



Schedule 4 in a joined-up industry

Jonathan Pugh

Senior Policy Manager, ATOC

Schedule 4 – in context

- Operators are closest to end-users of the industry:
 - Incentive regimes need to drive behaviours that support optimal service delivery and network availability
 - Need to reflect real value of possessions and impacts – the shorter the notice, the greater the disruptive effect
- Need for consistency and clarity of contract, incentives and behavioural interaction
- Already established, so changes need to demonstrate that they are deliverable and will drive appropriate outcomes
- Integration with network availability measurement and wider industry reform activity





The challenge going forward

- Potential for bespoke Schedule 4 or “switch-off” as part of alliancing between TOCs and NR
- Protection of the interests of less well-aligned operators – long-distance, cross-boundary and freight
- Alignment and simplicity of cross-boundary regimes – incentives and financial impact are important
- Co-ordinating engineering planning across NR routes to minimise cumulative disruption to operators
- Integration with wider industry reforms and PR13 workstreams, including network availability measurements



Issues for discussion

- A baseline Schedule 4: is it required to protect 'secondary' operators?
- Incentivising maximum VfM through appropriate engineering access
- Stable and reliable timetabling and customer information provision
- Support for network availability specification through franchises, HLOS and customer requirements
- Consistency of regulatory and contractual regimes and ease of communication across industry to drive behavioural and financial outcomes