG believes that we should be referring to stakeholder 'engagement', rather than stakeholder 'consultation', because it must be a meaningful two-way dialogue.
18. RDG wants to see buy-in to the plans from the whole industry. A good recent example of this was the FOCs sending a letter to ORR indicating support for the FNPO SBP. Where the industry can show they've done all they can to reach a common position, this should be looked on favourably by ORR. Some discussions can take place collectively through RDG, which can provide a forum for cross industry discussion.
19. The industry needs to ensure that there is continuous engagement. This must not be a process with the aim of satisfying a regulatory requirement to produce the SBPs, - but must instead be an ongoing engagement process in the delivery of the plans aimed at delivering value for customers, communities and the taxpayer.

# #4

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, March 05, 2018 12:13:06 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, March 05, 2018 12:18:09 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:05:03  
**IP Address:** 78.144.250.206

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

Maggie Simpson

### Q2 Organisation

RFG

### Q3 Role

Executive Director

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4 Are you interested in the Anglia route?** **No**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5 Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6 If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7 If no to Q5, why not?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8 In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9 Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q14** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **No**

---

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

---

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q23** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q30** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route? **No**

---

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q39** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---



**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q46** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **No**

---

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q55** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **No**

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q78** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route? **No**

---

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q87** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q94** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route? **No**

---

Page 15: Wessex

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q103** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q110** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **Yes**

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not?

N/a

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Discussion, Workshop, Consultation process**

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **No**

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not?

Diary constraints

---



**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement?

Pretty good overall

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Priorities for CP6

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

(a) in advance	<b>This depends on stage but relevant drafts at all stages</b>
(b) during the engagement	<b>his depends on stage but relevant drafts at all stages</b>
(c) following the engagement	<b>his depends on stage but relevant drafts at all stages</b>

---

**Q142** How useful was this information?

**Somewhat useful**

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Broadly good, but there is a lot of content so cannot be on top of it all.

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

I didnt

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Yes

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

The business plan process was more open and transparant.

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

---

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? **Yes**

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **No**

**Q151** If no to the above, why not?

My diary didn't permit.

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? **Workshop, Consultation process**

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **No**

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not?

Diary constraints

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement?

Good

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Business plan

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

- |                              |                |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| (a) in advance               | <b>Various</b> |
| (b) during the engagement    | <b>Various</b> |
| (c) following the engagement | <b>Various</b> |

**Q158** How useful was this information?

**Somewhat  
useful**

---

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Good

---

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

I didn't

---

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Yes

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

As for FNPO

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

---

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Vernon Baseley  
Date 8th March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Rail North (David Hoggarth)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. LNE, LNW, FNPO & SO.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

2. Yes, all of them.

### **If yes, did you take them up on this offer?**

3. Yes.

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

4. LNW Route – one multi-stakeholder workshop information on the proposed approach although there was opportunity for feedback.
5. LNE Route - two multi-stakeholder workshops (a preliminary one and then one providing more detail on the preferred approach). The LNE session was very open about the inability to deliver the full performance output so this wasn't a surprise (although still disappointing) when the final draft came out.
6. There was also consultation by FNPO, attended by a freight specialist from Rail North.
7. The SO had a 1 to 1 event (specific to SBP) in Summer 2017 (Graham Botham – SO lead for the north).

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

8. Yes.

### **If no, why?**

9. N/A

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

10. The 1 to 1 event of the SO suited Rail North's purposes best. The SO demonstrated a clear understanding of Rail North's role and embraces it as an important player.
11. LNE demonstrated an awareness of Rail North's role and welcomed engagement, although it stated that it would be unable to deliver the required level of reliability required by the franchises managed by the

Rail North Partnership. By contrast, LNW curtailed Rail North's input and gave the impression of merely going through the motions of seeking Rail North's views.

**What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

- 12. Input was mainly about Rail North's priorities, which are about ensuring that the TPE / Northern franchise outputs are 'baked in' to the SBP and that enhancements and investments reflect wider strategic plans.
- 13. For the SO, the discussion was about what Rail North wants from the SO and to identify how they can work jointly and closely. More specifically, Rail North sought to establish that timetabling activity can incorporate the timetable improvement commitments for the TPE / Northern franchises, given fears about Milton Keynes' inability to maintain adequate train planning resources.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

- 14. (a) It is not thought that any draft was provided before the events.
- 15. (b) and (c) – none to the interviewee. Others at Rail North received them.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

- 16. Yes - certainly for SO, and he thinks so for others.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

- 17. Yes.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

- 18. For routes, no evidence that they were – not discussed as proposals that were considered and rejected.
- 19. Certainly the performance targets are not right for the franchises.
- 20. For the SO, he has not read the document so not in a position to comment.

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

- 21. No.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

- 22. There was a clear logic to what was being proposed. However, it was very difficult to understand the performance score cards due to the use of jargon that was not explained.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

- 23. It wasn't too late in the SBP development process, so in principle it was still possible to feed in ideas. Whilst effective for the phase that the SBP had reached at the time, there really should have been later consultation.
- 24. For the Routes, there should also have been a high-level consultation with Rail North, recognising its statutory role (unlike the SO, which did speak on this basis).

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

- 25. It was a weakness that there was no sharing of early drafts of the SBP.
- 26. Other than that, strengths and weaknesses are as per the answer to the previous question.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

- 27. Rail North wrote to both Route MDs (who are considered as individuals to understand the role of Rail North), seeking further dialogue on the development of the SBP. This was not declined but simply did not happen.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

- 28. The LNE approach was considered to be better than that of LNW.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

- 29. No.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

- 30. It could have been set out more clearly at the start of the process what the overall process was. Had it been known that there was not to be further events beyond a certain point then Rail North could have reacted accordingly.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Simon Ellis  
Date 23 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with South Downs National Park (Allison Thorpe, Head of Strategy)

### Which Network Rail routes do you have an interest in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator?

1. South Downs National Park has an interest in the South East and Wessex routes. The stakeholder is also represented on two Community Rail Partnerships with an interest in these routes.

### Have the relevant Network Rail routes and the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

2. South Downs National Park did not participate in the consultation on the strategic business plans and has no recollection of being invited to any events. However, it has participated in consultations on previous studies, for example the South East passenger study of 2013/14 and engages with Network Rail from time to time on specific issues (e.g. level crossings).

