



Emyl Lewicki
Head of Freight and Open Access
Office of Rail and Road
By email only

Gianmaria Cutrupi
Customer Manager
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
By email only

27 June 2025

Dear Emyl,

Network Rail Infrastructure Limited Representations for a New Track Access Contract submitted under Section 17 of the Railways Act 1993 between Network Rail Infrastructure Limited and Alliance Rail Limited

This letter provides the representations from Network Rail for a new Track Access Contract (TAC) submitted under Section 17 of the Railways Act 1993 between Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (“we”) and Alliance Rail Limited (“Alliance Rail”). Our letter is a response to an invitation sent by the Office of Rail and Road (“ORR”) on 28 April 2025 to make written representations in respect of this track access application.

The application was submitted by Alliance Rail to ORR on 10 April 2025, which included the submission of the Form P and a draft TAC. Alliance Rail aspire to run the following services from September 2026 to September 2033 in their draft TAC:

- Nine (9) trains per day in each direction between London Waterloo and Marchwood on weekdays (SX) and Saturdays (SO), seven (7) trains per day in each direction on Sundays (SUN);
- Seven (7) trains per day in each direction between Southampton and Marchwood on weekdays and Saturdays, five (5) trains per day in each direction on Sundays (SUN).

The purpose of this representation is to provide ORR with Network Rail’s position on this application (and the specific access rights within it) and will do so by providing facts, data and evidence to support our position.

Network Rail can confirm that based on the facts, data and evidence outlined in this representation it is not supportive of this application. Our rationale for not supporting this application is explained in the



following sections.

Where there are a number of applications seeking capacity at the locations referred to in this letter, the basis of our support of applications either in total, or in part (as can be determined by reading the relevant representations), may have a connection to our position on all other applications at that location. You may wish to wait for representations on related applications and the information provided therein prior to making your decision.

Form P Application

Alliance Rail's Form P indicates that they are "seeking to introduce 8 new daily services (each way) between London Waterloo and Marchwood and 7 new daily services between Southampton and Marchwood [...]".¹ Alliance Rail's draft TAC states that the sought services are 9 trains per day in each direction between London Waterloo and Marchwood on weekdays and Saturdays and 7 trains per day in each direction between Southampton and Marchwood on weekdays and Saturdays.² The data submitted by Alliance Rail to Network Rail included 9 daily services (each way and weekdays only) between London Waterloo and Marchwood and 8 daily services (each way and weekdays only) between Southampton and Marchwood. For the avoidance of doubt, our Capacity Planning analyses are exclusively based on the data submitted by Alliance Rail and did not include a weekend timetable.

We will expect Alliance Rail to have the necessary licences and safety certificates in place prior to running their services, should the application be approved.

Investment Conditions

We note Alliance Rail referenced their plans for Marchwood station to be "re-opened and re-furnished (or possibly re-sited)", "with a later phase potentially moving the station around 500 metres to provide a new platform and provide immediate access to significant parking", including "significant improvements [...] to enable it to be brought back into use".³⁴⁵

We would be interested in understanding Alliance Rail's investments linked to their proposal, including the timescales involved and funding requirements for:

- Marchwood station
- Bringing Platform 5 at Southampton Central into passenger use, and
- Any upgrades or refurbishments required to lineside assets on the Marchwood–Totton section

Network Change would need to be undertaken for these changes and this has not yet begun.

During an initial interface meeting on 07 March, Alliance Rail have been briefed on the infrastructure impact of moving Marchwood Station to the south, including positioning of the new platform to

¹ Alliance Rail Southern, *Application to the Office of Rail and Road for a Passenger Track Access Contract, or an Amendment to an Existing Contract*, 10 April 2025, p. 2.

² Alliance Rail Southern, *Track Access Contract (Open Access)*, 10 April 2025, p. 59.

³ Alliance Rail Southern, *Application to the Office of Rail and Road for a Passenger Track Access Contract, or an Amendment to an Existing Contract*, 10 April 2025, p. 2.

⁴ Ibid., p. 4.

⁵ Ibid., p.8.



account for location/siting of existing signals. The same is applicable to the Marchwood existing station site temporary proposals, noting the potential limitations of the legacy site for service turnbacks. Diagrammatic illustrations would assist significantly in clarifying proposed interventions, and it may be useful for us to 'check over' any such design to ensure Alliance Rail have included the feedback we provided.

