

# Response to ORR’s further consultation on the PR23 review of Network Rail’s access charges

This pro-forma is available to those that wish to use it to respond to our consultation. Other forms of response (e.g. letter format) are equally welcome.

Please send your response to pr23@orr.gov.uk by **1 July 2022**.

Please contact Will Chivers at ORR with any queries: Will.Chivers@orr.gov.uk.

## About you

Full name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Job title: Click or tap here to enter text.

Organisation: Click or tap here to enter text.

Email\*: Click or tap here to enter text.

Telephone number\*: Click or tap here to enter text.

*\*This information will not be published on our website.*

## Chapter 2: Infrastructure cost charges

### Question 2.1: Do you have any views on our proposal to maintain the existing market segmentation of open access services (‘interurban’ and ‘other’), for the purposes of setting the open access ICC?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 2.2: Do you have any views on the most appropriate approach to setting the open access ICC for the relevant market segment in CP7?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 2.3: Do you have any views on whether or not we should maintain relief from any increase in charges prompted by the open access ICC, for existing operators (as defined in PR18)?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 2.4: Do you have any views on our proposal to maintain the existing market segmentation of freight services?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 2.5: Do you have any views on our proposal to continue to allow Network Rail to levy ICCs on freight services carrying iron ore, spent nuclear fuel and ESI biomass? Do you have any views on our proposal to remove the ICC on services carrying ESI coal, pending a further review later in PR23?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 2.6: Do you have any views on the most appropriate approach to setting freight ICCs for relevant market segments in CP7?

Click or tap here to enter text.

## Chapter 3: Variable charges

### Question 3.1: Do you have any views on how we should take account of new evidence in relation to VTISM, for the purposes of setting the VUC?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 3.2: Do you have any views on our proposal to review the VUC guidance for CP7 to allow a new VUC rate to be calculated for existing vehicle types that are downgraded to lower than HAW RAs, because Network Rail decides to remove HAW access rights?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 3.3:

***Do you have any views on our proposal to remove modelled consumption rates for new train services from the beginning of CP7?***

Click or tap here to enter text.

## Chapter 4: Station charges

### Question 4.1: Do you have any views on our proposed approach to calculating LTCs for CP7, including on our proposed classification of a large / complex station i.e. Option B?

Click or tap here to enter text.

### Question 4.2: Do you have any views on our proposed approach to setting LTCs for new stations in CP7 (and stations that have opened during CP6), such that the operational property element of their LTC is set at 10% of that for existing stations in the same route and station category for a fixed five-year period from the date of opening?

Click or tap here to enter text.

## Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Click or tap here to enter text.

Thank you for taking the time to respond.

## Publishing your response

We plan to publish all responses to this consultation on our website.

Should you wish for any information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that this may be subject to publication, or release to other parties or to disclosure, in accordance with the access to information regimes. These regimes are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the UK General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR) the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

Under the FOIA, there is a statutory code of practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this, if you are seeking confidentiality for information you are providing, please explain why. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on ORR. If you are seeking to make a response in confidence, we would also be grateful if you would annex any confidential information, or provide a non-confidential summary, so that we can publish the non-confidential aspects of your response.

Any personal data you provide to us will be used for the purposes of this consultation and will be handled in accordance with our [privacy notice](https://www.orr.gov.uk/privacy-notice), which sets out how we comply with the UK General Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act 2018.

### Consent

In responding to this consultation you consent to us:

* handling your personal data for the purposes of this consultation; and
* publishing your response on our website (unless you have indicated to us that you wish for your response to be treated as confidential as set out above.)

Your consent to either of the above can be withdrawn at any time. Further information about how we handle your personal data and your rights is set out in our privacy notice.

### Format of responses

So that we are able to apply web standards to content on our website, we would prefer that you email us your response either in Microsoft Word format or OpenDocument Text (.odt) format. ODT files have a fully open format and do not rely on any specific piece of software.

If you send us a PDF document, please:

* create it directly from an electronic word-processed file using PDF creation software (rather than as a scanned image of a printout); and
* ensure that the PDF's security method is set to no security in the document properties.