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

3. Not applicable.

### If no, why?

4. Not applicable.

### In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for each route/the SO?

5. Previous engagement has taken a number of different forms. On occasions, Network Rail has attended South Downs National Park offices and the stakeholder has also visited Network Rail.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

6. Not applicable.

### If no, why?

7. Not applicable.

**What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

8. Based on previous experience of consultation, South Downs National Park is broadly happy with the form of consultation. It has provided an opportunity for the stakeholder to explain its position on a range of issues.

**What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

9. South Downs National Park was not consulted on the SBPs specifically. In the past, it has provided input into consultations on passenger studies and level crossings.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

10. In the past, Network Rail has provided information in advance of meetings, for example on operational issues relating to level crossings.

**How useful was this information?**

11. The information has generally been helpful and supported subsequent discussion. Network Rail has sometimes used technical language that would have benefitted from more explanation. For example, information on line speeds did not make clear the distinction between the maximum speed on a line and the speed that trains actually travel.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage? If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

12. South Downs National Park cannot recall Network Rail recording discussions or providing an opportunity to review/correct the record.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question? If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

13. The stakeholder considers that its views are taken into account, although it is hard to point to specific outcomes that have clearly been influenced by South Downs National Park position.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

14. Not applicable – the stakeholder has not reviewed the Strategic Business Plans.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

15. Previous consultation exercises have been reasonably effective but South Downs National Park has not been engaged at all on the strategic business plans.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

16. It would be helpful if Network Rail could:
- Focus more on the specific geography/region relevant to particular stakeholders when engaging with them;



- Provide more warning of forthcoming consultation activity; and
- Be clear about responsibilities for different aspects of the rail service.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

17. The stakeholder was not aware of a specific process for escalating concerns within Network Rail. If it had concerns about specific issues, it would raise them directly with the relevant transport minister, possibly in collaboration with other national park authorities.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

18. Not applicable.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

19. The stakeholder was not aware of any change of approach to consultation in recent years.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

20. It is important that Network Rail is aware of the duty placed on it and similar bodies to have regard to the purposes of National Parks whenever carrying out its functions or bringing forward schemes in National Parks. This statutory duty is set out under Section 62 (1) of the Environment Act (1995) "to have regard to the twin purposes of the National Park.
21. The statutory purposes of National Parks as laid down by Parliament are:
- to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the NP;
  - to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of its special qualities.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From John Collins  
Date 22 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Southeastern (David Statham, Anne Clark)

### Introductory Discussion

1. LSER has been consulted multiple times on the Strategic Business Plan (SBP) consultation process. LSER has sent a letter to the ORR detailing its views on both the consultation process and content of the SBPs. LSER believes this study should focus equally on understanding stakeholders' views on the outputs of the SBPs as well as their views on the SBP consultation process.
2. LSER kindly passed its ORR letter to the Project Team. The letter reflects the views expressed in this interview.

### Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?

3. LSER was primarily interested in (and engaged with) the South East Route.
4. There was also some (limited) engagement with the System Operator, for example, through customer satisfaction surveys and in development of the Kent Route Study.

### Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? If so, what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?

5. Yes. LSER has been engaging with the South East Route for a significant period. LSER representatives, including senior managers, attended several workshops through the consultation process. These have been supplemented with weekly bilateral meetings, which focussed solely on the SBP and CP6 plans.
6. LSER also participated in joint forums, which the ORR attended. LSER jointly presented its perspective on the requirements for the South East Route at these forums. Other stakeholders involved in these forums included RDG, TOCs, freight operators, other train operators which run over the South East Route, County Councils, wider rail industry bodies and organisations representing the passenger (e.g. Transport Focus). The presentation was described as "joined up".
7. LSER has also attended progress meetings with the SO and reviewed drafts of the SO's SBP.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

8. Yes.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

9. The workshops included presentations of the aims of the SBP. They gave all attendees an opportunity to generate and discuss ideas and to list their requirements. The workshops were described as well structured.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

10. The South East Route held a separate session with LSER specifically to discuss the Scorecard. LSER input was also sought on joint measurements. .

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement? How useful was this information?**

11. LSER was consulted on the agenda for workshops and contributed to developing presentation material for these workshops. The overall impression is that the workshops were inclusive and well organised. LSER found the pre workshop material useful.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

12. Notes of the discussion from the workshops were distributed and there was an opportunity for all attendees to comment on and amend these notes.

### **If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

13. Yes (and did so on a number of occasions).

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

14. LSER believes it was listened to but also believes the final outputs fall far short of their expectations. In particular, LSER expressed concern regarding:
  - Performance improvement funding, which LSER believes falls short of what is needed to meet reasonable expectations of passengers;
  - Funding for track routes to address speed restrictions and track conditions, which LSER believes to be insufficient;
  - Funding for enhancements to depots and stabling, which LSER describes as “disappointing”;
  - Omissions of raised walkway schemes, which raise safety concerns;
  - Investment for siding improvements, which LSER describes as “insufficient”;
  - Funding for rancour points, which was not delivered in CP5;
  - General depot maintenance and renewals; and
  - Station capacity improvements, which LSER describe as “not sufficient” at Lewisham, Victoria, Charing Cross and Cannon Street.
15. In general, LSER would have preferred to have seen more emphasis on safety issues (e.g. depots, stabling, sidings, etc). LSER is aware ORR wishes to see more investment in these important safety issues, but does not see how the investment planned for CP6 addresses them.
16. LSER wants to support ORR In securing £600m “Vision Schemes” as they do not believe what is proposed for CP6 goes far enough.

**If not, do you feel Network Rail’s reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

- 17. Yes. LSER “consistently” challenged the South East Route.
- 18. LSER challenged the SBP through multiple channels including partnership boards, the LSER Board, the Go-Ahead Group Board, and through the SBP consultation process.
- 19. LSER found the timing difficult as it could only challenge effectively towards the end of the process when the full outputs were distributed.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its ‘final’ strategic business plan?**

- 20. LSER believes they have a role in supporting South East Route in lobbying for more funding from Network Rail “Central”. LSER understands not all this money has been dispersed to the Routes (leaving many Routes underfunded).