We believe ORR should grant access rights only when it had assurance that the infrastructure work could be undertaken.

Industry Consultation

In Alliance Rail's Industry Consultation, which was undertaken between 18 December 2024 and 31 January 2025, Alliance responded to South Western Railway (SWR)'s letter stating "It is disappointing that we have not been included in any ongoing timetable development as has happened elsewhere on the network when open access services have been proposed".⁶ We can confirm that the South West Main Line (SWML) Industry Working Group has officially started on 06 May 2025 and Alliance Rail is currently participating in this forum. We acknowledge that the Industry Working Group had not started at the time of Alliance Rail's response to SWR.

Alliance Rail also stated that they would expect Network Rail to flag any concerns on power availability immediately.⁷ We can confirm that we have power supply concerns flagged during our Southern Timetable Change Risk Assessment Group (TCRAG) meeting, which have been outlined in our 'Additional Considerations' section below.

Track Access Contract

Network Rail acknowledges the TAC that Alliance Rail have included with their application. As we do not support this application, we cannot agree with the terms drafted in the TAC.

Key findings from the submitted Track Access Contract which the ORR and the applicant need to take into consideration and are as follows:

- *Contract commencement vs Service Commencement*
 - The Expiry Date would need to be added.
 - The Longstop Date would need to be added.
 - The Effective Date would need to be added.
- *Schedule 1*
 - Network Rail's Southern Route contact details would need to be added.
- *Schedules 4 & 8*
 - Sustained Planned Disruption (SPD) Cost Thresholds would need to be specified.

⁶ The Office of Rail and Road, *Alliance Rail Industry Consultation Responses*, 08 April 2025, p. 9.

⁷ Ibid., p. 11.



- The Payment Rate of the Estimated Bus Miles for the Train Operator (EBMPR) would need to be specified.
- *Schedule 5*
 - 'Morning Peak', 'Evening Peak' and 'Off Peak Times' references should be removed from Table 2.1.
 - A footnote should be added to table 2.1 for the Passenger Train slots to commence in the proposed timetable change.
 - In Specified Equipment 5.1, Network Rail would like the applicant to add a specific rolling stock class once they know what rolling stock they will be operating but prior to the Contract commencing.
- *Schedule 9*
 - The Liability Cap would need to be specified.
- *Schedule 11*
 - We would like to propose the inclusion of a Schedule 11 which will be a 'Relevant Schedule 4 and 8 Modifications'. This is to allow Network Rail and the applicant to capture the required data once the services commence and then undertake a Schedule 8 recalibration. Network Rail invites the applicant to agree a 'Start Date' and 'Backstop Date' as required in this schedule.

As stated, these are the high-level points made in the review of the TAC and therefore Network Rail invites ORR and the applicant to review and take into consideration the TAC as part of Network Rail's representations.

The Specified Equipment

Alliance Rail stated in their draft TAC that they would like to use "Class 769 DC/diesel bi-mode".⁸

Funding will need to be agreed for the infrastructure required to facilitate a power change at Totton, which will also necessitate additional signage and a full understanding of the impact of additional dwell times on both the Timetable and Performance. Network Rail proposes to undertake a performance assessment (including stock and crew) as part of the SWML Industry Working Group.

The rolling stock being used needs to go through the Vehicle Acceptance process including gauge clearance and statement of compatibility. If there are works which need to be done to permit these to operate, this will take time and funding will need to be agreed. Alliance Rail state that Porterbrook is currently undertaking gauging works and Route Acceptance.

Class 769s are not shown in the Sectional Appendix to run at 100mph. We have concerns around

⁸ Alliance Rail Southern, *Track Access Contract (Open Access)*, 10 April 2025, p. 65.



recovery from fleet failures, maintaining driver route knowledge, Vehicle Change and the costs of introduction.

Capacity

On the grounds of capacity, we are unable to support the application.⁹ Our Capacity Planning team has carried out an assessment of the proposed weekday paths and this output is included as Appendix 1 to this response.

Of the 41 paths reviewed there were:

- 24 with major conflicts where it's not believed that a path can be identified,
- 15 with minor conflicts where a path can only be achieved with significant flexing to other services currently within the timetable, and
- 2 found to be compliant with the Timetable Planning Rules (TPRs) based on the assumptions given by Alliance Rail.