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

- 21. The interviewees said they “felt listened to” and engaged throughout the process. However, they expressed concern about the outputs of the SBP, which they do not believe will meet passenger needs or DfT aspirations for the future South East franchise.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail’s approach?**

- 22. There was regular contact and genuine engagement.
- 23. LSER would have preferred to have seen the outputs earlier (to enable an earlier response), but acknowledge this may not have been feasible.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

- 24. Yes.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

- 25. LSER only had very limited engagement with the System Operator, making comparisons with the South East Route difficult.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

- 26. Yes.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail’s consultation process for CP6?**

- 27. This time there was a much more concerted effort to involve LSER and other stakeholders. Previously, the consultation was more industry focussed.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

- 28. LSER wished to place on record that their concern is not with the consultation process but rather the output of this process. LSER does not believe the South East SBP will serve the needs of the Route for the

next five years. More time should be invested in making sure the outputs produce a safe, reliable railway, rather than focus on the consultation process in isolation.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Vernon Baseley  
Date 13th March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with SE LEP (Rhiannon Mort, Capital Programme Manager)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. Anglia, South East and SO.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

2. No. They may have contacted organisations at a more local level but not the LEP.

### **To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

3. Rhiannon considers that the SBP shows that Network Rail has addressed the correct high-level objectives – supporting economic growth, attracting businesses and providing a robust network.

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

4. N/A

# #1

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 1:50:09 PM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 1:59:07 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:08:58  
**IP Address:** 212.121.220.10

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

Stephen Forde

### Q2 Organisation

Stockport Council and South Manchester Community Rail

### Q3 Role

Transport Policy Officer (Rail) and Community Rail Officer

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4 Are you interested in the Anglia route?** **No**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5 Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6 If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7 If no to Q5, why not?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8 In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9 Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q14** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **No**

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands



---

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q23** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q30** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route? **Yes**

---

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **No**

---

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q39** If no to the above, why not?

No Idea

---

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement?

I'm not aware of any stakeholder engagement regarding CP6 or LNW

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q46** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

I'm not aware of any consultation process

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

No not in role at that time

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route?

No

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q55** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **No**

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q78** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route? **No**

---

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q87** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q94** How useful was this information?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route?

No

Page 15: Wessex

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q103** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q110** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---



**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route?

No

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q142** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 20: Route selection: System Operator (SO)

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? **No**

---

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q151** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q158** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

From Matthew Whearty  
Date 7 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Transport for Greater Manchester (Robert Fickling)

### **Has the Network Rail route and the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

1. London North Western had a launch event with TfGM in the summer of 2017, where LNW talked TfGM through the draft of the Strategic Business Plan.
2. This was very much LNW talking to TfGM, not a two-way dialog.
3. To their knowledge, the System Operator has not come to speak to TfGM; although, there was a little bit of their role included in the LNW presentation.
4. TfGM believes that the System Operator is more important to them in many ways.

### **If yes, did you take them up on this offer?**

5. Yes, it was a presentation.

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

6. LNW made a presentation to TfGM, there was not a two-way dialogue.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

7. Yes, as TfGM were only invited to that one discussion.
8. There were no larger stakeholder groups that TfGM were invited to.

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

9. The stakeholder felt that it was too much a case of LNW talking at TfGM, not a case of it being a dialogue. It was also too much of a presentation, with no interaction, and not a workshop.
10. TfGM provided written comments back to LNW on their draft SBP, as there was not an opportunity at the meeting.

**What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

11. For the draft SPB, TfGM were consulted on Maintenance and Renewals.
12. There were a lot of blanks at the time of draft publication, meaning there were not opportunities to consult on everything.
13. TfGM was not consulted on anything by the system operator.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

14. TfGM was provided with the draft of the SBP a couple days in advance of their meeting with London North Western.

**How useful was this information?**

15. It was useful to have it in advance of the meeting; however, it was at a quite high level and had a lot missing from it at the time.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

16. TfGM does not believe their views were recorded at the one event they attended.
17. However, TfGM did submit a letter to Network Rail containing their feedback for the meeting.

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

18. As TfGM sent a letter to London North Western containing all of their comments, there was no need to correct the record.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

19. TfGM does not believe that much was taken into account.
20. TfGM still have a number of issues with the SBPs, and have responded to the ORR consultation regarding these.

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

21. TfGM was provided with nothing between their meeting with LNW and the publication of the plans. Even this first event was a summary event.
22. TfGM was only able to challenge the outcomes through the ORR consultation.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

23. TfGM wished to have a workshop with Network Rail to speak about the SBP to be able to ask questions and challenge what it contained.
24. In terms of the priorities which NR has identified, there include more working together and a partnership approach. TfGM is not sure how well these will be undertaken.
25. On a scale of 1-10, the stakeholder rated their understanding at 5.

### **How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

26. The stakeholder felt that the consultation process was not good at all. TfGM would have much preferred a workshop approach and a two way conversation, which this consultation certainly was not.
27. TfGM also felt that the ORR workshop in Manchester in early 2018 was exactly the same.
28. TfGM believes that Network Rail should: “Trust us, talk to us, let’s work together, rather than simply tell us”.

### **What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail’s approach?**

29. A strength was that Network Rail did share a draft version of the SBP, and did explain the content, even if they were not accepting comments.
30. A weakness was that Network Rail did not let TfGM work with them. The consultation process was actually a dictation.

### **Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

31. There was no opportunity to do so, and TfGM have fed this back on the final version of the business plans.
32. The plans contained no “Virtual Northern Route” and TfGM doesn’t like the way NR is proposing to work with 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Funders.
33. The stakeholder did provide comments back to NR that their PPM targets were way below TOC targets so they are, in effect, planning to fail. Nothing was acted upon this comment.
34. TfGM has escalated their concerns via the ORR.

### **How did the engagement activity for the routes differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

35. TfGM is unsure as to why they were never approached by the System Operator. They were not aware they were doing the rounds.
36. TfGM believes the SO should have spoken to them at the same time as LNW did over the summer.