The primary issues that have been identified with the proposal is the disregard of the Class 3, 5 and 8 services in the timetable, which include Network Services and Empty Coaching Stock moves, often utilising those paths for their own proposed services. The Network Services seasonal services which conflict with the proposed Alliance Rail paths are a vital part of the timetable to ensure the safety and compliance of the railway. Their paths have permanent Working Timetable (WTT) rights, which are published in the national TPRs and are strategic paths that deliver treatment mitigations as part of the wider management by the routes for the safety of the line. Further issues were identified with regular freight and passenger services. Key locations where path compliance issues were found include Basingstoke, St Denys and Waterloo West Crossings.

The Capacity Planning timetable study is based on the following assumptions:

- The assessment was made against the December 2024 timetable. There have been no significant changes in this area for May 2025.
- Southampton Central does not have the capacity to support additional services with either extended dwell times, or any requirement to reverse trains in platforms 1-4, at most times of day. This specifically includes any reversals from the London direction (which don't form part of the proposal). The Alliance Rail proposed infrastructure at Southampton Central to turn the Down Bay Sidings into "Platform 5" must be in place to operate the service and is essential to this proposal. This would only facilitate turnaround of trains from the Marchwood direction.
- Between Totton Junction and Marchwood, where the line is currently only served by up to 6 freight/light locomotive services per day (3 in each direction), there would be work required to bring the line into passenger service to serve the additional 32 trains per day. Alliance Rail have identified the re-opening of Marchwood station but not considered other operational considerations which could impact the train paths. These include but are not limited to; token working on the branch line, level crossings operations, power changeover, route opening

⁹ Alliance Rail did not submit a weekend timetable.



hours, engineering access requirement. These operational considerations have been initially discussed with Alliance Rail on 07 March 2025, including Network Rail's proposals to abandon the line south of Marchwood.

- Class 769s are not yet cleared for running along this route. There are no agreed TPR values. Alliance Rail have provided modelling information to demonstrate that the run times they have used for their timetable can be achieved. For the purpose of the timetable assessment it has been assumed that these values would be accepted without change. However, an initial assessment by Network Rail has identified that the proposed run times may not be achievable (as described further below).
- Services have been timetabled to start from Eastleigh station and no ancillary movements to the depot have been provided. There is insufficient capacity at Eastleigh station to support an extended turnaround, dwell times or stabling in platforms. It's been assumed that valid ancillary moves will be developed with their stabling proposal.
- Consequential flexes to other operators' services have been provided by Alliance Rail. However, we are not confident that these 23 flexed services are TPR compliant and provide a suitable end-to-end path. Our timetable assessment has treated these consequential flexes as valid for the purpose of this review, which means that the actual number of timetable conflicts is likely to be higher than reported.

Alliance Rail have provided run-time modelling and made comparison against the Class 450 run times. Network Rail have undertaken a high-level review of the provided modelling outputs used to inform those values and do not agree with Alliance Rail's modelling as presented to date. Therefore, we're not yet able to ascertain that Class 769 rolling stock can meet the run times that Alliance Rail have specified. Network Rail have shared their initial observations with Alliance Rail on 25 June 2025, with an offer to Alliance Rail to discuss Network Rail's support with further exploration of this matter. The run times are an integral data source which underpin the proposed paths in the timetable.

The assessment did not take into consideration the SWML Industry Working Group, which is still in its infancy, where we included known aspirations from operators seeking to significantly alter their timetable by May 2027 along with the proposed rights sought in this application. Other operators' aspirations may be competing with Alliance Rail's application. Track Access Applications have not yet been progressed for these aspirations.

Alliance Rail have stated in their application "SWR raised concerns about impending changes to its own aspirations to operate more services, but no applications have been made to ORR in respect of any SWR expansion. Even so, the small number of trains applied for by Alliance would not impinge on SWR's ability to increase services over time".¹⁰ Both Alliance Rail and SWR have declared their aspirations through this working group for use of the same infrastructure between London Waterloo and Totton Junction.

¹⁰ Alliance Rail Southern, *Application to the Office of Rail and Road for a Passenger Track Access Contract, or an Amendment to an Existing Contract*, 10 April 2025, p. 10.