### **Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

37. Robert wasn’t with TfGM at the time.

### **If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail’s consultation process for CP6?**

38. From what he understands, previously Network Rail only provided the final report. On the fact that this time there was at least a conversation during the draft phase this represents an improvement.

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

39. The ORR-led consultation in Manchester, which was a follow-up to the publication of the SBPs was a peculiar event. There were not many people there, and they weren’t able to ask questions. ORR had already framed the questions. People were scared of being put in an open question session. ORR’s job should be to defend its job, not frame the questions.

40. TfGM believes that workshops are the better way to have a consultation, and would like to be able to ask question, pry, etc. as to the reason things are the way they are in the SBPs.
41. This was a box ticking exercise and TfGM felt like they weren't trusted. The stakeholder felt like they were an outside party.
42. There should have been a better System Operator consultation.



To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Simon Ellis  
Date 20 March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Transport Focus (Guy Dangerfield, Head of Strategy)

### Has each Network Rail route and the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?

1. Transport Focus has had periodic contact with Network Rail outside the SBP consultation framework, and was invited to the stakeholder events held by each of the routes and the SO. Nevertheless, Transport Focus considers that it, rather than Network Rail, took the initiative in seeking to ensure that the passenger perspective was taken into account in the preparation of the SBPs.

### If yes, did you take them up on this offer?

2. A representative of Transport Focus was present at at least one stakeholder event for each of the routes and the SO. Different representatives attended different events, and Transport Focus has not compared events systematically.

### If no, why?

3. Not applicable.

### In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for each route/the SO?

4. The engagement was always in the form of a workshop. Transport Focus did not have any bilateral engagement with Network Rail. However, it did ensure that Transport Focus representatives has a 10-minute slot at each event to outline the passenger perspective.

### Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?

5. Transport Focus attended as many as possible of the available events. A list of events was provided by Network Rail centrally, which was helpful, but in some cases it provided only 10 days' notice of the event and it was sometimes difficult to find a representative available to attend.

### If no, why?

6. Not applicable.

## What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?

7. Transport Focus considered that the workshops were generally organised well. Network Rail invited a range of stakeholders, including train operators, local authorities, voluntary user groups and organisations with a specific interest (e.g. ports in the case of Anglia). Network Rail presented an overview of the SBP and invited comments from the participants. There was a good level of discussion, although stakeholders frequently wanted to discuss enhancements which were out of the scope of the SBPs.
8. Transport Focus had not identified significant differences between the routes in terms of the effectiveness of the format, but will review its records to identify any key differentiating factors. **[It will provide further information if the review highlights anything significant]**. The SO engagement was better than that with routes, perhaps because it occurred later in the programme and the SO had more time to prepare. However, the level of engagement with Transport Focus may also reflect the fact that its contacts with the SO were already established and that it had already engaged on timetable issues before the formal consultation.
9. Transport Focus was given a 10-minute slot at each event, although it took the initiative to ensure this. It had not seemingly occurred to Network Rail to offer time in the workshop programme to set out the passenger perspective.
10. With Anglia route (and perhaps others), there was a mismatch between Network Rail's view of the appropriate level of engagement and Transport Focus's expectations. Transport Focus got the impression that Network Rail regarded the consultation as an obligation, but was not really seeking to build its plans based on the views of stakeholders. Transport Focus suspects this was partly because to do so the engagement needed to have happened far earlier in the process; it being too late to do anything other than, in effect, present a near-final draft of the SBP.

## What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.

11. Transport Focus used the workshops to highlight a number of issues:
  - The NRPS results for the route concerned;
  - The value in undertaking more work to inform particular decisions (e.g. the trade-off between passenger convenience and efficiency in planning possessions); and
  - The importance of renewals work in improving performance.

## What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?

12. Network Rail issued an agenda in advance of the workshops and in some cases these had supporting papers with details of draft proposals. Both Anglia and LNE shared draft material for the SBP following the workshops.
13. A list of the documents provided to Transport Focus is below:
  - Anglia Route Workshop Report (post-workshop), which included a page on Passenger Focus's feedback
  - Anglia Route SBP
  - Anglia Route stakeholder presentation
  - Western Route SBP

- Western Route Stakeholder Workshop Agenda
- LNW Route SBP Workshop Agendas
- LNW Route Draft SBP
- FNPO Workshop Slides
- FNPO SBP
- FNPO Workshop Notes from group discussions
- South East Route SBP "At a glance"
- Scotland Route SBP
- Scotland Route Workshop Slides (including Transport Focus and inputs from FNPO and SO)
- Scotland Route Scorecard
- System Operator Draft SBP
- System Operator Stakeholder Workshop Agenda
- System Operator Stakeholder Workshop Preparator Reading

### **How useful was this information?**

14. The information provided was useful and Transport Focus considered that Network Rail provided an honest view of the challenge in CP6 (e.g. noting that the 15% uplift in renewals would not be sufficient to deliver the desired performance improvements).

### **Were you given the chance to present all the information/research you wanted to the route/the SO?**

15. As already noted, Transport Focus was given a 10-minute slot at each workshop to present NRPS results for the route concerned. However, it would have been useful to present more information on passenger requirements (e.g. in relation to possessions – see question 13 below).

### **Do you believe the routes/the SO engaged with and took account of the information/research you presented to them?**

16. Transport Focus has not yet reviewed the full SBPs in detail and cannot comment on the extent to which they address passenger concerns/issues. It does not consider that the summary documents are particularly passenger-focused.

### **Would the routes'/the SO's ability to take account of passenger interests in their plans have benefited from better/more use of information/research (including newly commissioned research)?**

17. Transport Focus is keen that Network Rail should undertake/commission more research into the passenger perspective on a range of issues, for example how the impact of possessions on passengers can be minimised (the trade-off between a number of short possessions and one long one). More generally, Transport Focus considers that the preparation of the SBPs, and supporting consultation process, should be much more grounded in passenger needs.