Our timetable capacity analysis demonstrates that we cannot accommodate Alliance Rail's application in its current form. Inputs from the SWML Industry Working Group may present an opportunity to understand if a timetable recast could open up further options for its participants, including Alliance Rail. As part of the SWML Industry Working Group, analysis is underway to understand whether the aspirations for both operators can be accommodated alongside those with firm access rights and applications with outstanding rights decisions for the December 2025 timetable. This timetable analysis is currently planned to conclude in September 2025, with a performance assessment following.¹¹

Alliance Rail is a timetable participant of this group and attended the first Working Group on Tuesday 06 May 2025, where they provided a verbal description of their service proposal to attendees.

Key Location Performance Analysis

December 2024 Performance

Appendix 2 details the specific performance impact to existing services that surround the Alliance Rail proposal. It highlights current existing services that already experience performance challenges which in some cases are significant.

The Waterloo to Totton section highlights that the December 2024 (Dec 24) timetable shows performance challenges particularly at Woking (average 17 trains per hours [tph] in each direction), Eastleigh (average 11tph in each direction), and Southampton Central (average 14tph in each direction).

The Alliance Rail service proposal presents additional crossing moves at Totton Junction and St Denys. These are areas which have the potential to impact the current performance most significantly as they are crossing lines in front of, and behind, other services. The performance of these services is higher than the national average, but the introduction of Alliance Rail's trains may introduce a performance risk to the existing timetable.

From Waterloo to Woking, the Alliance Rail services would run in between 1Pxx (Waterloo to Portsmouth Harbour) and 1Wxx (Waterloo to Weymouth) services which both drop in performance over the section. The deterioration to adjacent paths suggests a performance risk in this part of the hour. From Woking to Waterloo, the Alliance Rail services mostly run behind services that have a performance lower than the national average.

For both directions at Winchester, the Alliance Rail services run in close proximity to existing services that currently perform lower than the national average.

At Eastleigh, most of the services that run towards Marchwood (Down) are scheduled on platform 3 (Up platform loop). The 1TXX - Portsmouth Harbour to London Waterloo services are scheduled to arrive on platform 2 which means crossing in front of the departing Alliance Rail service. There are 3-5 minutes between these scheduled moves, however the 1TXX services have a less than 50% on-time arrival at Eastleigh which adds risk to the Alliance service that it would not be able to depart on time, impacting other services on its onward journey. The Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) services from Southampton Central to Brighton (1N) move through St Denys 0.5-2.5 minutes before the Alliance Rail London Waterloo to Marchwood (1B) Services. The 1Ns would cross over the down lines,

¹¹ The September 2025 date may be reviewed depending on the level of validation required and complexity of interactions.



in front of the 1Bs, which would require them to have a high punctuality to avoid causing reactionary delay.

At Southampton Central, the Alliance Rail services that run between Waterloo and Marchwood (in both directions) will have adjacent paths in the timetable to services that have a current performance lower than the national average. The Alliance Rail services that run between Southampton Central and Marchwood would all originate from Platform 5 which is not currently in use for passenger services.¹²

At Totton, the Alliance Rail services would, in both directions, run behind services that have a performance that is lower than the national average.¹³

Complex and Competing Applications

Alliance Rail's aspired paths present conflicts against multiple schedules aligned to Section 17 and 22A applications submitted to ORR by 20 May 2024, in line with their letter to industry dated 24 April 2024. ORR previously indicated to Industry that decisions would be made on the applications submitted by 20 May 2024 prior to any future complex/competing aspirations. Decisions made in relation to the applications below would further impact on Network Rail's ability to accommodate these aspirations for the reasons outlined in this letter and quantum uplifts associated with the complex/competing applications (20 May 2024) would further challenge the ability to accommodate Alliance Rail's proposal, but Network Rail believes this application should not impact those decisions due to the reason outlined above.

Submitted track access applications interacting with the geographic area of the Alliance Rail proposal:

| |
|---|
| XC Trains Limited 38 th Supplemental Agreement |
| DB Cargo (UK) Limited 70 th Supplemental Agreement |
| DB Cargo (UK) Limited 81 st Supplemental Agreement |
| Freightliner Limited 21 st Supplemental Agreement |
| Freightliner Limited 22 nd Supplemental Agreement |
| Freightliner Limited 24 th Supplemental Agreement |
| Freightliner Limited 25 th Supplemental Agreement |
| Freightliner Heavy Haul Limited 24 th Supplemental Agreement |
| GB Railfreight Limited 25 th Supplemental Agreement |

¹² Platform 5 is currently Special Instruction only.