### **Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage? If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

18. The Anglia workshop was documented and the notes circulated. **[Transport Focus was not sure if this was the case for other workshops, but will check]**. Transport Focus could not recall being asked to comment on the notes. Anglia did ask it for a quote to the effect that the consultation had been undertaken effectively, but Transport Focus refused to provide this because it felt more should have been done.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question? If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

19. See response to question 12. It is difficult to say whether Transport Focus's input has influenced the SBPs, although it is possible that it has informed renewals plans in some cases.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

20. See response to question 12. Transport Focus does not consider that the summary documents are very useful, but needs to consider the full documents more carefully.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

21. The consultation did provide an opportunity for genuine engagement but did not fully exploit the potential to investigate the passenger perspective (see response to question 18).

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

22. Strengths:

- The fact that Network Rail organised stakeholder events and provided information on the SBPs should be recognised.
- Network Rail were honest about the challenges facing them in CP6.
- The consultation did ensure that senior Network Rail representatives engaged with stakeholders and responded to questions on real issues.

23. Weaknesses:

- The process started too late and was not sufficiently iterative – the opportunity for engagement was largely focused on a single event.
- Network Rail did not take the opportunity to engage with Transport Focus on the benefits of further research into the passenger perspective, except in two instances – see below.
- Transport Focus had to take the initiative in pushing for opportunities to engage.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

24. Transport Focus has not sought to do this, but has communicated with Network Rail at the most senior level in the past and could do so again.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

25. As already noted, the SO engagement was better than that by the routes. [Transport Focus has not noted major differences between the route workshops but will consider further].

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

26. Transport Focus's recollection is that the preparation of SBPs in CP5 was very centralised and that there was no meaningful stakeholder engagement. The CP6 process represents a significant improvement but still falls short of best practice.

### **Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

27. Transport Focus considers that ORR may need to give more direction to Network Rail on what is required for effective stakeholder engagement. At the same time, the availability of funding to carry out effective engagement needs to be taken into account. Transport Focus is aware that some routes recognise the need to undertake more research into passenger requirements but are unable to do so because of lack of funding in CP5 to start planning renewals in CP6.
28. Transport Focus had discussions with Anglia route about potential research to understand passengers' views about different options for a major CP6 points renewal project at Colchester – c. £13m. This foundered because – as noted in 22 – Network Rail had no money in CP5 to inform a CP6 renewal.
29. Transport Focus undertook joint research with South East route to understand passengers' views about engineering work for routine maintenance, to inform its thinking about 'sustainable reliability' in CP6. This was published by Transport Focus on 15 December 2017 as "Routine railway maintenance: passenger perspectives and priorities" and can be viewed here <https://www.transportfocus.org.uk/research-publications/publications/routine-railway-maintenance-passenger-perspectives-priorities/>

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Vernon Baseley  
Date 9th March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with Transport Scotland (Chris Clark, Senior Rail Regulation Manager)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. Scotland / FNPO / SO

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

2. Chris is not able to recall in detail what contacts were made but he believes that workshops were held by Scotland and possibly FNPO. An event was held in December or January and it is thought that another even was held before.
3. Certainly SO did discuss matters related to its SBP within the framework of ongoing discussions, including a workshop on SO's costs but had no events specifically badged as being SBP consultation.

### **If yes, did you take them up on this offer?**

4. Yes

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

5. Workshops.

### **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

6. Senior people attended any events to which they were invited (as they were understood to be pitched at a senior level)

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

7. Feedback from colleagues was that engagement was well-organised.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

8. Key issues in the draft were the Scottish HLOS and how the SBP meets it, including the manner in which it is broken down into SO and Routes.

**What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement?**

9. Not certain about this but those attending would certainly have complained to him if materials had not been suitable.

**How useful was this information?**

10. It was useful so far as he is aware – certainly no complaints noted.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

11. No evidence has been seen that this was the case – he feels confident that he would have seen it if that had been done.

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

12. A mixed picture – he thinks NR listen but do not document these views and don't always take them into account.

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

13. No

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

14. Yes but still not happy with the contents, which don't reflect what Transport Scotland has asked for funds to be used for.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

15. On the whole, no.  
16. The process was appropriate and adequate but not effective because it didn't address what needed to be addressed in terms of Transport Scotland's concerns.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

17. The fact that the process was undertaken was a strength. It is also a strength that NR generally have a good relationship at a senior level and do consult them and hear what they say.  
18. It is a weakness that NR has not changed its views to reflect what the funder wants.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

19. Dissatisfaction with contents of SBP has been escalated to ORR with NR copied in.

**If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

20. He is not in a position to answer because others attended the route events.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

21. He has knowledge of what was done.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

22. His impression is that the approaches were very similar.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

23. No, other than to say that Transport Scotland is most interested in what happens when the draft Periodic Review is published in June by ORR.



# #11

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, March 21, 2018 3:36:34 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, March 21, 2018 3:42:35 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:06:00  
**IP Address:** 185.38.245.154

## Page 1: Introduction

### Q1 Name of respondent

Mal Drury-Rose

### Q2 Organisation

Transport for Wales

### Q3 Role

Interim Rail Services Director

## Page 2: Route selection: Anglia

**Q4 Are you interested in the Anglia route?** **No**

## Page 3: Anglia

**Q5 Has the Anglia route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6 If yes to Q5, did you take them up on this offer?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q7 If no to Q5, why not?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q8 In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Anglia route?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9 Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?** **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10** If "no" to Q9, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q11** What are your views on the format of the Anglia route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q12** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Anglia route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q13** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q14** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q15** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q16** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q17** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Anglia route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q18** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q19** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4: Route selection: London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM)

**Q20** Are you interested in the London North Eastern and East Midlands (LNE&EM) route? **No**

---

Page 5: London North Eastern and East Midlands

---

**Q21** Has the LNE&EM route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q22** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q23** If no to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q24** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the LNE&EM route? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q25** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q26** If "no" to the above, why not? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q27** What are your views on the format of the LNE&EM route's stakeholder engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q28** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the LNE&EM route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q29** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q30** How useful was this information? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q31** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q32** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q33** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the LNE&EM route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q34** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q35** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 6: Route selection: London North Western

**Q36** Are you interested in the London North Western route? **No**

---

Page 7: London North Western

**Q37** Has the London North Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q38** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q39** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q40** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the London North Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q41** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q42** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q43** What are your views on the format of the London North Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q44** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the London North Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q45** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q46** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q47** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q48** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q49** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the London North Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q50** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q51** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 8: Route selection: Scotland

**Q52** Are you interested in the Scotland route? **No**

---

Page 9: Scotland

**Q53** Has the Scotland route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q54** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q55** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q56** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Scotland route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q57** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q58** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q59** What are your views on the format of the Scotland route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q60** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Scotland route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q61** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q62** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q63** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q64** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q65** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Scotland route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q66** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q67** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q68** Are you interested in the South East route? **No**

Page 11: South East

**Q69** Has the South East route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q70** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q71** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q72** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the South East route? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q73** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q74** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q75** What are your views on the format of the South East route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q76** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the South East route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q77** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q78** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q79** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q80** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q81** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the South East route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q82** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q83** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 12: Route selection: Wales

**Q84** Are you interested in the Wales route? **Yes**

---

Page 13: Wales

**Q85** Has the Wales route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Yes**

---

**Q86** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Yes**

---

**Q87** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q88** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wales route? **Discussion, Workshop**

---

**Q89** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Yes**

---

**Q90** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q91** What are your views on the format of the Wales route's stakeholder engagement?

Relaxed and fairly open to input.

---



**Q92** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wales route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending.

proposed work, scorecard and funding.

**Q93** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement?

- |                              |                         |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| (a) in advance               | <b>N/A</b>              |
| (b) during the engagement    | <b>Slides and plans</b> |
| (c) following the engagement | <b>N/A</b>              |

**Q94** How useful was this information? **Some hat useful**

**Q95** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach?

Fairly engaged and aligned but limited. NR found it difficulty to include WG service aspirations as they were not committed given the 'outcome' based nature of the procurement.

**Q96** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q97** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wales route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Yes to the route planning team.

**Q98** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Perhaps a little more aligned with WG's priorities.

**Q99** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

No

Page 14: Route selection: Wessex

**Q100** Are you interested in the Wessex route? **No**

## Page 15: Wessex

---

**Q101** Has the Wessex route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q102** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q103** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q104** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Wessex route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q105** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q106** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q107** What are your views on the format of the Wessex route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q108** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Wessex route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q109** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q110** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q111** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q112** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q113** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Wessex route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q114** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q115** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 16: Route selection: Western

**Q116** Are you interested in the Western route? **No**

---

Page 17: Western

**Q117** Has the Western route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q118** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q119** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q120** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the Western route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q121** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q122** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q123** What are your views on the format of the Western route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q124** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the Western route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q125** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q126** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q127** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q128** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q129** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the Western route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q130** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q131** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 18: Route selection: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q132** Are you interested in the Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO) route? **No**

---

Page 19: Freight and National Passenger Operators (FNPO)

**Q133** Has the FNPO route sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q134** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q135** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q136** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the FNPO route? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q137** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q138** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q139** What are your views on the format of the FNPO route's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q140** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the FNPO route's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q141** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q142** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q143** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q144** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q145** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the FNPO route regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q146** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q147** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q148** Are you interested in the System Operator (SO)? **No**

---

Page 21: System Operator (SO)

**Q149** Has the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q150** If yes to the above, did you take them up on this offer? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q151** If no to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q152** In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the SO? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q153** Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q154** If "no" to the above, why not? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q155** What are your views on the format of the SO's stakeholder engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q156** What areas were you consulted on/did you provide input to? This could relate to, for example, the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard, and/or proposed spending. **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q157** What information was provided to you:(a) in advance;(b) during the engagement; and(c) following the engagement? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q158** How useful was this information? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q159** How effective do you believe the consultation process to be? What were the strengths and weaknesses of Network Rail's approach? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q160** If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)? **Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q161** Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q162** Did you take part in Network Rail's consultation for CP5? If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**Q163** Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process that you wish to provide?

Respondent skipped this question

---

To	Office of Rail and Road		
From	SDG Project Team		
Date	28 March 2018		
Project	Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement	Project No.	23263801

## Interview with Virgin Trains (VT)

Interviewees: Gus Dunster

Interviewer: John Collins, SDG

Date: 28 March 2018

Location: Telephone interview

### Specific Question Responses

- Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?
  - London North Western (LNW) – this is the primary route for VT.
  - Scotland.
  - Wales.
  - SO.
- Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)? If so, what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?
  - All three routes sought input from VT, but the level of engagement varied significantly between routes.
  - Virgin were disappointed with LNW's approach and the draft SBO produced. The Route shared its high-level thinking with VT early in the process but provided very little detail. There was very limited input from VT into the SBP and, in particular, its scorecard. VT described feeling "talked to" rather than consulted.
  - There was limited engagement with Wales as VT only operates on a small part of the route (west of Chester/Chester-Wrexham / Holyhead). The part of the Route served by VT is not operating near capacity, so VT has limited interest in any major renewals planned for this route.
  - Scotland was very active in their engagement. The interviewee was very complimentary of this Route's Strategic Planning Team.
  - There was limited engagement with the SO at the beginning (but there was more activity later on). The SO acknowledged it started late and was making up for lost ground. SO also acknowledged it is still "finding its role" in this process.
- Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?
  - VT attended one LNW workshop.



- VT attended Route Investment Group meetings in Wales, where the SBP was discussed.
- VT attended several workshops in Scotland and described them as being “good sessions” with productive “philosophical debate”. There appeared to be a high level of engagement with stakeholders at this workshop.
- What are your views on the format of the route/the SO’s stakeholder engagement?
  - VT described the LNW workshop, which reportedly lasted more than 4 hours, as “death by powerpoint”. There was no opportunity for VT to provide input at this event. The LNW experience was summarised as “being talked to a bit at the beginning and then being presented with a draft SBP”.
- What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO’s proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.
  - There was little engagement with LNW. VT was only able to see a draft (one page) PPM MMA trajectory for CP6 through informal channels. VT was not invited to formally comment on these trajectories, and does not agree with them.
  - In Scotland, overall, VT was invited to provide input into scorecards and other aspects of the SBP.
- What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement? How useful was this information?
  - LNW did not provide much useful information in advance of the publication of the final SBP.
- Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?
  - Not by LNW.
- If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?
  - There was nothing to correct.
- Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?
  - VT was underwhelmed by the draft SBP for LNW. VT fundamentally does not agree with LNW’s with proposed performance trajectory, regarding it to be unnecessarily cautious and lacking in evidence.
- If not, do you feel Network Rail’s reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?
  - Not adequately by LNW.
  - VT escalated their concerns about the lack of engagement and the contents of the LNW SBP (particularly regarding the scorecard) by writing to the Route.
- To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its ‘final’ strategic business plan?
  - VT believed the LNW SBP was unambitious, particularly with respect to performance.
  - VT is happy to provide evidence to Network Rail / ORR showing why they believe LNW’s performance targets are too soft and why they believe a more ambitious PPM target should be adopted for the Route.
- How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?