¹³ Wessex Route and South Western Railway have produced a Joint Performance Strategy for 2025-2030.

Waterside Line

A decision was taken in July 2024 not to progress with the Waterside Line project (operation of 2tph Totton – Hythe). The work completed as part of this proposal is useful in understanding considerations in relation to Alliance Rail's proposal. The work highlighted a number of issues, in particular:

- Track – beyond the initial curve at Totton Junction, the alignment through to Marchwood is predominantly straight, with a series of minor bearing changes. No geometry change would be proposed for 1tph, however componentry renewal will remain necessary where the existing infrastructure is life expired.
- Signalling – the Minimal Viable Product (MVP) Signalling layout suitable for a 1tph service Southampton – Hythe is dependent on a Level Crossing Risk Assessment process and the type of upgrade required at each crossing.
- Level crossings – as a minimum Jacob's Gutter and Marchwood level crossings would require upgrades.

Safety

Alliance Rail wrote in their Form P that “the branch line is fully operational between Totton and Marchwood”.¹⁴

The current Waterside Line infrastructure is neither designed nor capable of handling the level of service proposed by Alliance Rail and is currently classified as a goods online line, therefore it will require work to reclassify the line as a passenger line. Many components are obsolete and require renewal and the last scheme that developed a proposal for a passenger service along this line was unable to secure the required levels of funding to renew the infrastructure.

Operations

Network Rail would as a minimum require the following:

- The Line will require reclassifying as a passenger line and a fully funded plan to address track condition and the introduction of passenger services on the Marchwood branch prior to any services operating. Our track engineers will need to agree a scope of works required to change the category. This is likely to involve more access/patrols as well as changes to the operation of some level crossings and lineside fencing.
- A fully funded plan to resolve level crossing risks as identified in the original Restore Your Railway (RYR) scheme and subsequent narrative risk assessments.

¹⁴ Alliance Rail Southern, *Application to the Office of Rail and Road for a Passenger Track Access Contract, or an Amendment to an Existing Contract*, 10 April 2025, p. 4.



- We would need to understand the full implications on maintenance and signalling resourcing:
 - Option A is to close Marchwood Signal Box and re-signal the area to be controlled by Eastleigh Area Signalling Centre (ASC). This was discussed at the 07 March meeting with Alliance Rail, noting that any transfer of signalling control would necessitate the provision of colour light signalling, new interlockings, motorisation of points and associated upgrades to legacy infrastructure to ensure current compliance. This cost was assumed to be prohibitive for the initial proposals under consideration unless some form of major infrastructure rationalisation was included as a baseline.
 - Option B is to open Marchwood earlier and later – when currently there is only one signaller allocated to Marchwood. This would see an increase of circa 6 heads at £250,000 cost (which needs to be validated). Network Rail is not funded in our Control Period 7 (CP7) settlement to resource Marchwood to open beyond the current hours with one member of staff. An increase in service would need extended operating hours as required to meet both the service intent and our fatigue/rostering requirements. We are currently funded for one signaller post at Marchwood.

Additional Considerations

The following points add further detail to our rationale not to support Alliance Rail's application. We expect that the concerns and assessments highlighted below can be resolved as Business As Usual (BAU) activities through our standard regional TCRA unless otherwise specified, should Alliance Rail's application be approved by ORR.

TPRs and SRTs

There are no agreed TPRs or Sectional Running Times (SRTs) to run Class 769s on the proposed geography. Any TPRs developed for the Class 769s are unlikely to be consulted in time for a May 2026 timetable. Timescales for the December 2026 timetable would be more realistic, given that draft rules are to be published in September 2025.¹⁵

Level Crossings

The biggest impact will be at Marchwood level crossing, which is a manually operated gated crossing. It will require an upgrade to a full barrier system either CCTV or Obstacle Detection (OD) or as a minimum an installation of Wigwags on both approaches. Network Rail does not believe that the crossing can be left as it currently operates due to the additional risk from increased traffic. It is also anticipated that signaller workload will increase in Marchwood signal box. A full level crossing risk assessment is required for Marchwood and for all impacted level crossings. The remaining Automatic Half Barriers (AHBs) and 1 User-Worked Crossing (UWC) and 1 Footpath Crossing (FP) are unlikely to be justified for any future upgrades on a cost benefit analysis. Communication will be required around the increase of train count on this line that over the years has been very light.