- VT was disappointed with LNW. It sees this as a lost opportunity, as VT could have helped LNW make the case for investment to Network Rail central. VT believes the LNW Route has “underestimated the economic value of [their] services”.
- The Scotland Route consultation was as effective as it needed to be for VT.
- VT chose not to actively engage with the Wales Route as this covers a very small part of the VT network. That said, VT has no complaints and believes it would have been listened to if it had anything to raise.
- VT had some engagement with the SO late in the process. VT appreciated the SO’s openness and transparency and accepts it is still “finding its way” through the process. The SO took VT’s questions at face value and appeared to take VT’s feedback and suggestions on board.
- What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail’s approach?
  - The Strategic Planning Team in Scotland did “an excellent job” and “tried hard to gather input from stakeholders”. They are aware of which stakeholders are in agreement (and opposition) with each-other (and with Network Rail) but didn’t shy away from having “good debates” in meetings.
  - LNW, by contrast, while aware of issues and conflicts, did not appear to wish to engage in debate. VT described LNW’s consultation activities as “ticking the box”.
- Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?
  - VT escalated its concerns in relation to the LNW SBP through writing to Network Rail after the final SBPs were published. The Route responded by offering a bilateral meeting, which took place. However, this came too late in the process to make a meaningful difference.
- If you attended engagement activity for more than one route, how did they differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?
  - LNW was poor.
  - Scotland was good.
  - Wales was probably good, even though VT was not actively engaged with this route.
- Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?
  - Yes.
- If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail’s consultation process for CP6?
  - LNW was worse at engaging with VT in CP6 than CP5. This may be because enhancements were included in CP5 and required more input from VT.
  - Scotland has always been strong in engaging with VT, both in CP5 and CP6.
- Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?
  - No.

To	Office of Rail and Road		
Cc	SDG Project Team		
From	Helen Waters		
Date	8 <sup>th</sup> March 2018		
Project	Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement	Project No.	23263801

## Interview with the Welsh Government (Simon Tew and Gareth Evans)

### **Has the Network Rail route and the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

1. Welsh Government (WG) has had engagement with Network Rail (NR) on the CP6 business plans. While the WG do not disagree with what NR has included in the plans, the process for developing the plans could have been more inclusive with more done to seek their input and ideas.

### **If yes, did you take them up on this offer?**

2. WG did participate in the process.

### **In what format did the stakeholder engagement take place for the route(s)/the SO?**

3. Engagement from NR was usually through Planning and Strategy meetings (approx. monthly) with NR which were taking place anyway. NR added a monthly meeting on the SBP. On many the occasions, the meetings were cancelled by NR. The SBP was then added to the regular meetings, but it was rarely talked about in detail. WG could only recall 2-3 instances where the business plan was discussed in dedicated meetings over the course of a year.
4. NR held 2 workshops over the SBP. WG attended both; the attendees were mainly industry parties. All 4 bidders for the franchise attended the first workshop and this was very early in the competition process – this meant that none of the bidding parties, including ATW, really wanted to engage in any active debate.
5. The approach taken at the first workshop involved the delivery of a series of presentations. There was much talk about the difficulty and cost of the Cardiff to Swansea electrification scheme. There were some round table discussions at the first workshop, but these were constrained primarily due to the ongoing competition issues.
6. Freight may have been present and there was limited representation of the passenger, although Transport Focus was present.
7. The second workshop had lots more talking, with NR engagement. There was a discussion as to how a possible additional £5m of OMR money could be used to do more renewals and how additional money, if received, could be spent.

## **Did you attend all workshops/meetings available to you?**

### **If no, why?**

### **What are your views on the format of the route/the SO's stakeholder engagement?**

8. WG feel that NR did engage with WG at a level towards the minimum end of the possible spectrum.
9. WG are aware that there is a SO. They were dealing with SO people embedded in the route team under the banner of Strategy and Planning. They are not sure how "joined-up" the engagement is between the SO and the Route.

### **What areas were you consulted on / provided input to? This could relate to, for example, the route or the SO's proposed work, proposed scorecard and/or proposed spending.**

10. A key area of discussion was the final funding settlement.
11. NR has achieved circa 5% of the total OMR pot. WG believes that this is broadly in line with the Barnett formula and therefore may be seen to be acceptable. However, given that the Wales route has 11% of the route miles across England and Wales, challenging topography and covers more than Wales (e.g. the Marches), it is arguably low.
12. WG believe that the increase in funds is largely because the total cake is larger, and not because Wales has done any better relative to the rest of the country.
13. The total enhancements money is 1.5% of the total spend for England and Wales which is very low and of great concern to the WG.
14. WG was also interested in the CP5 context.
15. Many renewals have been cancelled / deferred in CP5 and WG has been keen to understand when / if they will be implemented in CP6. A plan / list was requested but never provided.
16. WG believe that ORR are aware of this issue in respect to CP5/6 in Wales. WG thinks its engagement in the PR18 Joint Steering Group is very useful, as this enables it to understand the wider context and it provides access to valuable information which he can then reflect back into the process.
17. As an example of CP5 issues – the resignalling of the West part of the North Wales mainline has been cancelled / deferred and will not go into CP6. NR are using the argument that this is a renewal which is not based on asset condition, but to improve efficiency and hence is not a priority. This decision has been explained very generally and it is felt that the plans have been "pushed into long grass" with the vague expectation that digital railway would provide a solution. WG felt that DR is a long way off for North Wales.
18. WG has no insight into what the engineers etc are talking about – they have no way to see what has been omitted, only what is included.