Additionally, a full ergonomics assessment for Marchwood Signal Box is required, including suitability of signal box location and potential incorporation into Eastleigh ASC or Basingstoke Rail

¹⁵ "D64 – Start of NR Consultation of Proposed Changes to Rules" is on 19 September 2025. "D59 – Publish 'Draft Rules'" is on 24 October 2025.



Operating Centre (ROC) – a holistic assessment should be undertaken to include any plans to extend services to Fawley. This assessment is a significant piece of work that will require funding, should the application be approved. As part of the Waterside scheme, Jacobs Gutter AHB had a high-risk profile with nearby school and traffic/pedestrian flows. There was an initial suggestion from our Regional Level Crossing team to convert this to an Automatic Barrier Crossing, Locally Monitored (ABCL+) level crossing and reduce line speed to 10mph each way over the level crossing on single line. During a meeting with Network Rail on 02 May 2025, Alliance Rail did not object to that speed profile and the effect on the WTT.

Network Rail would be prepared to work with Alliance Rail to draw up these costs, should that be required. We would expect Alliance Rail to fund the required enhancements to mitigate the traffic increase, should the application be approved by ORR.

Signalling

Retaining control at Marchwood with the existing Signalling system is potentially viable and may be cost effective in the short term to allow passenger traffic under a minimum viable product. Southern Region is prepared to consider an alternative strategy which would relocate the signalling to Basingstoke ROC or Eastleigh ASC for example, but this requires further consideration if the application is approved.

The signalling on the Marchwood line is mechanical and will require an upgrade to Train Protection & Warning System (TPWS). Furthermore, a signal sighting assessment will be required if the application will be approved.

Track and Track Maintenance

The Waterside Line will require reclassifying as a passenger line and is only suitable for the existing level of traffic. Any increase in usage will require intervention (e.g. rails, sleepers, possible On-Track Machine [OTM] work). Increased traffic will increase the track category on the line, requiring more frequent inspections and appropriate Maintenance access will need to be agreed. Empty Coaching Stock (ECS) pathways will impact on any maintenance access given. Track recording trains will need to be extended to cover the Marchwood Line. A full review/walkout of the track will be required to include a track category assessment of the Marchwood branch line. Current line speeds may be acceptable to Alliance Rail, but a structural engineering assessment is still required to ensure it is fit for passenger traffic use.

Power

Power supply works will be required to replace the current mechanical signalling system on the Marchwood branch line. A full power availability assessment is required for all services (including the services to Waterloo) as there may be insufficient power available for the services proposed. This assessment will be part of the SWML Industry Working Group.

Platform Occupation at Southampton Central

An Assessment of the platform occupancy at Southampton (once timetable work completed) is required and will be part of the SWML Industry Working Group.



Resources

An increase in current levels of Signaller, Mobile Operations Manager (MOM) and Maintenance Response coverage will be required to cover the extension to Marchwood. Timescales for the recruitment and training timescales for signaller and maintenance staff may not support the proposed implementation date.

Access Planning

The Engineering Access Statement for 2026 was finalised at the end of February 2025. Any changes to the engineering access statement/strategy to support delivery of this proposal will require late notice consultation.

Network Change

A Network Change is likely to be required as a result of any infrastructure works identified as part of this proposal, including the Marchwood branch line changes.

Environment

Given the current line status, an environmental impact assessment will be required. The Marchwood line would need to be incorporated into the Seasonal Treatment Plan and a Vegetation Management Plan. This will require additional funding to be part of the Autumn Treatment Plan and that will sit outside of the current CP7 funding settlement.

Conclusion

In this representation letter we have confirmed that we do not support Alliance Rail's application for a TAC and the access rights sought in this application.

Network Rail is not supportive of this track access application for the reasons set out in this representation letter, namely timetable capacity, performance and several operational concerns on the Waterside Line.

Network Rail is willing to continue working with Alliance Rail and other operators in the Southern Region to assess their proposals and to understand whether they could be accommodated in the timetable via the SWML Industry Working Group.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if there is any further information you require.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gianmaria Cutrupi'.

Gianmaria Cutrupi
Customer Manager



System Operator



List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – *Final - ATT Analysis of Alliance Rail Southern Proposal v1.1*

Appendix 2 – *Marchwood – Performance Slides*