### **What information was provided to you (a) in advance; (b) during the engagement; and (c) following the engagement? How useful was this information?**

19. WG rarely received the data or information to understand an issue or a decision regarding choices.
20. When it came to the details of prioritisation / cost, NR made the choices and WG didn't see the bases for decisions.

21. The draft plan was finally released to the WG in December 2017 by NR's centre. WG received in one day the draft plans for Wales, freight and long-distance operators, and the SO.

**Were your views recorded by Network Rail at any stage?**

**If so, were you given the opportunity to review/correct this record?**

**Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

**If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

22. At the second workshop, there was some discussion of options and choices, but it was not apparent how decisions were made subsequently.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

23. WG understands that ORR provided feedback to NR following the first stakeholder workshop.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

24. The SBP needs to take account of forecasted traffic likely to arise through the next Wales and Borders franchise and it does not do so adequately at this stage. Ongoing engagement with Transport for Wales to build in growth projections emerging from the procurement for the next Wales and Borders franchise is needed.

25. NR state that they are pleased and relieved that the Director at the WG supports the SBP. WG feel that they needed to provide support in order to ensure that the uplift to OMR funding is secured.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

**How did the engagement activity for the routes differ? What practices did you consider particularly effective (or not)?**

26. The Director in the route responsible for developing the plan met with the WG specifically on one occasion, and in all other direct communications were with his No 2 or SO people.

27. WG were aware from industry engagement that other NR routes had been sharing draft plans with stakeholders at a much earlier stage than was the case in Wales.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

28. Regarding the final SBP, when WG read the plan they found it hard to disagree with the overall message and what is said. Hence, they broadly support and hope to see the Wales Route securing more money in CP6.

29. WG are keen to support the route getting the best deal from the ORR. If NR feels there may be cuts to the plan, then WG wants to know so that it can support and lobby in the right place.

To Office of Rail and Road  
Cc SDG Project Team  
From Vernon Baseley  
Date 6th March 2018  
Project Assessing the quality of the routes'/System Operator's stakeholder engagement

Project No. 23263801

## Interview with West Yorkshire Combined Authority (James Nutter, Head of Rail)

### **Which Network Rail route(s) do you have an interest(s) in? Do you have an interest in the System Operator (SO)?**

1. Primarily in LNE, though some interest in LNW due to cross-Pennine services. If timetabling is a function of the SO then would have an interest in SO as well.

### **Has the relevant Network Rail route or the SO sought your views (e.g. by way of a discussion, workshop, consultation, bilateral session) on the route strategic plan(s)?**

2. No.

### **Do you think your views were taken into account for the strategic business plan for the route(s) in question?**

3. Whilst there was no consultation during the development of the SBP, up until 9-12 months ago, WYCA had been working closely with NR, for example in working / programme boards for East Coast line to develop a body of evidence on the purpose of the line and interventions that would support this, based upon business case appraisals. By Summer 17, emerging draft strategy documents appeared to be responding to different drivers (perhaps minimising political challenges rather than flagging up the difficult choices to be made). Some schemes that had been under consideration had simply disappeared. It appears that – quite possibly associated with devolution – there was now a disconnect with previous strategic work, route studies and market studies. This disconnect may have been carried-forward into the SBP work.
4. Other examples of how NR had worked closely with WYCA in the past was in the Yorkshire Rail Network Study, looking in detail at how to enhance the network. This was solid work that could have found its way into the SBP but didn't.

### **If not, do you feel Network Rail's reasons for not doing so were well-explained, or were you given an opportunity to challenge their decision?**

5. No – there seems to have been a disconnect in the development of proposals, meaning that, even where views had been expressed through earlier engagements, these were not reflected in the plan. Because of the lack of any consultation about the SBP plan itself, there was nothing to challenge.

**To what extent could you understand/reason with what the route/the SO was proposing in its 'final' strategic business plan?**

6. Had WYCA been consulted, it would have commented that the performance targets set for the end of CP6 do not tie-in with those contracted in the TPE / Northern franchise contracts.

**How effective do you believe the consultation process to be?**

7. Not effective at all from WYCA's point of view.

**What were the strengths and weaknesses in Network Rail's approach?**

8. There were many strengths in the approach that was being taken by NR up to 9-12 months ago but it is not possible to identify strengths from WYCA's point of view for this consultation phase.
9. Mr Nutter does not recall there being any reference to the role of Rail North in the SBP. It is quite possible that the devolution of NR and of Rail North has contributed to the loss of the interfaces and there is need for affected parties to undertake work to 'dove-tail' the newly-devolved organisations together.
10. The failure to consult on drafts of the SBP meant that the opportunity was lost for WYCA to provide evidence of the effects of prioritising one scheme over another.

**Was there an opportunity for you to escalate your concerns with a route/the SO regarding its strategic business plan (where applicable)?**

11. No.

**Did you take part in any similar consultation process for CP5?**

12. There was some engagement at that time, though it is difficult to remember exactly what was involved.

**If so, have you noticed any changes to Network Rail's consultation process for CP6?**

13. The engagement that took place for CP5 has not happened on this occasion.

**Is there any additional information on the stakeholder consultation process you wish to provide?**

14. It is possible that PTEG was consulted on behalf of multiple organisations – Mr Nutter will check.

**Local Authorities and Development Partnerships: additional questions**

**To what extent did the route/the SO explain the scope of the strategic business plan and how that related to particular railway priorities that you have an interest in?**

15. Not at all.

**To what extent did the route/the SO work with you to identify areas of joint or collaborative working?**

16. Not at all during the SBP development process.



## CONTROL INFORMATION

<b>Prepared by</b>	<b>Prepared for</b>
Steer Davies Gleave 28-32 Upper Ground London SE1 9PD +44 20 7910 5000 www.steerdaviesgleave.com	Office of Rail and Road One Kemble Street London WC2B 4AN
<b>SDG project/proposal number</b>	<b>Client contract/project number</b>
23263801	
<b>Author/originator</b>	<b>Reviewer/approver</b>
Daniela Phillips, Matthew Whearty	Helen Waters
<b>Other contributors</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
	<i>Client:</i> Siobhan Carty Mark Tettenborn
	<i>SDG:</i>
<b>Version control/issue number 1</b>	<b>Date: 11 June 2018</b>



